



VOL. II.

PORTLAND, OREGON, SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1896.

No. 3

THE FIREBRAND

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

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

Admitted as second-class matter at Portland, Oregon.

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

ANARCHY.

Ever reviled, accused—ne'er understood,
 Thou art the grisly terror of our age.
 Wreck of all order! cry the multitude,
 Art thou, and war and murder's endless rage.

Oh, let them cry!—To them that ne'er have striven
 The truth that lies behind a word to find,
 To them the word's right meaning was not given—
 They shall continue blind among the blind.

But thou, O word, so clear, so strong, so pure,
 That sayest all which I for goal have taken,
 I give thee to the future!—thine secure,
 When each at last unto himself waken.

Comes it in sunshine? In the tempest's thrill?
 I cannot tell... but it the earth shall see!
 "I am an Anarchist!"—"Wherefore?"—"I will
 Not rule, but also ruled I will not be!"

—JOHN HENRY MACKEY.

HOW TO GET ANARCHY.

In last weeks issue comrade Hesse asks how the Anarchists expect to realize the social order which they advocate, and I hope all the readers of THE FIREBRAND who feel so inclined will give their ideas on this question. Many persons agree with Anarchists in the abstract, but see no way of establishing that ideal. Hence the importance of this discussion.

In this issue S. T. Byington gives his ideas of propaganda. His view is that of a college-bred man. One who views life from a position of comparative ease and security. The methods he outlines may work very well in that strata of society, and are applicable to the work of propaganda in all classes of society to a greater or less extent. One thing, however, appears to deprive his methods of the vigor necessary to make them effective among people who suffer from our present social arrangements. That is, his conception of establishing Anarchy in a society exactly, or nearly, like the present one. The present society is as rotten and detestable, in many respects, as is the State.

My standpoint is that of a workingman who has known nothing but hardships and bitter struggles from infancy till now; of one who has come in contact with persons in all walks of life, from top to bottom; that has sought to know the cause of human misery, and the springs of human activity, not only from reading books, but from actual life among and in contact with those who toil and suffer.

To such as suffer most from the hypocrisy of society and the interference of the State, the gaining of a condition of freedom means vast changes. That is why it is so hard for some to think it possible, or to understand how to accomplish it. I

will give my ideas on the question, and hope all who feel so inclined will not hesitate to criticize them.

Some Anarchists expect to see Anarchy established by means of a slow growth of sentiment, and the supplanting of present institutions by voluntary ones, until the government will go out of business from lack of support. This is not a logical conclusion for the simple reason that governmental support is compulsory, and if everybody—except its beneficiaries—were to cease to support it willingly, the beneficiaries would continue the business by force of arms, unless resisted by the non-governing multitude.

Many there are who look to the Social Revolution as the means of establishing Anarchy, and those who got their education in the old International, are prone to view the coming of the Social Revolution much as the Christian views the coming of the Judgement Day. This, too, is illogical. This belief was born of the idea that an organization so strong, and yet so arranged that it cannot be sold out or given away, could be spread all over the world, and, on the fateful night, when word should be sent from headquarters, every member would do his duty, and when morning broke the new world would be born: the Co-operative Commonwealth established. Experience has shown that such an organization, and such sudden transitions, are impossibilities.

The Social Revolution would not necessarily establish Anarchy, but it is a necessity, inevitable and desirable, to clear away the barriers that stand between us and liberty, and make the reconstruction of society on a voluntary basis possible. In order that people may associate at will for any given purpose, they must have the opportunity. Thousands who now desire to associate are prevented from so doing by the monopoly conferred by government, and by the exactions of society. Against these restraints they constantly chafe. Industrial warfare, in like manner, must continue and grow more fierce and extensive as a result of the hundreds of thousands of out-of-workers, whom the employers seek to use in terrorizing their employees into more abject submission. Thousands are striving to undermine the power of monopoly by co-operative efforts, Labor Exchanges and threats to establish Mutual Banks. Thousands more are refusing to pay taxes, rent or interest—as the case may be—while millions more are becoming disgusted with politics and politicians. With many others, I am trying to point out the fact that all forms of government are based on force, upheld by force, and must always result in creating class distinctions and the establishment of privileges. I favor every effort at peaceful emancipation. I would like to see Trades Unions become co-operative associations; Labor Exchanges established in every locality, and all who are dissatisfied refuse to pay taxes. All these things I like to encourage. If those who engage therein stay the pangs of hunger, that is good; for it shows them that self and mutual helpfulness are better than depending on a boss. I believe—like comrade Hesse—in having as much heaven every day as possible, but I cannot see how

a condition of Anarchy can be established and maintained unless people are rid of the superstitious reverence for law, and their dependence on any form of outside power for assistance. So to me the most important thing in trying to establish Anarchy is to rid the minds of my fellows of the belief in the necessity of government.

The next thing in point of importance is to get them to do something to help on the propaganda; to cease advocating and upholding law; to stop patronizing legal institutions when by association the necessity for so doing can be removed; to openly defy, or to ignore such laws as interfere more directly with their personal liberty. By these methods the work of education is carried on by word and deed, and when the period of violence—which nearly all students of history and sociology concede is just before us—does come, and present affairs are disarranged, enough persons in each locality may come together and begin the work of reconstruction, taking care to discourage and oppose all attempts at the re-organization of government.

I may never see Anarchy realized, but whether I do or not I will try. If I do, well and good. If I don't, those who come after me will be benefited by my efforts. I see no way to realize Anarchy except by trying and inducing others to try.

HENRY ADDIS.

PROPAGANDA METHODS.

The question of Communism versus Commercialism is one that I am not much disposed to raise. I think that the tendency of human progress is to increase the amount of communism in our life, and that this tendency is for good so long as the communism is voluntary. Free roads suit me better than toll-roads, free libraries than subscription libraries. At the same time, I can hardly believe that Communism will ever reach the point of the entire abolition of private property among the majority of people, or that any sudden attempt at a great extension of the sphere of Communism will be successful on a large scale. But none of these things is so certain or so prominent in my mind as that we need liberty. Whether Communism or Commercialism is to predominate in the coming society, it must have freedom as the condition of its developments, or it will be rotten at the core. The task of securing liberty will be enough and too much for my strength as long as my working time lasts; therefore my habit is to treat Communism as mainly an academic topic, deserving the student's attention, but not within the sphere of such agitation as aims at early results.

I am certain that we shall not as William Morris would have us believe, in "News from Nowhere", get Communism first and Anarchy as a secondary result of it. Communism, if it is to come, must be the result of development in freedom. If Communism were established while government remained, it would (it seems to me) lead to government control of all industry, and put us further off from Anarchy. It is worth noticing that our present communistic institutions—public roads, public schools, public charities and the like—are favorite material for the arguments of Anarchy's opponents.

I say, then, that the business end of all anarchistic agitation, whether it be Communist-Anarchism, Mutual-

al Bank Anarchism or any other brand, is the fight for freedom. All our work should therefore be so directed as most quickly to bring freedom. From this standpoint the question of Communism takes this form: What shall we say about the relation of Communism to Anarchism, so as thereby to make the public mind most favorable to Anarchism?

Well, in the first place, we will tell the truth; I see no reason to believe that we shall do any good by lying. And the truth in this matter is that Anarchism allows both Communism and Commercialism. Those who wish to unite in the communistic enjoyment of the products of their labor will be free to do so; those who wish to hold the products of their labor as private property will be equally free to do so. If any one would interfere with the carrying out of either program, he is no anarchist according to my definition, nor, as I understand, according to THE FIREBRAND's definition. Recognizing, then the possibility of both forms of society under Anarchy, and the practical certainty that both will at least be tried, we put our question in a new form: which of the possibilities that Anarchism offers shall we specially emphasize, in order to be most effective in propaganda?

The first suggestion is that we emphasize the most attractive one. But which is most attractive? That depends on every man's standpoint. Those of us who admire Communism are attracted to Anarchism by the hope of a perfect communist order, those who admire Commercialism by the hope of a perfect commercial order. We may expect it to be the same with those we wish to convert. It will pay best to show communists how Communism may prosper under Anarchism, and commercialists how Commercialism may prosper. If one of us has a powerful enthusiasm for Communism or any other economic system, he may be able to convert others to that system and then through that to Anarchism; but he must face the difficulty of getting two new ideas into a man's head, where it commonly borders on impossibility to get in even one. I believe there are most converts to be made by finding out what each man favors, and then showing him how much more easily his ideas could be put in practice under Anarchy, assuming them to be, as he believes, practicable and useful.

But there is another point to be considered in our portrayals of the anarchistic future, besides their attractiveness. We must make Anarchism not only attractive but intelligible. I believe that the country is full of people who would see the advantages of Anarchy without argument, if they could only understand how people could live under it. I believe that the most important work we can do is to give people a clear idea of Anarchism itself; that it is unessential, and comparatively unimportant, whether this idea is or is not accompanied by an idea of Communism, of the Mutual Bank, or of any other particular possible product of anarchic liberty. Such things have their importance, in some respects a great importance; but it sinks into insignificance compared with the importance of making people understand what the word "Anarchism," without any modifying prefix, implies.

For this we must remember that man is generally able to understand, well enough to satisfy himself if not us, anything that he has seen, or anything much like what he has seen; but it is very hard to make him understand your conception of something quite different from anything in his experience. Therefore men will understand the idea of an anarchic society organized on the economic principles of to-day, only with the abolition of governmental monopolies,—better than one in which an economic innovation like Communism or the Mutual Bank is presented as an essential part.

Men are also ready to take in ideas along the line of their own favorite thoughts. Therefore we shall not only make Anarchism more attractive, but also—a still more important thing—make our propositions easier to understand, by looking for each man's economic standpoint and showing the possible realization of his ideals in Anarchy. One of these two things we must do, either describe the working of Anarchy in a society otherwise like the present, or apply it to the material furnished by a man's habitual dreams, if we want much chance of making him understand our meaning. There is nothing easier than to explain a thing from one's own standpoint, but there is nothing more fruitless. Your explanation must begin with the ideas that are already in your listener's head, and keep as close to them as the nature of the explained thing allows.

In one sense, too, it is more truthful to describe anarchic society as very like the society we know; for it will be so at first. Most men, when free to do as they

please, will go on doing as they have been used to. Therefore, when we cross the line that separates government from Anarchy, industry in general will continue to be organized as it was before crossing the line. Unquestionably great changes in the industrial system will result from the establishment of liberty, but these changes will be gradual.

The same principles hold true on the question of defensive associations. Either it is a crime to use violence, against violence, or it is not. If I think it is not, then I can have no objection on principle to defensive associations, and doubtless shall want to join one. If I think it is, I shall morally oppose defensive associations, but I shall not try to repress them by force, since that would be committing the same crime I am opposing. Therefore, in Anarchy, those who want defensive associations will form them, and those who oppose them will do nothing to stop them. Since government always fulfills some defensive functions, people will be used to receiving defence as long as it lasts; therefore, because of the inertia just referred to, almost all will wish to maintain defense for person and property, and defensive associations will be a predominant feature in anarchic society when it begins. (This is provided, observe, without reference to the question whether they are themselves desirable.) Most present-day men will understand the probable working of anarchic society with defensive associations better than without, because it more like what they have been used to; and most present-day men will be more attracted by the prospect of an anarchy in which they expect to belong to such an association than by any scheme which asks them to get along without police service,—because, as I say, the present-day man wants defense.

Since, at the first establishment of Anarchy, there will be no extensive social changes beyond the mere abolition of invasive coercion, it follows that those who have learned to think of Anarchy as inseparable from such changes will then form a dangerous class, tending to break it up in disorder, since they will be surprised and discontented at the lack of such an overturning.

Anarchy would give us, at first, a society like the present—Tammany and all—new only in its new possibilities of reform. Second, the rapid clearing away of the public corruption which springs from the monopolistic character of government. Third, the growth of new and better forms of associated effort, and the disintegration of such old forms as served no sufficient purpose; these processes going on rapidly, much more rapidly than the progress of a reform to-day, but slowly enough to have none of the revolutionary character which now attaches to the sudden enactment of a reform when it at last secures a majority in the legislature.

Practically, Anarchism is the proposition that we should not use force against those who are not criminally using force against others. If we give the impression that it necessarily includes any other sweeping change, we make it less attractive to most people, we make it harder for them to understand, and we give them a misleading idea of what they have to expect when it is established. Those are my points, and I think they are sound.

STEPHEN T. BYINGTON.

Flushing Institute, Flushing, N. Y.

PERHAPS, I SPOKE CARELESSLY.

I accept your reconnection inasmuch as I spoke carelessly. In my communication in your issue of Jan. 19., I said: "People cannot have freedom until they are fit to have freedom." I should have said, "until they know enough to have freedom." That is I mean to say, I believe that people have things about as they want them now; about as near right as they know how to. They thoughtlessly follow the lead of designing men until they have become so stupid as to have lost, as you say, "nearly all conception of freedom."

When I said, "nature's laws are just," I did not mean to say that nature is perfect. I meant that nature's law are universal, impartial and immutable; that all right relations between men are in obedience to nature's laws, and that no legal enactments can alter their force. In such sense I call them just. They are just when they declare man's inalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; the right of self-possession of one's own energies. The individual self-possession of the fruits of one's own labor. I mean that we must act in accord with nature's laws, to get the best results.

A. A. OLCUTT.

Rutland, Vt.

CHRISTIANITY AND THE CHURCH.

III

"Take the book of the law and put it into the side [inside] of the ark of the Lord your God, that it may be there for a witness against thee." (Deuteronomy XXXI, 26). It was supposed to have been "put" there, these writings of Moses and his god, but supposition is an uncertain thing to swear by.

When the ark was opened in the time of Solomon, "the Book of the Law was not in it!" (1 Kings viii, 9). The writings of Moses and his god—where were they? For three hundred years the world had to get along without the "Book of the Law," until it was found by a priest. "Hilkiah, the high priest, said unto Shaphan, the scribe, I have found the Book of the Law in the house of the Lord." (2 Kings xxii, 8.) But it disappeared again—how, no one pretends to guess. One hundred and fifty years after Hilkiah's discovery, Esdras (Ezra) said to God: "Thy law is burnt; therefore no man knoweth the things that are prone of thee." Ezra then decides to "write all that hath been done since the beginning, which were written in thy law that men may find thy path."

Quite an undertaking! Ezra made a decided mess of the first two chapters—the creation story—or rather, two stories—as they flatly contradict each other. However with five scribes to help him he wrote the whole thing out in forty days! Moses is said to have written five books; Ezra wrote twenty-two books and did it all in forty days, with the aforesaid help! It took God and Moses the same length of time to engrave the decalogue, and they thought the occasion worthy of an extraordinary display of fireworks.

Where did Ezra find the "Book of the Law"? "Inside his own head" and I do not doubt he had wood enough left to write another book. Perhaps he did and it got "lost"! However that may be, Ezra wrote "all that hath been done since the beginning" not in Hebrew, but in Chaldean characters! Hebrew had become obsolete—the Jews did not know the Hebrew letters! Hebrew was a language having twenty-two consonants and no vowels: it was read from right to left, no division of words or sentences, an endless string of letters. The first word in the Hebrew Bible was B R S T, and according as they were combined with the vowels a, e, i and u, might mean one uncertain thing out of twenty-five—God knows how many. The sonants or vowel points placed under the Hebrew letters were invented (so far as anyone knows) some time between 500 A. D. and the eleventh century.

What became of Ezra's book? (God alone knows! We now come to another Old Testament or Bible—the Septuagint, which made its appearance 150 years after the work of Ezra and his scribes. No one knows who made this Greek version, or Septuagint, or from what originals (if any) it was made. It seems to have been "on deck" about 280 years before Christ.

The oldest Hebrew manuscript is not earlier than 1000 years after Christ leaving a dead blank of more than 2000 years without a manuscript to show the book existed. "So far as Biblical scholarship knows at present, there is not a single ante-Masoretic without sonants or vowel points) Hebrew manuscript of the Bible in existence."

But any sane man or woman (or even those not wholly insane) should know what the Bible is, today. There is more filth in the book than in any English author I have ever read: plain, unadorned, and witless filth. The atrocities of every kind; of cruelty, blood-thirstiness, vengeance, immorality and indecency have never been exceeded, even by the Christian Church—and she has done surprising well—has been a "good second". Jehovah is simply a monstrous monster, a "flannel-legged fiend," possessed of all the revolting weaknesses and criminalities of the most savage and fiendish of men, and is, withal, clothed with supernatural, that is to say, unnatural powers. Jehovah, as a god, can only be in harmony with the meanest or most ignorant or the most blood-thirsty of peoples. he was created by man and by man must the fiend be destroyed.

CLINTON LOYERIDGE.

Brooklyn, N. Y.

Religion, per se, pertains to man's relation to a hypothetical God and a hypothetical future existence beyond the grave. Religion is a theory of the unknown and possibly the unknowable.

Morality belongs to man's relation to man sociologically.

Religion and morality have no necessarily vital relationship and should not be confounded.

If it be argued adverse to the above proposition that religion teaches that our happiness in another state depends on a moral life here, it is begging the question—the moralist devotes all his energy to make men better morally, while the religionist divides his energy between religion and morality.

If it be argued that man must recognize a God and a future life as a necessary qualification to the attainment of a happy condition in a future state, it is again begging the question, for such recognition is not within the purview of mortals. A belief in a God or future state of existence is neither good nor bad in itself, and is therefore neither moral nor immoral.

Men may censure an immoral act, but a belief of any kind is scarcely censurable, much less a belief or disbelief of religion. But a religion may have a demoralizing influence depending on the character attributed to its God. If a God of vengeance, who will arbitrarily punish his creatures in an eternal state for deeds done here is believed in, the effect of such belief on character here is demoralizing. It will not square with ethical science deduced from the experience of the race. A belief in a religion does not result from a philosophical analysis of a proposition so much as from emotional feelings generated by priests, preachers and religious zealots. Hypnotization has much to do with religious belief.

Morality may be reduced to a science. Religion cannot be, for it cannot be proven. To say that it cannot be proven is not saying that there is no God nor future state of existence, but that it is hypothetical—speculative. Moral science can be demonstrated in theory and supported by the experience of the race.

The reason morality and religion have been associated is that the priests found it easier to get a following by comingling with religion what the consensus of mankind had determined to be right. Hence the modification of religious teaching as the moral horizon of the race enlarged. Religion has been a great hindrance to moral and intellectual progress and at the same time morals and science have to a great extent modified the theory of religion, and held in check the encroachments of religious tyrants and bigots on the liberties of the people.

Religion is dependent for its support on authority. Morality on reason and experience. The religionist takes authority for truth. Reason takes truth only for authority. The exercise and development of reason ends where authority begins. When bloody Queen Mary was interrogated as to why she beheaded so many protestants, her answer was: "God intends to punish heretics to all eternity, and I felt it my duty to begin the good work on earth." She had authority for her actions which could not be gainsaid by any who believed in authority. Reason has discovered the law of equal freedom which is the moral law. The discovery has been made in defiance of authoritative religious teaching. There is nothing immoral but the infringement upon the equal freedom of some person or persons. The moral law, the law of equal freedom, expressed in words is, "every sentient being has a right to do as it pleases, limited only by the equal freedom of every other being to do the same thing."

When the moral law obtains, religious belief will be more rational and many priests and preachers loose their vocation. It will then be better for both morals and religion to be kept distinct if not separate entirely. It is a hopeful sign that it is almost so now. The churches teach very little morality, much less the highest.

There is a growing sentiment that religion and morality are very distinct. The preacher is alarmed at the growing influence of moral men. He warns his religious devotees against moral men. Tells them that morality cannot save a man. That the moral man is a dangerous man in the community.

So long as a tyrannical God is taught by religionists, so long will the recognition of the moral law be retarded. As people are educated in the moral law, this conception of God will be modified from that of a tyrant to that of a Father. Men in all ages have had glimpses of the moral law. Confucius 500 years before Christ taught that it was wrong to do to others what we would not have them do to us. Christ taught that it was right to do unto others as we would they should do to us. If people would regard Confucius' injunction and NOT do to others &c., the law of equal freedom would prevail. Who wants to be governed? no one. Then why govern others? Under the law of equal freedom, everyone would say as did the wise Persian Noble: "I neither command nor obey." Behind every command there is hid in ambush, "if you don't I'll make you." So long as one obeys a command the law of equal freedom is violated. When the moral law prevails, the words command and obey will become obsolete along with many other words implying force. All physical force, or compulsion will cease. The law of love will prevail when we need "take no thought of the morrow as to what we shall eat or wear." The words mine and thine as used now will also be obsolete. "If a man takes thy coat give him thy cloak also." Two hours labor per day will produce more necessary wealth than is now produced by double, and no one would need for anything. There could be no deprivation or suffering nor temptation to produce suffering. No one could distinguish himself except by doing good. Nearly all crime now results from the love of distinction. The only way some can gain distinction is through riches; hence the love of money is said to be the root of all evil. Government is the root of all evil, and money is only a brace root.

There would be no evil but for law. Freedom is the only good. Restriction of liberty the only evil. "What is sin but the cause of misery?" said Young in his "Night Thoughts." What is terror of the law but misery? What does the law deter from? exercising one's rights. Rights are natural: Privilege is of man's creation. Government denies man natural opportunities to produce and live on the land. It creates the privilege of property in wealth, and denies to the producers of it their right in it. The moral law says: Do as you please, and all you can of good. Allow every other person to do as he pleases, limited only by your equal freedom. What a heaven on earth if every one observed the above moral law.

Along with the evolution of the God idea from the God's idea there grew the idea of omnipotence, omniscience and goodness as attributes of his character. The word God is a contraction of good with naught (o) left out and a capital G substituted for a little g to denote personification. Now if there is an omnipotent, omniscient all good person, how can we effect His happiness by a belief or disbelief in Him? Why does He allow suffering among his creatures—His children?

If His laws—natural laws—are perfect, as they should be, emanating from an omnipotent, all wise good being, why does man try to improve them by enacting laws and forming governments? Is it not saying in substance, God's laws are very imperfect—they need amending here and annulling there? It won't do to allow man natural freedom.

What blasphemy some religious people indulge in. Is not all the sin and misery of the race the result of man's inhumanity to man, by limiting his freedom?

J. C. BARNES.

"THE SPEECHES" IN LIBERTY LIBRARY.

Comrades,—Prompted by the articles by comrades Austin and Addis in THE FIREBRAND, many of you have written me concerning The Speeches in LIBERTY LIBRARY, and instead of writing to you separately this note in THE FIREBRAND will answer all instead.

No. 1, as you are aware, is "Basis of Anarchy" by Wm. Holmes; No. 2 (which was unavoidably delayed until Feb. 15) is "God and the State;" for No. 3 I have announced "The Commune of Paris" and "An Anarchist on Anarchy." This will be ready promptly March 1. No. 4 (April) will contain "The True Aim of Anarchism," by E. Steinle. This arrange-

ment cannot well be changed, as many have ordered with the understanding that articles should appear in this way.

I have two excellent articles in manuscript that I expect to publish as soon as possible, but as the demand for the speeches seems to be so great I can publish them in the May Number and let the two articles referred to go over to June and July.

My intention was, if possible, to publish a grand double number on November 1 next, which would contain, (if the publisher's permission could be secured), Gary's defense of himself, Trumbull's reply in the ARENA, the Speeches and other remarks concerning this matter. This grand number could be produced at from 2½ to 5 cents (according to number printed), and I think would do more good than the speeches alone.

However, let me hear from you all in regard to this matter. Do you want the speeches alone in the May number of LIBERTY LIBRARY at 1½ cents each, postpaid to your address, or the double number mentioned above for November and December at 2½ cents each.

E. FULTON, Publisher.

Columbus Junction, Ia.

My proposition was that all comrades who contributed now to help bring out the "Speeches before the Court" should get them at one half of the regular wholesale rate, so that they could be distributed free, without much pecuniary loss to any one. As you see by the above, comrade Fulton accedes to this proposition. Be sure and express your wish as to which of his propositions you prefer. H. A.

THE DEVIL AND THE PREACHERS.

The Devil to prove religion a sham, seems to fish for Congregational preachers and his last catch is the Rev. Doctor Brown. He is the brightest catch since he caught Henry Ward Beecher. The Church will as usual, no doubt, whitewash their shepherd, while his son hissed at Mrs. Cooper at prayer-meeting in the house dedicated to God; the crime of the century located in the Church!

We are told that the Devil himself, who appeared first in the Garden of Eden, treated the woman politely, talked common sense with her and never lied, for the day she ate the forbidden fruit she did not die, even if God had said she would. He never hissed at the woman as did young Brown, whose father never rebuked him. This shows that the apple don't fall far from the tree, for his father is the same Brown who, when asked last Spring to go and look at the condition of the men on the dumps, feeding on the vile refuse from swill barrels, said their condition could be worse, that there was some food they could get from the barrels while it was good enough to for men to eat. He could not have this subject talked of from his pulpit, oh no! But it seems there is another subject, of a different nature got into his church, and pulpit, and he is in it, head over heels. They may whitewash him as they did Beecher, but they can never convince the thinking people but that he is a monster of iniquity, using his hypnotic power over weak minded women. What better could you expect of a man who would say what he did: that a dollar a day was all sufficient for a laboring man, and then he would be nearer the place God intended him to be. Some say let the dead rest, but I know he helped to sow the seed that has produced a most damnable crop and we must cut it down; we must do more; must pull it up root and branch, and for fear it may take root again burn it up and scatter the ashes to the four winds.

I hope to live to see that day, and am then willing to say, while I am blessed let me die.

MARY E. SQUIRE

San Francisco Cal.

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.

Chas. Doering % Geo. Otten, Printer
Washington Street off Eyn Buldy

Correspondence.

WORKER'S CONGRESS,

INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST WORKERS' AND TRADERS' UNION
CONGRESS.

LONDON ANARCHIST COMMITTEE.

The above committee was formed at a conference of London Anarchists held at York Minster Music Hall, London, 26th Dec. 1895. Its purpose is to endeavor to secure concerted action against the attempt which is being made by a handful of Marxist intriguers, to shut out of a workers congress the delegates of the Anarchist and non-political workingmen's associations. It is about to issue two manifestoes, one addressed particularly to Trade Unions, asking for their assistance on the congress, and the second, more in the nature of an International Anarchist protest signed by the groups in each country.

A large demonstration is shortly to be held in London. The committee meets weekly, and any communication from comrades anywhere would be welcome. A fund has been opened to which funds are earnestly requested. The treasurer is W. Wess, 42 Cressy House, Cressy Street, Stepney, London. All other communications to James Tochatti, Cormagnole House, Hammersmith, London.

T. REECE, assistant sec.

London, England.

A FRIEND.

Dear Firebrand,—Some unknown friend is kind enough to send *THE FIREBRAND*. I desire to compensate in some way and as it requires my every dollar to get out my new book, I will if thou wilt accept, contribute two copies of my published work *IRENE, OR THE ROAD TO FREEDOM*.

I like thy toleration of various opinions and believe thou art seeking to unite in spirit all true lovers of justice and liberty of every shade of opinion. I belong to the Progressive Friends, and try to be consistent to the quaker peace principles.

We have here in Philadelphia what we call "The Silent Circle," which meets every Tuesday eve in unison with many others throughout the country. We believe in the Thought Power—that thoughts are things. We have perfect faith that if all who thus believe would unite in thought of peace that this great struggle between the modern Gog and Magog, capital and labor, can be settled peacefully. We invite *THE FIREBRAND* and its readers to join with us in this thought of Peaceful Freedom.

SADA BAILEY FOWLER

Torresdale, Pa.

Comment.

The above letter speaks for itself. We have pursued the reverse policy of the "Silent Circle" so far, i. e., have made all the noise we well could. Our plan has worked quite well, so far, but if any of our readers agree with the plan mentioned above we are glad to make them and our Philadelphia Friends acquainted.

GENEROUS.

Comrades,—As I promised you in my last letter from Hasting, I have mentioned the necessity of supporting *THE FIREBRAND* to the French comrades here. As elsewhere times have been very bad, and every one is making sacrifices to support our French paper. Yesterday at our meeting a collection was made in favor of *L'AMI DES OUVRIERS*, but I induced the comrades to divide it up between *L'AMI* and *THE FIREBRAND*, and as a result you will find here enclosed \$1.15. I suppose that very few papers would do as *L'AMI DES OUVRIERS* is doing toward *THE FIREBRAND*, that is dividing a collection made in its favor. But I feel the need of a paper in the English language published in this country (we need more than one for that matter) and have been trying to impress on the minds of friends here and elsewhere. That it is nothing but right that they should support first of all the papers published in this country. Conditions are entirely different here to what they are in Europe, and if we neglect now the propaganda amongst the Americans, we will be sorry for it later on. It would be better that all papers published here in foreign languages would go down, than to see *THE FIREBRAND* drop out. Of course we need them all; and I hope that all will be kept alive and more started, but to my mind, the English papers ought to go first.

The proposition of Kate Austin is a good one and ought to be taken hold of at once. I will subscribe \$1.00 for that purpose. Let some more follow, and we

will have the book. It will certainly be the best monument that we could raise to our dead heroes. I would not give a single penny for a stone or marble monument but for one of this kind I would give all I could afford.

The enterprise of comrade Fulton in offering to the public first class reading at such a low figure, is also worthy of support. It was something badly needed and I hope that the *LIBERTY LIBRARY* will receive the support that it is worthy of.

Charleroi, Pa.

LOUIS GOAZIOU

A NEW ENTERPRISE IN FRANCE.

Dear Comrades,—As our cause,—the abolition of capitalism and all imposed authority—is international I trust you will find room in your paper for a few words about a new undertaking, by the united French Trade Unions and Cooperative Societies; namely, the erection of a workingmen's Glassworks.

Although this enterprise is not initiated by the Anarchists here, it is nevertheless one which every consistent Anarchist-Communist must approve, and in which many of our comrades are assisting. It is a communistic effort in so far as that the factory is to belong to the whole French Proletariat, under the management of a committee of 45 delegates of Trade Unions and Cooperative Associations. Its profits also are to be consecrated not to political ends, or to a limited number of individual interests, but to the support of the economic struggle against capitalism, in a way approved by the united Unions and Associations concerned. This surely is a step entirely to be approved and sympathized with, and assisted, too, by all who are able to contribute their mite.

Let united effort for the common good be thus once established, there can be no doubt that such an example will be speedily followed, and that the effects of such attempts will soon also be perceptible in economic relations. On the one hand, when the workers have thus a means of supporting their comrades in conflict with their employers, the latter, at least in the same trade, will not find forcing strikes such a desirable game as they often do at present. While at the same time the possession of such an arm of defense will give fresh courage and strenght to the workers.

Such action, again, will draw the attention of the workers to the understanding of the true cause of the present economic misery, namely the individual appropriation of the means of production, and cause them by mutual assistance and every other suitable means in their power, to establish a better order of things, while political action would be correspondingly abandoned for the freer Anarchical modes of combat.

With these few lines, I commend your attention to this arduous undertaking of the establishment of the Workingmen's Glassworks in France, on which subject there is an able article in No. 37 of "*LES TEMPS NOUVEAUX*" by Pellontier, who is one of the Secretaries of the Executive Committee. Any individual or group, who is willing and able to assist can do so by applying to the Executive committee ("Comite d'Action") for tickets, which are sold at 5 cents each, but are sent out only in packets of 50, on receipt of the payment per packet, (10 francs) \$2 00. Such applications should be made to Victor Jaclard, 110 rue Vieille-du-Temple, Paris, France. All information, concerning the scheme is to be had of E. Guerard, secretary, at the same address.

A. HENRY.

Pont Aven, Frinistere, France.

The Letter-Box.

E. W., Spring Valley, Ill.—Good, we are glad you take that view of it.

C. L., Brooklyn, N. Y.—Say what you please. We will take chances on getting into trouble on account of what you write.

M. F. F., Portersville, Cal.—The copy of "Bases of Anarchy" is sent. We are glad you have concluded to study Anarchism, and are confident you will be an Anarchist—if not one already.

W. S. A., Palmer, Mass.—Copies of "Bases of Anarchy" and "Revolution" have been sent. The "Speeches before the Court" will appear in a future number of *LIBERTY LIBRARY*. Keep the ball rolling.

F. D., Baltimore, Md.—We are glad you have been working for *THE FIREBRAND* and succeeded in getting one subscriber. Keep on with the good work. If we had a thousand such workers we would get on fine.

J. J. G., Toronto, Canada.—We are sending five copies regularly. If you can distribute more to good advantage we will send them. Conservative towns are

trying, but we find everywhere a few that are susceptible to new ideas.

C. L., Los Angeles, Calif.—you will see by notice that the announcement of J. Grave's book was a mistake. The money will be returned, or anything from our library to the amount will be sent you. Your appreciation is encouraging.

Matilda C. W., Bosko, S. D.—We read your letter with rejoicing. It is a characteristic phenomenon that nearly all women on our list are fearless and enthusiastic workers. We wish you could associate with Anarchists so that you could interchange views on different subjects.

M. D., Paterson, N. J.—M. G. is on our list. It is gratifying to hear that the English speaking people of Paterson are taking an interest in *THE FIREBRAND*. It would be so all over the country if the Anarchists had only the means to circulate our literature and rid the people of their prejudice about Anarchism.

RECEIPTS.

Donor, \$2.00. L'Ami de Ouvriers, \$1.00. Wagler, Weigle, Saller, Barret, Dvorak, Bursik, Watney, Weber, Williams, Walter, Lynch, Wagner, each 50c. Penhallow, Fontain, Wagner, each 25c. Loveridge, Allen, Smith, each 10c.

NOTICE.

EVERYBODY'S CLUB meets every Sunday, 3 P. M. at G. A. R. Hall, Cor. 1st & Taylor Sts. All subjects of interest to the working people will be discussed. A free and unrestricted discussion of all questions will be had.

FIREBRAND LIBRARY.

Bases of Anarchism; Historical, Philosophical and Economical, by Wm. Holmes	5c
God and the State, by Bakounin	5c
Economics of Anarchy; a study of the industrial type, by Dyer D. Lum	20c
A Rex Revolution, by Lois Walshrocker	25c
Anything More, My Lord? "	5c
Wants and Their Gratification; H. Addis	10c
A Secret and Confidential Address, by Gavroche	15c
Revolution, a lecture by S. H. Gordon	5c

LIBERTY LIBRARY MONTHLY

E. H. FULTON PUBLISHER

Columbus Junction, Iowa.

SUBSCRIPTION 50 CTS. PER YEAR.

In this Library Mr. Fulton brings out one or more volumes of anarchist literature every month. It is printed on fine book paper, in new clear type, and is a model of neatness and artistic skill. No. 1 contains Wm. Holmes' "Bases of Anarchy: Historical, Philosophical and Economical." No. 2 contains "God and the State," by Micheal Bakounine. No. 1 contains 32 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. They are uniform in style, neatly bound, artistic title page, and sold at the remarkably low figure of 5 cents per copy, or 2½ cents each in lots of ten or more; 100 copies or more at 2½ cents each. No better means of propaganda is to be found. Orders received at this office.

Unbounded Liberty

By S. T. THORSON.

Good reading for people that go to church or believe in the Bible.

— 34 pages — 5 Illustrations — size 8½"x12" —
20 Cents by mail.

CH. L. BODENDIECK,
1140 Milwaukee Av. Chicago, Ill.

Agents for *THE FIREBRAND*.

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

C. C. Schmidt, 412 South 13th Str., Omaha, Neb.
I. Rudash, 167 Norfolk street, New York City.