



An Exponent of Anarchist-Communism: Holding that Equality of Opportunity alone Constitutes Liberty; that in the Absence of Monopoly Price and Competition Cannot Exist, and that Communism is an Inevitable Consequence.

VOL. II.

PORTLAND, OREGON, SUNDAY, AUGUST 9, 1896.

No. 27.

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.

For Freedom.

Nature rejects the monarch, not the man,
The subject, not the citizen: for kings
And subjects, mutual foes, forever play
A losing game into each others' hands,
Whose stakes are vice and misery.

Of virtuous soul commands not nor obeys.
Power, like a desolating pestilence,
Pollutes whate'er it touches; and obedience
Bane of all genius, virtue, freedom, truth,
Makes slaves of men, and, of the human frame,
A mechanized automaton.

The man

—[Shelley.]

More Concerning Methods.

In pursuance of my promise to say more concerning methods that I consider practical, in a constant struggle to get Anarchy, I would say, to begin with, that I am not one of those who entertain but one idea at a time. Neither am I one to wait for the revolution, but am in favor of making constant and repeated efforts to realize as many of our ideas as possible in our association with each other, both in our social and our business life. By so doing we may be able to better our economic condition, and educate by example. If our efforts are suppressed, that will add to the propaganda by creating public sympathy and by calling attention to our theories and efforts.

Viewing the question in this light I am constrained to always encourage, by all means at my command, every effort to better economic conditions by voluntary and non political methods. That many of these efforts may seem to be foredoomed to failure does not cause me to discourage those who are about to make the effort, for I consider that such efforts are always worth the making, and the experience most always compensates for any loss that may be sustained. But there are some efforts that may be made that are revolutionary in their character, and yet so inoffensive in their outward appearance that, to my mind, they appear the most practical, and most worthy of our support and encouragement.

One of the most important of these movements is the Labor Exchange. If carried out as planned by Mr. De Bernardi it would eliminate from the business affairs of its members those three great objects of all Anarchists' hatred, viz., rent, interest, and profit. And right here let me say, while I do not oppose the Mutual Bank, I consider the L. E. preferable; more sweeping and revolutionary in its ultimate results, and more practical today. It answers every purpose of the M. B., and at the same time opens up opportunities for the idle to find employment, and then secures to them the enjoyment of the result of the exertions. Another point of comparison is this: while our "philosophic" friends do a good deal of talking about the M. B., their talk comes to naught; but a few ordinary people get to-

gether and form a co-operative association, or a L. E., and try to realize in a measure a juster and more civilized mode of dealing with each other. Last winter Comrade Hesse, of Seattle, complained that the Anarchist propagandists did little but talk, and his complaint is not without foundation.

The L. E. is a non-political, economic and industrial organization, with the employment of all the unemployed, the furnishing of a circulating medium free of interest, and the transforming into non-taxable, Association property, of the permanent wealth created by the members, as its foundation principles. Should it become widespread, its influence would reduce interest, raise wages, and lessen profits. If let alone by the courts it would eventually revolutionize present methods of distribution, eliminate profit, abolish interest, and make non-taxable property of all permanent wealth produced by the members, said property to be held for the general use and benefit of the members.

Lest some one accuse me of not being explicit, I will explain.

A number of persons come together and form an association. They apply for a charter, as a branch of the L. E. Among the members are some farmers and laborers, a carpenter, a tailor, a shoemaker, a painter, etc. All of them have either products or labor power to sell, and all agree to accept the certificates of the association in payment for anything they may have to sell. The association secures a room to be used as a depository, and the farmers deposit some potatoes and other stuff, and receive certificates of deposit therefor. The farmers need some carpenter work and painting done, and so the carpenter and painter get a job. They receive their pay in the certificates issued to the farmers, and pay the tailor and the shoemaker for work done, with the same. The shoemaker and the tailor pass them on to the grocer and the doctor, and finally they are redeemed at the depository, by the purchase of commodities on deposit with the Exchange. A man with a little spare coin deposits it, receiving certificates of deposit for it. With this coin machinery is bought and a broom factory started, and the farmer's broom corn made into brooms. A tannery is started to utilize the hides which the farmers have on hand, and which are accumulating at the butcher shop, which has been added to the Ex.

In this manner a number of associated industries can be built up, the L. E. serving the double purpose of marketing agent and banker—furnishing a ready market, and supplying a sufficient volume of circulating medium without interest. The certificates of any branch would be good at all other branches, and the Central Exchange would act as Clearing house for all the various branches.

Just in proportion to the growth of the L. E., idle men and women would find employment; and legal tender money lack for borrowers. This would tend to raise wages and reduce interest, thus gaining the friendship of the wage earners, and the now famous "debtor class." When a large minority of any community worked and traded together on the L. E. plan, local tradesmen would find necessary to reduce their profits, in order to hold their customers, and most of them would find it expedient to accept the L. E. certificates as money.

I know that there are many objections that can be raised, and many obstacles to overcome, but nothing is accomplished without effort. Then too, no one method can be equally practicable in all localities, and under all circumstances. What I contend is, that this is a practical method of bettering economic conditions, revolutionary in its tendency, and worthy of the support of all Anarchists.

When there is no desire to engage in industrial pursuits, but simply to provide a circulating medium, a simple association like the Co-operative Exchange of which I spoke last week is a good and practical plan. Anything that will tend to relieve the money famine, and at the same time reduce the superstition concerning fiat, or legal tender money, is of prime importance just now, while the silver and legal tender craze is running high, and the scarcity of money causing so much distress.

I think that all efforts made on these lines tend to hasten the revolution, and to reduce the danger of violent outbreaks, which, owing to a lack of a clear conception of what is wanted, would be premature. It would also put a good many in position to fight—when fighting becomes necessary—who are now unprepared and unable to prepare themselves.

When the L. E. becomes widespread and active enough to reduce interest considerably, an attempt at suppression, by the government, at the instigation of the Bankers Association, is sure to occur, and all petition and appeal to the courts will be in vain. Then a struggle between the members and sympathizers on one side, and the officials and "law and order" fools on the other, will begin. In this struggle the government can succeed only by the most drastic and brutal methods, and the use of such methods will awaken the revolutionary spirit in all lovers of liberty, and combine the various other forces that are at work undermining the government, with this movement. Of these forces, and the result of their combination, I will speak later.

HENRY ADDIS.

Byington's Young, Fresh Talmud.

COMRADE BYINGTON wants to know where I found my quotation from the Talmud. I am more than pleased to have so good a scholar show interest in my articles. He will find the quotation in "God and his Book," by Saladin (W. Stewart Ross), which book contains a chapter by his colleague, Julian, that will interest my comrade and also prove instructive. I do not believe the conclusions arrived at can be successfully refuted, or his historical facts disproved, or his splendid scholarship denied. The honesty of the author is unquestionable.

Says W. Stewart Ross: "Since I first asserted that the 'Lord's Prayer' was to be found in the Talmud, it has been asserted, in defense of Christianity, that the Talmudical writer had copied the prayer from the Gospels. Such a wild conjectural allegation is hardly worth the refuting. That the Jews should copy the hagiography of the detested Christians is as reasonable as the conception of the harmonious blending of fire and water; or a community of sentiment and worship between the temple on Mount Moriah and that on Mount Gerizim. As if anticipating this objection, which some Christian apologists, driven to desperation, might advance, Deutsch remarks: 'We need not urge the priority of the Talmud to the New Testament, although the

former was redacted at a later period. To assume that the Talmud had borrowed from the New Testament would be like assuming that Sanskrit sprang from Latin, or that French was developed from the Norman words found in English."

For scriptural plagiarisms from the Talmud, I will refer Byington to Moncure D. Conway in his "Sacred Anthology", to whom Mr. Ross refers his readers. It appears that the writers of those four tracts, or gospels, helped themselves very plentifully to the ethical maxims of the Talmud. Mr. Ross quotes much more from the writings of Emanuel Deutsch, "the most learned of modern Talmudists".

Probably I value less the historic evidence of the fathers than my comrade does. Yes, Tertullian wrote, "I believe because it is impossible," referring to Jesus getting out of his grave and flying up to heaven. However, Tertullian, like Rob Roy's gillie, seems to have had "glimmerings of common sense", for he had the wit to know that the story is "manifestly impossible"—more wit than even educated Christians can boast of today. Tertullian could weigh probabilities and distinguish the impossible from the possible. Even Comrade Byington seems at a loss in doing so.

Here goes Nehemiah, 8:8: "So they read in the book [Exra and a lot of priests] in the law of God distinctly, gave the sense, and caused them [the people] to understand the reading." The effect of all this reading was to set all the people weeping. Evidently Exra, Nehemiah and the Levites were as moving in their supplications as Col. Fellows was at the late convention at Chicago. After the reading was over and the people's tears wiped away they all went to eat and drink—it was noontime—and "made a great mirth"—whatever that might be. All of which only shows that the priests and politicians had it all their own way, very much as they have today.

I do not think the gospel writers knew anything of "astronomical" eclipses, but that an eclipse was meant seems to me indisputable. Matthew's writing of the second coming of Christ shows no acquired knowledge of astronomy. His writing may be imaginative, but it is none the less nonsense. However, Byington is as strong when he returns to his "local" eclipse as in all his criticism. True, the ancient Egyptians were studying astronomy and solving social and scientific problems as best they might centuries ere the first man and the first woman were manufactured by Jehovah and placed in Eden; centuries before God "in the beginning" stepped into a vast natural vacuum and made out of its contents(?) this little planet—made it flat and square and walled it around by a firmament above and rushing waters under the earth; centuries before all this happened eclipses were seen and wondered of by men. The moon was traveling with the earth around the sun centuries before Jehovah did them and hung them up to dry—I mean, to light the earth by day and by night. I do not believe the gospel writers knew anything of astronomy or cosmogony excepting the fable of the creation. Whether or no the Hindoo fable is given at third or tenth hand, it is more beautiful than the preposterous Bible yarn, and quite as true.

Christianity was for so long a period so busy in burning and destroying the best on earth of knowledge and its results, as well as sane men and women, that it is not to be marvelled at that we cannot judge the age of a book by its manuscripts. Christianity destroyed all evidence discovered (so far as possible) not only in the old world, but in this country as well. God "in the beginning" (!) evidently created only the old world and was ignorant of America, so he did not "make it". But even in the old world man got ahead of God in knowledge centuries before he got to work! Even when God awakened and started in to do something he was not up to date. The best he could do was to make a flat, square world out of that which he found inside a vacuum. I admit the material was not easy to work up into shape!

Doubtless he did the best he knew how to do, but it is to be hoped he will try no more experiments. He was not at all scientific and lost his temper over very small matters. If he be fast asleep now, as I hope he is, may he never again awaken and get to work. A sleeping god is a very good god indeed.

The god who made this world "in the beginning" and stocked it with Adam and Eve and the beasts of the field, including the talking serpent, was awakened too late. Man and woman had already made themselves at home in their world for tens of thousands of years and gotten far ahead of him in knowledge. God was "left". He did his best—wrote ten laws on stone, gave Moses an exhibition of a "living picture"

on Mount Sinai, and then broke all his laws and told his people to "follow suit". No, God did keep one law himself—he always considered himself the one great I Am—was "stuck on himself", and working on small capital.

But God's world has come to an end, as logically it should do, having had a "beginning". Infallible popes holding the keys of a diabolical heaven could not hold men in a flat, square, walled-about earth—even the fagot failed. True, an infallible pope rules millions today, but he has been forced to enter the world men lived in before God's time. The Church posited a God family always from the beginning in heaven and tried to keep the flat, square world alive. Naturally, wherein God failed the Church could not succeed.

The Church did not give up all, however. She brought along some old portraits of the God family with her; furnished them up, regilt the frames and does business at the old stand; bleeding the people and persuading them to drink of a juggled cup. Here, in the States, she escapes taxation on at least five thousand millions of dollars of wealth, which is, of course, paid by those who do all the useful work ever done.

CLINTON LOVERIDGE.

P. S:—The Talmud is certainly as old as the oldest portions of the Bible. In fact, there are two Talmuds. My comrade is right, however, as to the Talmud being without sonants or vowel points.

Definition of Property.

In one of his incomparable communications to The Firebrand Mr. Byington attacked the writer's position, which contended that "Property" originated in the will of the rulers.

As a matter of fact, property based on and constituted by law, cannot exist in the absence of law, and in turn law cannot exist in the absence of rulers. Mr. Byington, although otherwise sagacious, undoubtedly confounded the terms property and possession, which, though synonyms, have two entirely different meanings.

The former, Property, means nothing else but the ownership and control over natural opportunities and products of labor by an individual or number of individuals for whose development such control is not in the least required, thus cutting off the opportunity for development of other individuals.

Possession, on the other hand, has no reference whatever to legal control of opportunities. It states simply the personal holding of opportunity and product. For our learned friend's consolation we will state that we are aware of the fact that man held things in his possession before rulers existed. But when rulers sprang up and law originated, the institution of property, antagonistic to natural possession, began to benumb human development. Then the artificial property law, which through the granting of privilege permitted control of opportunities, took the place of naturally constituted property, which found its equitable adjustment in the individual requirements for possession.

H. EICH.

Two of a Kind.

In No. 21 I criticised Mr. Tandy's "Free Competition", and in No. 24 I had something to say about Mr. Fulton's "land plank". In No. 4 of "Age of Thought" I find somewhat amusing attempts at reply. I quote from Mr. Tandy:

Mr. Morris says of "Free Competition": "It appears to me that the land question is the principal point where Mr. Tandy's school goes astray." But at the close of the same article he says: "How shall each individual realize his right to the most favorable opportunity, which is coexistent with the rights of all other individuals? Simply by, singly or in association with others, applying his labor to any unused opportunity; thus production being free and unlimited, values will disappear and all will consume freely." Here he advocates just exactly the system advocated by me.

Then after assuming that there is no difference between us, he says in the very next sentence: "It is futile to hope that Mr. Morris will ever agree with me." Possibly he is right here, but I deny that we agree on the question of land tenure, because private ownership of products is a part of his proposition, and with this I do not agree. I see no difference between ownership of the products of land and ownership of the land itself, since such products alone contribute to the desirability of land.

Mr. Tandy "cannot see how occupancy and use

will abolish all value to land". His occupancy and use might not do so; I, at least, have never claimed that it would. I fear he has the same notion of value as Mr. Greene, who recently wrote of the value of air. But it is plain that air can have no value so long as its quantity is unlimited as compared with our needs. The same is true of water, land, or any other desirable article. The destruction of monopoly means the destruction of values. That is why unrestricted production will result in free consumption. Mr. Tandy's inability to see how values are to be abolished is his reason for declaring equality of opportunity unattainable. I admit the difficulty from his property standpoint. Property is monopoly; monopoly is restriction—denial of liberty, and restriction is the creator of values.

Mr. Tandy thinks that "economic rent" will tend to decrease under occupancy and use, and assumes that what I mean by the disappearance of values is the disappearance of economic rent, and wants me to prove that it will disappear. He also finds an inconsistency between this assumption of my meaning and my recognition of, or, as he puts it, belief in, economic rent. All of this is absurd. What is termed economic rent is simply the superior productivity of the best over the poorest land in use, and how this difference would decrease under occupancy and use tenure is not plain. Neither has this difference anything to do with values. True, the more productive land would be the more desirable, just as pure air is more desirable than foul air. But in paying a greater price for the better land today, a man simply pays for the privilege of monopolizing a greater amount of products. Under Mr. Tandy's land tenure the economic rent is to be appropriated by the individual who is successful in gaining possession of the best land. I claim that the individual cannot appropriate this superior advantage without infringing the liberty of every other individual whose right to it are co-existent and coequal with his. No individualist has denied the proposition, but Mr. Tandy calls such privilege "contract right", and says that if those who decline to enter into the contract will let them alone the non-contractors will be let alone. This is generous in the extreme. If any number of individuals should be opposed to contracting away the best opportunities, to which all are alike entitled, without any consideration in return, it is proposed to hold those advantages by conquest! The monopolists of today offer us a similar proposition.

Mr. Fulton's reply is devoted principally to ground already covered in our discussions in The Firebrand. In No. 3 of "Age of thought" he defines Communism thus: "The word Communism means the negation of the right of private property." Then in No. 4 he demands that I declare for communal (that is, group) property, as a condition of further discussion; that is, unless I consent to commit myself to an absurdity for him to point out he will not pay any more attention to what I say. He refers me to Holmes and Malatesta as already having committed the error, and suggests that if I will follow suit he will be happy to tell me what a fool I have been. Then he closes with a series of questions, which I must decline to notice. If Mr. Fulton does not wish to discuss Communism on its own fundamental propositions I have no desire to force the discussion upon him; but I insist that it must be so discussed if at all—I will not come to his absurd terms for the sake of bandying words with him. However, I expect to criticise his statements in the future as in the past, and he may notice me or not as seems best to himself.

J. H. M.

To Comrades in Anarchy.

LET us reason together and see if we can arrive at an agreement as to the correct position assumed by the two schools of Anarchists, not so much with the intention of reconciling the difference as establishing the hope that a careful consideration of the idea will tend to make us more tolerant of each others mode of propaganda. The first point I would make is this: in discussing anything we must consider the fact that nature has constituted an irreconcilable difference in our organizations; we cannot see alike, we cannot think alike. While I strive to hold my mind open to conviction, I am

forced to acknowledge that preconceived opinions exert a tremendous influence, especially after we have made up our minds as to the correctness of certain ideas, and advocated a certain mode of propaganda.

There are two methods of propaganda, the one we may designate as the truth seeker, the other the truth soldier. Both are essential, and may, and frequently do, combine their forces. But the nature of the soldier often impels him to adopt methods that the truth seeker cannot approve. He is inclined to be aggressive in arguments. He shoots logic to kill. If he is a "master at fence," and an artist in his line, he may, in a certain direction, do a great deal of good, and awaken thought in minds which the more modest truth seeker could never hope to reach. But for the common folk, the laborer, the majority, it requires a more simple propaganda. It is not the soldier logician, it is not the learned economist, but rather a modest mediocrity; those who can appeal to them from their own standpoint.

It is not for me to say which of the various lines is the most important. The importance of awakening thought all along the line bids me welcome all who seriously strive to advance the banner of reform or revolution. I hold it true that it is better to think wrong than never to think at all. While I oppose the theory of State Socialism, and would fight it as the very achme of political evil, I can but rejoice at its progress in the political field. It tells me that the apathy of the people is giving way; that thought is converging on lines of reform. It is ever so in the evolution of thought—the apparent precedes the real. The symptoms are mistaken for the disease. Pope has said of education:

"Shallow draughts intoxicate the brain,
But drinking largely sobers us again."

We may trust to thought, for the evil it engenders it also cures. My own experience bids me hope. To paraphrase Tupper: "I follow economy through the world and find her home in Anarchy." But I find in that home some honest differences of opinion, and these do not constitute the happy family that should be gathered there. I would class as Anarchists all those who disbelieve in authority. All who repudiate the rule of man by man. All who hold to the sovereignty of self and equality of all. All those who believe that government is an unnecessary evil; that it engenders monopoly, which in turn creates poverty, vice and crime. All Anarchists agree as to the desirability of abolishing government, but disagree as to the methods to be employed, as well as the state or condition society would be in after the revolution, one party advocating free trade, free banking, occupancy and use the only title to land; free competition to destroy profits, as free money would destroy interest, and free land rents. These style themselves Individualists, and would disintegrate, disestablish, decentralize and introduce an era of small industries, making every man an individual producer, a capitalist and sovereign. On the other hand stands the Communist, who would attack private property, competition and commercialism as props that doth sustain government; who would integrate, unite and centralize society. Let both proclaim the equal liberty of man in the pursuit of happiness. The importance of some action to bring about a condition of greater liberty leads me to favor the individualistic conception of Anarchy: that is to say, the favoring of some project like Mutual Banking, the Labor Exchange or kindred enterprise, for the purpose of abolishing, or doing away with interest, rent and profits. These appear, in my light, to be the greatest obstacles to human progress.

To fasten these upon civilization, government is instituted. Deprive civilization of these and government, like Othello, would find its occupation gone. The formation of a Communistic society—that is to say, a cooperative commonwealth devoid of authority—would of course effect it. But it

seems to me more expedient to adopt some means less radical, yet distinctly tending to complete emancipation. Labor and its entire reward, it strikes me, is something which we can all comprehend and consistently work for. Reciprocal relation is easily understood. Justice, that is doing to others as you would have others do to you. "As ye sow so shall ye reap," is beginning to appear to the minds of the masses. Let us lay bare foundation principles, and impress the importance of building square upon them. Just now the voice of the politician is heard in the land asking you to contribute your offering to the political pot now beginning to bubble.

"Trust him not—
He is fooling thee!"

Boycott him and his necromancy. Impress upon the minds of all this great truth, that the selfishness of man's nature is a good servant, but a poor master. Let each of the units of society work for the greatest good of self, but guard against the possibility of any self subjecting the wills of others to his own.

"Power, like a desolating pestilence,
Pollutes whate'er it touches. And obedience,
Bane of all virtue, freedom, genius, truth,
Makes slaves of men, and of the human frame
A mechanized automaton."

A. L. BALLOU.

Questions About Communism.

I THINK Mr. Morris is probably right in suggesting that we shall make nothing valuable out of our discussion of the relations between education and sustenance till we have laid some clear mutual understanding of the property question as a foundation. I accept the discussion on property, therefore, and wish to begin by getting a clearer view of my opponent's position. So I will ask Mr. Morris to answer these questions:

Suppose that in a society where it is customary to conform to Anarchist-Communist principles, certain men build a brewery and brew a quantity of beer, because they and some of their neighbors want beer to drink; but certain other persons in the neighborhood, having made up their minds that because of its alcoholic and intoxicating nature beer is worthless as a drink, believe that when there is a lot of beer around the most economical thing to do is to use it in the arts; these latter, therefore, build a distillery and varnish factory, and as fast as any beer is brewed cart it off, distill it into alcohol and make it into varnish, thereby preventing the brewers from getting their drink. Is the action of the latter party contrary to Anarchist-Communist principles? If so, wherein? and, if they cannot be persuaded to stop voluntarily, is there any way to make them stop without violating Anarchist-Communist principles?

The supposed case does not seem to me to be a very improbable one; but if it does seem so to another, that is no sufficient reason for objecting to my questions. For my purpose is not to get instructions on which I may act in the concrete case for which they are given, but to have a principle made clear by its action in a test case; and extraordinary cases are often the sharpest tests.

I suppose I know already that, however much he may object to a young man's devoting all his working hours to the study of theology and taking all his exercise in recreation, Mr. Morris would not try to resist his supplying himself with food from the common stock, nor to compel him to work with his hands, so long as the fellow chose to keep on in his course. If I am wrong, I hope to be corrected.

STEPHEN T. BYINGTON.

Mixed Pickles.

THERE is an old saying that there are tricks in politics. Here is a sample of the "City of Destiny" style.

There are two gangs lurking for the city pie. One (the former) is Republican and the other (the present) is Citizens-Reform-A. P. A.-Irish Catholic combination, by which Mr. Fawcett was elected mayor of Tacoma. At the election things were not working any too smoothly, and the mayor only received two majority over Mr. Orr, the former incumbent. This was in April last. But Mr. Orr found a "splinter in the eye" about the two majority, and there were a

lot of nice epithets exchanged between the old and new(?) administrations. As Mr. Orr is a very respectable, law-abiding citizen, he went to the courts for protection and a recount of the votes of the mistified mistification boxes; but some of his partners wanted to fight rather than give up their jobs.

Yesterday, July 22, the affair was to come up for the second time, and this was expected to be a final decision. But, a surprise(?) to the city controller, the ballot boxes of the disputed district were gone from the vaults! As soon as the theft was made public the present administration wanted almost(!) to give up their commissions, but later on got a little cooler. Mr. Fawcett offered \$200 and ten of his compeers \$10 each for the arrest of the mistified mistification thief. Mr. Orr was smiling very sarcastically over this, and the "Morning Union" says the trouble is not over yet, and I am inclined to think so too.

It is also to be noticed that the present administration is the result(?) of the prayers offered to the Lord from the "Free Church" and on down to the orthodox praying institutions. God bless you, good souls. Halleluiahs for evermore!

And you, intelligent voter, don't you see that they are only two robbing and mystifying gangs, of which you are the conscious or unconscious tool? All you know is to work, endure starvation, and pay the expenses of the different kinds of legal enactments. When are you going to open your eyes and see that any government is nothing but the result of our indifferent submission to a lot of professional rascals, called politicians in Webster's vocabulary? Why shouldn't we go now to the City Hall and Courthouse, take the rest of the mistification papers out and turn them into smoke? This would make a starter from the politicians, provided we follow up the job. And why shouldn't we do it? Think of the local match factory.

A. KLEWENCIC.

Note and Comment.

THE June number of "Our New Humanity", that splendid sociologic quarterly issued from the office of "Lucifer", has reached us. Its contents are: "The Abolition of Marriage," by John Beverly Robinson; "Isabel's Intention," a short story dealing with the "social evil"; "Reminiscences of Berlin Heights," a sketch historical of a free love community in Ohio early in the fifties, by Alvin Warren; "The Sexes and Love in Freedom," a splendid article which recognizes the relations between industrial and sexual freedom, by Oscar Rotter; also poems by J. William Lloyd and James F. Morton, Jr., and reviews and reminiscences by the editor, Moses Harman. "Our New Humanity" is devoted especially to questions of sex relation, and we are glad to recommend it to those interested in such matters, because of the great importance of the question and the inability of The Firebrand, on account of small space, to give it proper attention. Send twenty-five cents for a copy, or \$1.00 for a year's subscription, to M. Harman, 1394 West Congress street, Chicago, Illinois.

A COMRADE in Philadelphia has collected \$10.00 for the press fund, and informs us that a concert is to be given in that city for the benefit of The Firebrand. They are very anxious to see the paper enlarged and are working to that end. The prospects now are that enlargement is assured in the near future. The response to the proposition has exceeded our most sanguine expectations.

It does not appear to me that Mr. Byington's questions touch upon property in any way. I should say that a man has a right to brew and drink beer, as well as to distill alcohol and manufacture varnish; and that these rights never clash without the violation of liberty. It appears that the only reason the distillers have for using beer instead of grain for their purpose is a desire to invade the brewers' liberty to drink beer. The question, therefore, is one of liberty and not of property. So long as there are those who are inclined to prohibit, directly or indirectly, the use of intoxicants, or to interfere in any other way with individual liberty, such questions are likely to arise. I might show how, in the absence of this desire to prevent beer drinking, the matter would be self-adjusting, but it is altogether foreign to the property question. If Mr. Byington

wishes to discuss property, let him substantiate his claim that property is necessary to Anarchy.

J. H. M.

A new German weekly paper, "Der Kämpfer" (The Combatant), has made its appearance in St. Louis. It is non-authoritarian in tendency and contends for true freedom (absence of dictation). It is a welcome addition to the German Anarchist press in this country, composed of "Freiheit," New York, "Arbeiter Zeitung," "Vorboten" and "Fackel," Chicago, and "Arbeiter Zeitung," Buffalo, and "Der Arme Teufel," Detroit.

H. E.

We have received the first number of "The Match". It is a small, neat, four-page weekly, published at 174 Hanover street, Boston, by Comrades H. M. Kelly and Geo. E. Miller, at twenty-five cents a year. We are glad to welcome it to our table, and hope it may kindle many a flame of thought, both of revolution and of better days. May it show a gleam of hope every week. It is doubly pleasing to note that "The Match" is an unpretentious, earnest effort of two comrades to carry on the work of propaganda to the best of their ability, and we predict for it success if the comrades continue in the way in which they have begun. Let the comrades everywhere subscribe for "The Match" and help the comrades in the good work they have begun.

A STRIKE at the Brown hoisting works, Cleveland, Ohio, occurred August 1st. The union men, according to reports, turned their attention to the non-union men, throwing stones and bricks at them. The Central Labor Union will probably order a sympathetic strike. A general sympathetic strike is to be commended, but the strikers, so far, have struck at the wrong men. Instead of turning their hatred against the non-union men, it would be far better to settle with the Brown Hoisting Company directly.

The western strikers have a way of dealing with their enemies that is more direct than stoning scabs, as is shown by the following associated press dispatch:

Boise, Idaho, July 24.—News reached here tonight that striking miners at Mullan dynamited a flume of Hunter mine at that place. Gov. McConnell was wired for assistance, but as he has no state militia at his command he could render no aid. In case of further trouble government will be asked to send federal troops to the scene of difficulty.

RECENTLY, anticipating a visit to Omaha by Comrade John Turner, "The White Slave," a State Socialist paper of that city, published the following:

Very few men so thoroughly understand the situation today as Mr. Turner. A wage earner himself, he has the advantage over many labor leaders who quietly sit at home clipping coupons for a living. Mr. Turner is a student of social economy of no small reputation, who combines with it a profound knowledge of the subject he treats and a wonderful command of speech. Let us turn out en masse to his lecture and show him that the invitations sent him to visit us were no hollow formalities.

This aroused the ire of "The People" (perhaps the reference to coupon-clipping labor leaders struck too close home to suit Mr. DeLeon), the New York Socialist organ, and after calling Mr. Turner muddle-headed, ignorant and vicious, it demands that "The White Slave" either retract or be read out of the party, concluding in the following language:

If "The White Slave" erred unintentionally, let it turn up sharp, or, if it knew what it was doing, let it rank itself promptly with the swindle sheets of catch-penny journalism. We shall wait and see.

This shows the calibre and animus of the editor of "The People". As long as "The White Slave" shouted for the Socialist Labor Party he spoke very complimentary of it, but now that it speaks favorably of an Anarchist it must crawl on its belly to "The People", the leader of the party, or rank itself promptly with the swindle sheets of catch-penny journalism. What do you think of such free press as that? Such is Social Democratic freedom.

The following, written by Mr. Bryan, Democratic populist nominee for President, appeared in the Omaha World-Herald the 11th of last November:

The Anarchists in Chicago did not hold memorial services over the graves of those of their comrades who were executed for participating in the Haymarket riots. For seven years it has been their custom to hold exercises of this character in Waldheim Cemetery, where the remains of their misguided friends are buried, but the directors of the cemetery this year refused to permit it. It seems harsh to prohibit a tribute by the liv-

ing to its beloved dead, but in this case the action of the directors was justifiable. These annual gatherings have not been those of genuine mourning, but the participants have used the place and occasion to teach their doctrines and to stir up an animosity against the law and its officers.

Anarchy has no place in this country, either in the busy walks of life or in the quiet city of the dead. Anarchy is an enemy to peace, to society and to happiness. It is NOT to be TOLERATED in ANY COUNTRY (small caps mine). Much less has it any cause for existence or toleration in this country, and its friends and devotees cannot use the sacredness of the grave as a means for spreading their unwholesome doctrines and to stir up new strife against the law that accords to even the teachers of arson and assassination a fair and impartial trial before a jury of their peers.

The Democratic platform declaration for free speech, free press, anti-injunction, etc., seems to have inclined a number of radicals to support Bryan, but what do they think of this? ANARCHY IS NOT TO BE TOLERATED in any country. Does that look like the maintenance of free speech and free press? H. A.

Jacob S. Coxey tells the readers of his paper that "John Most the New York Anarchist comes out square for gold and would even make the karat of diamonds the standard of exchange." This is a lie, Mr. Coxey! Most simply ridicules the silver craze in this country, but neither advocates a gold nor silver standard.

A. I.

The Letter Box.

A. WASSERMANN, New York City.—Received subscription. The rest is alright.

H. M., Philadelphia.—We never got 30c from S. towards your subscription.

SERAPIS, New York City.—Your work we consider highly commendable, and have no doubt good results will follow.

A. B., Philadelphia.—The paper is sent to all the names you sent in from the beginning of the second volume, except No. 2, which is exhausted.

G. W. C., Santa Ana, Cal.—Helen Wilmans is still publishing "Freedom" in Boston. We have changed address, and hope you will live long enough—in spite of your old age—to see freedom realized.

A. D., New York City.—You will have seen the account in the press fund receipts by this time. Pictures were not ready, but was sent a few days ago. We hope you have heard from Fulton also.

P. E., New York.—Shelly's "declaration of rights", written, as you say, at the age of sixteen, is perhaps remarkable as coming from one so young, and it may also have some value or interest because of the celebrity of its author; but in itself it cannot today be called radical, and quotations from Shelly might be given which are far more worthy of the space, for he was later in life an Anarchist and advocated it both in poetry and prose.

TO ALL COMRADES NOT RECEIVING THE FIREBRAND REGULARLY.—The Firebrand is mailed regularly every Friday, and we take great care that every name on the list is included. If it fails to reach you promptly, the first thing to do is to make inquiries at your postoffice. Do this and send us the reply you get, if unsatisfactory, with your letter of complaint.

"I honor the man who is willing to sink Half his present repute for the freedom to think; And when he has thought, be his case strong or weak, Will sink 't'other half for the freedom to speak; Not caring what vengeance the mob has in store— Be that mob the upper ten thousand or lower."

Propagandists Attention.

HAVING an opportunity to obtain a lot of splendid Anarchist-Communist pamphlets at about three-fifths cents each, we decided to use a part of the press fund for that purpose. We now have on hand 1200 copies of "The Paris Commune" and "An Anarchist on Anarchy" (in one), 1200 "The True Aim of Anarchism," by E. Steinele, and 500 "Scientific Principles of the Theory of Anarchy," by the same author, which we offer at two cents each in lots of ten, the entire proceeds to go to the press fund. We have taken this action because we believe it will hasten the time when we can put in a press and enlarge THE FIREBRAND. We will make every effort to do this with the beginning of volume three, at the very latest. Let all the comrades push the sale of the pamphlets. Everybody order ten and distribute them among friends. They are among the best and certainly the very cheapest literature to be had, and their sale means the addition of \$40.00 to the press fund.

Raffle.

The comrades in New York are arranging a raffle for an Encyclopedic Dictionary, at ten cents per chance, half of the proceeds to go to The Firebrand.

All those interested should address I. Rudash, 60 Rivington St., New York.

Receipts.

Waterbury Group, \$2.50. Willers, \$2.00. Pfuetzner, Wurst, Rudash, Shilling, each \$1.00. Kislink, Marcus, each 75c. Jacobsen, Raaka, Taylor, Baylor, Hampe, Adams, Schmidt, Janzen, each 50c. Jaeger, 40c. Tannenbaum, Fisher, Press, each 25c. Austin, Levinson, each 20c. Ballou, Wallis, each 10c.

Printing-Press Fund.

RECEIVED, for the purpose of buying a printing press for THE FIREBRAND, as follows:

Previously acknowledged	\$31.00
N. Notkin, Philadelphia, Pa.	\$10.00
C. Shilling, " "	3.15
B. Casper, " "	1.00
I. Hurwitz, New York City	1.00
A. Klemencic, Tacoma, Wash.	.90

Sample Copies.

We send out each week large numbers of sample copies, and for this purpose we ask friends to send names of persons likely to be interested. The receipt of a sample copy has no other significance than this hope of interesting you and securing your assistance in the work. The subscription price is nominally fifty cents, though in reality it is voluntary, for many friends pay more and we send it to all who desire it, even if they feel able to pay only a few cents or nothing at all. No bills are ever sent out.

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.

L. Rabotnik, 731 Plover St., Philadelphia, Pa.

M. Morwitz, 1141 E. Lombard St., Baltimore, Md.

C. Pfuetzner, 239 W. Taylor st., Chicago, Ill.

FIREBRAND LIBRARY.

In lots of ten or more, five-cent pamphlets furnished at three cents each.

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. Steinele	5c
Revolutionary Government, by P. Kropotkin	5c
Anarchist-Communism, " "	5c
The Wage System, " "	5c
Expropriation, " "	5c
Anarchist Morality, " "	5c
A Dialogue, by L. S. Bevington	5c
Fundamentals in Reform, by W. H. Van Ornum	5c
A Talk about Anarchist-Communism, Malatesta	5c
Anarchy, " "	5c
Revolutionary Studies	5c
Anarchy on Trial	5c
An Anarchist Manifesto	2c
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
Fundamentals in Reform, by W. H. Van Ornum	5c
Life of Albert R. Parsons, with brief History of the Labor Movement in America. Beautiful illustrated. Nicely bound. 290 Octave Pages.	\$1.50
Albert R. Parsons' book on Anarchism; Its Philosophy and Scientific Basis (English and German Editions). Handsomely bound in Cloth and Gilt, 75 cts. Paper Cover	35c

ADVERTISEMENTS.

The "Age of Thought", published by E. H. Fulton, Columbus Junction, Iowa, is an advocate of individual liberty; of the free use of land and other natural resources; of free banking and is an unalterable opponent of arbitrary authority and special privileges. It is eight 9x13 pages in size and printed on fine book paper. Send 2 cents for sample copy, with terms and premium offer.

"The Match" is a weekly Anarchist-Communist paper published at 174 Hanover st., Boston, at 25 cents a year. Send for a sample copy.

International group Free Initiative meets at 64 Washington Square, New York, every Monday evening at 8:30.

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. Gore, 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.

OMAHA: PROGRESSIVE CLUB, meets Wednesdays, 7 p. m., at 616 South Tenth Street.

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