



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.]

WHY DON'T HE LEND A HAND?

You say there is a God
Above the boundless sky,
A wise and wondrous deity
Whose strength none can defy.
You say that he is seated
Upon a throne most grand,
Millions of angels at his beck—
Why don't he lend a hand?

See how the earth is groaning,
What countless tears are shed,
See how the plague stalks forward
And brave and sweet lie dead,
Homes burn and hearts are breaking,
Grim murder stains the land;
You say he is omnipotent—
Why don't he lend a hand?

Behold, injustice conquers;
Pain curses every hour;
The good and true and beautiful
Are trampled like the flower.
You say he is our father,
That what he wills doth stand;
If he is thus almighty
Why don't he lend a hand?

What is this monarch doing
Upon his golden throne,
To right the wrong stupendous,
Give joy instead of moan?
With his resistless majesty,
Each force at his command,
Each law his own creation—
Why don't he lend a hand?

Alas! I fear he's sleeping,
Or is himself a dream,
A bubble on thought's ocean,
Our fancy's fading gleam.
We look in vain to find him
Upon his throne so grand,
Then turn your vision earthward—
'Tis we must lend a hand.

'Tis we must grasp the lightning,
And plow the rugged soil;
'Tis we must beat back suffering,
And plague and murder foil;
'Tis we must build the paradise
And bravely right the wrong;
The god above us faileth,
The god within is strong.

—SAMUEL P. PUTNAM.

NUDITY.

In response to the request of many readers of THE FIREBRAND, we reprint the following "Autumnal Idyl," with a few remarks in prose on the same subject.

The naked hills lie wanton to the breeze;
The fields are nude, the groves unfrocked;
Bare are the shivering limbs of shameless trees;
No wonder that the corn is shocked.

"Pull down the tablecloth a little," said Madam Prude to Miss Simple, "the limb of the table is showing; such nudity is shocking."

How the mind of the prudish, mock-modest picture direful and uncanny scenes, when the thought of nudity enters. Visions of undressed men and women fleeing in terror from the gaze of their fellows or standing shamefaced and blushing, while endeavoring to conceal from view such portions of their bodies as can be covered with the hands, or hair of the head, crowd thick upon each other, and the color mounts to the cheek, and the blood flows throbbing through the temples.

Just why nudity is so to be avoided, so utterly awful, is inexplicable to those who so consider it; it just is " 'cause."

In the days of fine art in Greece, "the human form divine" was considered the most perfect thing to fashion marble after, or to imitate on canvass. But with the rise of Christianity, and its ideas of the baseness of the human body, a change came over art, and in the conception of what is beautiful and pure. "Fade, fade each earthly joy," sings the Christian. Nothing is pure but a reaching out after the unattainable, and the human form is vile and unfit to be seen. This idea is so prevalent that a vast majority of the women try to change their form by wearing corsets. "It don't seem as if I'm dressed unless I have my corset on," some will say. Oh my, you'r that much nearer a condition of nudity, arn't you? yes, you are and you are that much more beautiful. There never was a "corset form" half so beautiful as the natural form.

Clothes may add to ones comfort, and should he worn for that purpose, but they add nothing to the beauty. Of course, too, there are some who are so unfortunate as to be deformed, or perhaps have a skin disease or other malady, which it would be painful for them to expose to view. But these are the exception and do not alter the fact that the nude form is more beautiful than when partially concealed by clothing. In this country we never conceal all of the person and laugh at the Turks for being so silly. To be logical we would laugh just as much at the prudishness amongst us and dress for comfort solely, and put an everlasting quietus on such foul minded bigots as Authory Comstock.

Here again the conventional and "respectable" raise their hands in holy horror and protest that the sight of a nude person of the opposite sex inflames the passions and leads to indecent orgies. Yes, to the foul all things are foul. Perhaps it does have that effect on them, or even on others, that only shows that we are accustomed to look upon nude forms with lustful eyes, for in regions where nudity is the usual way of dressing, it is far more difficult to arouse the sex passions than in countries where prudishness and drygoods stores have full sway.

In countries where nudity is the rule sexual selection is natural; the women choose who shall be the father of their children, and never dream of prostituting the sex function as is so prevalent in all countries where nudity is considered shocking. Oh ye moral lepers, cleanse first your own minds of evil before decrying others or holding up hands

in holy horror at the thought of the human form freed from artificial drappings, which, though first used for comfort, have come to be looked upon as a shield from the wicked glances of others.

I would not advise anyone to throw off their clothing, especially this time of the year, but what I do object to is the silly idea that "looks" and not comfort, is what clothes are worn for; that nudity is shocking; that the human body is any more indecent naked than covered with clothes. Indecency exists in the imagination, and often lies behind the most superabundance of clothing and show of modesty.

Oh, "consistency thou art a jewel". If nudity is so shocking we must quit telling the naked truth, and giving bare facts, and clothe them in the garb of obscurity and deception. HENRY ADDIS.

MEUM ET TEUM.

It is contended by a great many reformers that the desire to own and accumulate private property is a natural impulse of the human mind; that it is a fixed and permanent idea; the cornerstone and bulwark of all progress, and that its eradication would sooner or later relegate mankind to savagery and perhaps utter extinction.

By others, the opposite extreme is set forth. They claim that the institution of private property is the primary and principal cause of all the ills of society; that it is a lust created by the continuous presence of the dread phantom of poverty, which would soon smoulder and die out with the abolition of want; that progress—real and lasting progress—is impossible as long as the institution of private property exists.

Thus, while one school stoutly maintains private property must be preserved; the other school as vehemently insists that it must be wiped out at all hazard.

Between these two rival factions of economic thought (both beyond questions honest and sincere) it seems impossible to effect a satisfactory compromise. Perhaps a compromise in principle is not necessary or to be desired. Individuals have as many tastes and aspirations as there are modes of gratification. What is desirable for one individual or class, is repulsive to another. What might constitute elements of progress for one person or community, might prove inimical to the welfare of another. The difficulty, it seems to me, is this: Most of us are so sure our ideas and our schemes are the best, that we not only ardently desire to practice them ourselves, but imprudently seek to foist them upon others, and even to compel them to adopt them against their will. Thus the Individualist sneers at and "boycots" the Communist who declares the institution of private property must be abolished. While the latter insisting upon such overthrow by force must necessarily invade the equal natural right of the individualist.

In attempting, therefore, to determine which school is right and which is wrong, we at once encounter a snag of the largest proportions—in fact it is a barrier which can only be surmounted by evasion. We must go around it, by declaring that both are right—which paradox is easily understood when we admit what I have above written; viz., that what is good for one person or community is not good for another. The world is wide; opportunities, when not restricted, limitless, and human nature so complex that all shades of thought and belief spring spontaneously. There is room for all; opportunities for all; abundant wealth for all. What

we most need to make us all happy is (1) freedom; (2) toleration. Toleration to enable us to permit each other to seek happiness each in his own way; freedom to enjoy such happiness when found.

To my own thinking, the institution of private property, when applied to public or semi-public utilities, is illogical; an evil not to be driven out by force, but to be eradicated by education. It arises in part from fear of poverty (whence ensues a lust for gain) and in part from man's distrust of his fellows. We look upon one another as evilly inclined. We regard each other as naturally invasive. It would be well for us to regard mankind under other and better conditions. At present we are a drove of hungry dogs, struggling over a few bones; a pyramid of writhing, angry worms, each striving, at the expense of his fellows, to reach the top, where a few lack contentedly in sunshine and peace, while the vast mass beneath are crushed and broken. At nature's banquet there is room for all, and when, before her delicacy-laden table we assume the position we ought to fill, there will be no more grasping; no more crowding; no more greed or brutishness. Some men, I know, are bestial. I have known men who would delight to commit murder, but these were abnormal. They were deformities and monstrosities, the direct product of our evil system. I do not believe that all, or the majority of my fellows are invasive. I do not believe we seek to own or accumulate private property merely for the pleasure of such ownership or accumulation. Washington Irving, in his delightful "Knickerbocker's History of New York," makes the genial old gentleman say:

"For my part I have not so bad an opinion of mankind as many of my brother philosophers. I do not think poor human nature so sorry a piece of workmanship as they would make it out to be; and so far as I have observed, I am fully satisfied that man, if left to himself, would about as ready go right as wrong."

Ingersoll, in one of his charming lectures, well illustrated the folly of accumulation for its own sake. "Imagine," said he, "a man with a million neckties, and being continually desirous of adding to his store!" The reason we wish to increase our store is because we are afraid we shall not have enough, and goods are costly. If production were carried on scientifically, and distribution equitably, all kinds of wealth would be so abundant that we would hold it lightly and regard its accumulation as ridiculous.

These are my own ideas. I am neither responsible nor sponsor for the ideas of others. I do not seek to force them upon others. I wish for myself as for others, opportunity; freedom to live according to the light that is within us.—[WILLIAM HOLMES, in *The Altrurian*.]

CHRISTIANITY AND THE CHURCH.

IV

The following quotation is to be found in the "Works of Flavius Josephus," translated by William Whiston, A. M.: "Now there was about this time Jesus, a wise man; if it be lawful to call him a man; for he was a doer of wonderful works, a teacher of such men as receive the truth with pleasure. He drew over to him both many of the Jews and many of the Gentiles. He was (the) Christ, and when Pilate, at the suggestion of the principal men amongst us, had condemned him to the cross, those that loved him at the first did not forsake him; for he appeared to them alive again the third day, as the divine prophets had foretold these and ten thousand other wonderful things concerning him. And the tribe of Christians, so named from him, are not extinct at this day."

It is now well known and admitted by all scholars and people of wide-reading, that is to say, those to whom reading includes hearing "the other side," that Josephus never wrote one word of the above quotation. The hoary, baldheaded, senile interpolation fits just as snugly in the history as a square stick does in a round hole. Regarding this interpolation, John W. Chadwick, author of "The Bible of To-day," says:

"The external evidence against it is simply overwhelming. Origen (third century) and the fathers before him did not know of its existence. If they had we may be sure they would have quoted it. It is first quoted by Eusebius (fourth century), who evidently found it in a different place from that in which it now stands. What makes it absolutely sure that Origen would have quoted it, if it had existed in the Josephus of his day, is that he does

quote another reference to Jesus in the twentieth book of the "Antiquities." There we have "James, the brother of Jesus, called the Christ." And this allusion, though afterward tampered with, appears to be genuine. It is quoted by Origen in such a way that it is absolutely certain that he knew nothing of the biographical passage first quoted by Eusebius."

It is, however, admitted by many excellent scholars that Josephus made no mention of Jesus Christ. Josephus was born thirty-seven years after Jesus'—and was writing his history, "Antiquities of the Jews," in Rome, after the destruction of Jerusalem. A. D. 70.

But this is by no means all: Josephus never mentions the massacre of the children by Herod, nor does any cotemporary writer mention it,—which is incredible, or, rather, would be incredible had the massacre of 14,000 children by Herod's order, ever taken place. Justus of Tiberias, writing of the same time never mentions Jesus. Pliny writes on eclipses and earthquakes but never mentions the three-hour eclipse, and earthquake of the crucifixion, the strangest of the world has ever known—according to the Gospels!

"Had there been at that time a person with the blood of David, the Jews would not have been his accusers. The Magi from the east, who saw his star to the east, would not have had to journey west to Bethlehem to find him. He would have occupied a throne or a grave."

"It was a bright literary age. If Herod had massacred 144,000 children—afterward reduced to 14,000—or the dead walked the streets, would not cotemporary writers mention it?"

I will now quote from the writings of the veteran J. K. Ingalls:

"Why refuse to listen to the Agnostic because he is honest enough and brave enough to tell you he does not know to be true, what the Church asserts to be true, without proof? She asserts things upon a strained interpretation of a book, compiled from a large number of manuscripts and as many writers, we know not whom. Some of these were written, we know not when or where, nor even in what language. They were voted canonical by a bare majority of a council after two-thirds of its members had been expelled by the fiat of a half converted pagan emperor. The four Gospels were selected from a score or two of others and decreed the "Word of God" to the exclusion of all the rest, by a show of hands of unlearned, bigoted and exasperated priests, though unquestionably they were originally written without any thought on the part of the writers that they would ever be used as sacred books, and though many passages and even whole chapters are held by the most competent critics to have been interpolated hundreds of years after the events they claim to describe could have taken place."

To return to Mr. Chadwick's quoted words: "I do not see how either the Romish or Protestant Church can find much complaint with the illusion," "after tampered with!"—James, the brother of Jesus." How could a man, anyhow, be the brother of a Ghost. Moreover the council of Chalcedon, A. D. 451, decreed Mary as Ever-Virgin, and another council, A. D. 1845 decreed her the Immaculate Virgin. Are Orthodox Christians cannibals when they partake of juggled bread and wine?

I will conclude this article with a "clipping" sent to me.

"Yet there are some things in the sphere of religious opinions concerning which the Agnostic can attain to a practical certainty. Negative certainties, at any rate, are not denied to him in these matters. Therefore, if the devout churchman assures me that he is certain of his Trinity, I answer that I am certain, as certain as I can be of anything not actually capable of mathematical proof, that this doctrine of his is "a fond thing vainly invented," for I feel not the slightest doubt that this Trinity is the invention of man, an aftergrowth, an accretion, a strange product evolved in the crucible of warring factions over the white heat of the odium theologium. Nay, we can trace clearly enough the history of this unfortunate dogma, the very name whereof is unknown to any Biblical writer. We can trace it back to its Alexandrian and Neo-Platonic origin, and follow it through its various developments—through the strife

of the Homoeousians and Homoiousians and the conflicts that raged around the phillioque clause—the single or double possession of the Holy Ghost!

And how well can we conceive the triumphant delight of the Athenasian Christians when, 325 years after Christ, the damnable errors of Arius were finally condemned, and the heresiarch himself and all his followers placed under the solemn anathema of the Church. For how nearly had Arius succeeded in defeating them, and how terrible would have been the calamity if Arrianism and orthodoxy had become synonymous terms. Verily these Christians would have been more or less than human had they not put the tenets of the victorious faith upon unassailable rock of rigid definition and an uncompromising formula. The Nicene Creed was the *Io triumphae* and the *Vae Victus* of the conquering sect, the very charter of Athanasian Trinitarianism.

I find, then, that it is impossible to believe in the doctrine of the Trinity. Nay, I see not the slightest reason to believe in it, and even the most proselytizing of the orthodox will not, I imagine, ask me to believe without finding some reason for my belief. It appears to me the most preposterous of all the dogmas which have been fabricated by the perverse ingenuity of theologians. If, indeed, it were proved to me that this doctrine rested upon a revelation from God, I would, of course, accept it as truth, though even so I should be subject to the limitation so well expressed by Archbishop Secker: "Let any proposition be delivered to us, as coming from God or from man, we can believe it no further than we understand it, and therefore, if we do not understand it at all, we cannot believe it at all."

CLINTON LOVERIDGE.

Brooklyn, N. Y.

THE GARDEN OF PLEASURE. THE RESULT OF OBEYING "DUTY."

She walked upon the beds, and the sweet rich scent arose; and she gathered her hands full of flowers. Then Duty, with his white clear features, came and looked at her. Then she ceased from gathering, but she walked away amid the flowers, smiling, and with her hands full.

Then Duty, with his still white face, came again, and looked at her; but she turned her head away from him. At last she saw his face, and she dropped the fairest of the flowers she had held, and walked silently away.

Then again he came to her. And she moaned, and bent her head low, and turned to the gate. But as she went out she looked back at the sunlight on the face of the flowers, and wept in anguish. Then she went out, and it shut behind her forever; but still in her hand she held of the buds she had gathered, and the scent of them was very sweet in the lonely desert.

But he followed her. Once more he stood before her with his still white, deathlike face. And she knew what he had come for; she unbent her fingers, and let the flowers drop out, the flowers she had loved so, and walked on without them, with dry, aching eyes. Then for the last time he came. And she showed him her empty hands, the hands that held nothing now. But still he looked. Then at length she opened her bosom and took out of it one small flower she had hidden there, and laid it on the sand. She had nothing more to give now, and she wandered away, and the grey sand whirled about her.

—FROM DREAMS, by Olive Schreiner.

SAMPLE COPIES.

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

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

COMRADES agitate for THE FIREBRAND.

THE LEGISLATURE.

Each of them, taken singly, is passably gifted with reason;
Let them assemble—and straight into a blockhead he turns.
SHILLER (translated).

THE LEGISLATOR.

"I am honest," exclaimed the legislator with fervor;
Honest? Well, that may be, but your job is a thief.
EICH.

ELECTION.

"Here is an honest man that will stand for the rights of the people,
To secure his success pays five dollars a vote."
"What," said Hayseed, "a man who will fight for the cause of the people."
And five dollars besides? There is a bargain, I trow!"
"Hayseed! Lookout! Be aware! That man there is an impostor."
Now he is buying your vote but to sell you in time.
Here is the honest man! He pays for your vote not a penny.
But if elected he will stand by your cause to the death."
Hayseed voted for him; this honest man was elected.
And the power he held made him a knave just the same.
Hayseed was striking his breast. He cried: I was duped like a schoolboy.
Had I but taken the five! I could be that much ahead.
EICH.

"INDECENCY" AS THE SOURCE OF LIFE.

A few months ago I made the acquaintance of a young married woman, a graduate from several American and European universities. She is a free-thinker by conviction and is regarded by all who know her as a very clever and intellectual woman. I have on several occasions discussed with her many serious questions with very little disagreements in our views. One day she asked me to give her some of my printed articles. I gave her a number of articles, including one on marriage printed in the "Freethinker's Magazine," and two or three Lucifer articles dealing with the age of consent laws. I did not know whether or not she would agree with me on these questions, but I did not think that she would be afraid to discuss them in a frank way, and I was greatly astonished to hear that she was horrified to see a young unmarried man like myself discuss such questions in such a radical way. She regarded my articles on the age of consent as indecent and unfit to be read by a refined woman.

Now, if an intellectual and highly educated woman finds it impossible to free herself from conventional bonds, what shall we say of the "common herd?" Why is it that a refined woman cannot discuss the sex question in plain language? Is it true that the sex act is such an indecent thing that the mere discussion of it cannot but bring a blush to the cheek of a refined woman? If so, how can a refined woman indulge in the sex act at all? How can she marry and give birth to children? If the sexual relations are altogether too indecent to be discussed, how much more indecent it should be to have sexual relations in real life! If the sex act is indecent, I do not see how a refined woman can endure the sight of a baby. We cannot manufacture children out of nothing, and there is but one way for even the most delicate and refined woman to become a mother; but if the act is so indecent that we must not mention it in the presence of a refined woman, it should not be practiced. Let us be as holy as angels and stop having children. Will our refined ladies say that we must have children in order to perpetuate the human race? But why should we trouble ourselves about the human race if it cannot be preserved except through "indecent" acts? Is it not high time for our refined woman to know that the sex appetite is in itself no more indecent than any other natural appetite? If a mother can justly be proud of her baby, she should not be ashamed of the process by which the child came into existence. Let a woman be ever so refined; there is no reason why she should not be able to discuss the sex question with a member of the opposite sex, even if he is not a married man, and I do not know what to think of an intellectual woman who regards the recent Lucifer articles on the age of consent laws as indecent. I am indeed tempted to quote a blunt saying of Samuel Johnson. "Do you not think that

the Elgin marbles are indecent?" Boswell inquired of the doctor. "No sir," replied Johnson, "but your question is."—[C. W. COOLIDGE, in Lucifer]

A FEW QUESTIONS.

- 1.—Would a violent revolution have any other effect, (if we won) than to put us on top in place of those now there?
- 2.—What would we gain by establishing Anarchy before a large majority were in favor of it? Is that a possibility?
- 3.—If we should force people to try Anarchy, would it be Anarchy? E. H.

REPLY.

- 1.—That would depend on circumstances. If the idea is broadcast and dominant, that it is parties or men, who are responsible for our miseries, and a complete change of men would cure them, then, of course, we will only change our masters. On the other hand, if the idea of freedom is dominant, and all are willing to allow others to associate without interference from them, then no one will be put on top.
- 2.—The majority of the people are always indifferent and passive. If freedom could be gained, the Anarchists could so associate in production and otherwise, as to show by example that freedom is better than government. We would then gain a condition of continued peace, and make all other improvements possible.

If a majority of the active minority are in favor of Anarchy we could establish it, for all changes are wrought by the active minority.

- 3.—No. H. A.

NOTES.

Mr. Martin Quinn tells me that he never read Robert Ingersoll's speech in Chicago, which I accused him of imitating in his charge that ballot-box stealers etc. were Anarchists, which I critised in No 2. I gladly make the correction for I do not wish to accuse anyone wrongfully, and as Mr. Quinn has not read the speech referred to he could not have plagiarised from it. The resemblance was so strong that the mistake was quite natural. H. A.

A LEARNED idiot from Leland Southern Pacific Stanford Junior University lectured to a large audience at the Academy of Sciences on "The Abolition of Poverty." Professor Powers said among other things: "Poverty had its rise at the building of the Pyramids," and has been handed down to the present day "as a case of necessity." The professor said that "poverty never can be abolished," but he knew how to cure it. There was only one true method of doing that, it was to remove the influence which maintained and supported the evil. He laid down some rules as a remedy, as follows:

- "Don't give to tramps. Starve them."
- "Don't give to anybody you don't know."
- "Don't give money unless to one who knows how to spend it."
- "Don't give to hungry children. Imposture is almost universal in such cases."

This is the "cure" for poverty proposed by a high salaried professor, and yet some people wonder why the poor and starving hate such men.

If the poor were not long suffering and gentle they would make short work of such as he, and it is none too certain but that they may yet be goaded by such methods as he proposes, until they turn on their tormentors and exterminate them.

ACCORDING to a copy of the Buffalo LABOR NEWS, which was sent to us too late to use these information in our last comrade Most held a series of lectures in that city during the first week in February. His subjects were "Anarchism," "Situation of the American workmen," etc. This lectures were attended by from 400 to 500 men and women.

A reporter of the Buffalo COURIER interviewed comrade Most, and asked him among other things if he advocated the use of force and dynamite, and if the revolution will be a violent one.

"I, and all social revolutionists and Anarchists," he replied, "believe that a revolution will break out,

and that in such case dynamite will undoubtedly be used. We don't know when the revolution will come any more than we know when a thunderstorm will come. We would certainly be glad if it could be settled peaceable.

"If an Anarchist throws a bomb, or commits an act of violence, he does it on his own responsibility. Sovereigns murder Anarchists, Anarchists murder Sovereigns; capitalists murder strikers, strikers murder capitalists. The politician Guiteau murdered president Garfield, but Guiteau was not anymore an Anarchist than Booth, who murdered Lincoln. Kings Henry III and Henry IV were murdered by priests. The use of violence is chiefly favored by rulers and oppressors against discontented people. Violent actions committed by Anarchists are very few compared with the number committed by the rulers and aristocracy.

"A revolution is necessary to purify the foul atmosphere in which society lives."

It shows a healthy growth of sentiment for a daily paper to publish interviews with an Anarchist, and the interview from which the above is taken coming as it does from the man that has always been held up as the very embodiment of violence—undoubtedly will put a good many conservatives to thinking as they never thought before.

CLIPPINGS AND COMMENTS.

WHAT does it cost you to be governed, and how much good do you derive from it? Our national tax is seven dollars a head, forty-two dollars for a family of six. Add this to your state and county tax, and ask yourself if you receive that much benefit for it, or are you not rather paying that for the privilege of being further taxed by trusts, corporations and combines? [ARKANSAW KICKER.

Right you are, and yet if any one refuses to whoop it for politicians and points out that all governments are rotten, and a curse to the people of any country, the ones who are most oppressed will join in with their oppressors in a demand to "put 'em down! hang 'em."

There may be a few ignoramuses left who believe Socialist and Anarchist to be synonymous terms, it is worth while saying again that the chief accusation Socialists bring against the present system is that it is a system of anarchy. As a matter of fact, it's necessary to repeat this from time to time as many who are not ignorant, willfully misrepresent Socialists and classify them and Anarchists together. "Business," as it is carried on now is simply anarchy. Had we the sense and the courage to use it, the ballot gives us the power to free ourselves. But we seem to have neither sense nor courage; we are certainly woefully lacking in the latter quality.—[S. Simon in PEOPLE'S VOICE, Winnipeg, Manitoba.

Thus another self confessed fool tries to misrepresent Anarchism. It is necessary to repeat time and again that the present system is anarchy, because people are beginning to learn the meaning of the word, and it is loosing its terrors for them. But the man who says that the present system with its conferred privileges, its legalized monopolies, and instruments of torture ready to apply to anyone who may dare to oppose it, is anarchy, is either a willful misrepresenter, or an ignoramus, to ignorant to write on social and economic questions. He simply tries to imply that anarchy means disorder, and we all know that our present society is in a chronic state of disorder. But if he knows anything of definitions of economic terms, he knows that Anarchism is "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.

I am inclined to credit him with the lack of sense which he confesses, and, it may be, that the lack of courage plays a part, and fearing lest some one should call him an Anarchist, he says again and again that we are in a condition of anarchy and that he is a Socialist. It is a pity such fools and cowards are not modest enough to refrain from so constantly parading their ignorance and cowardice.

We believe Anarchy is a pleasant and happy idea and would be the ideal of society, but that is not practicable here. It may prove so in the Heaven of the hereafter, but as we want to remain as long as possible (though as it is) we must look to the earth. No doubt there are many monopolies that could not exist were they not upheld and maintained by the government. But it is erroneous to say that all are the result of government, for instance, while the government charter bonuses and assists the railways, steamboats and many other such concerns, it is not necessary to their existence, as capital would mass itself according to the desires of its owners. Government or no government,

society requires an organization for its own protection, which, when properly handled, should restrain the evil inclination of the strong, encourage the good and assist the weak. —[FREEMEN'S LABORS JOURNAL.

The above is the argument of very many persons who catch a glimpse of Anarchism but are still dominated by the old fallacy that springs from the "fall of man" theory. It is an unfounded assumption to say that the strong are evilly inclined, and the height of sophistry to argue that, men being evil out of office, they will not only become pure themselves, but also restrain the evil tendencies of others, if in office. Besides that society, that is to say, people, have a perfect right to associate, and to provide against fire, flood, famine or invasion, all of which can be done by spontaneous and voluntary co-operation without delegating any arbitrary authority to any one. In reality there are no such distinctions as the strong and the weak. Some are strong physically, some mentally, while others have great inventive power. In a condition of freedom congenial persons, and those best suited to work together, would associate for the purposes of production, distribution etc. "Capital" being merely the tools of production, inanimate forms of senseless substance, cannot mass itself. The massing of money and its investment in enterprises that can be monopolized is made possible only by the fostering of, and special privileges granted and upheld by the government. Anarchy above all other forms of society is practicable here and now, for it is in accord with human needs, and is a necessary condition for a high development of the race. Common men would have a heaven on earth in a free society, but it takes the "angels in heaven" to form a good government, and as the angels are scarce now-days, a good government or one that can be "properly handled" will never be formed.

H. A.

Correspondence.

WILLING TO HELP.

Comrades,—In your correspondence of Jan. 26. we notice a proposition from comrade Kate Austin to have 200,000 copies printed of the "Speeches before the Court" of our noble Dead, and to be distributed free.

In reply to this we will gladly give \$5.00 whenever the work is done or when remittances are required, and cheerfully say that this proposition is a noble one, and hope that all comrades will do what they can to sustain the effort. *)

WORKMEN'S AID ASSOCIATION.

Pittsburg, Pa. Feb. 10.

WITH US.

The brave, fearless FIREBRAND comes regularly every week. I read them all carefully and then lend, or give them to some neighbors. I think that some of them are not quite as afraid of the Anarchists as they used to be; in fact you do not seem to be half as bad as I used to think before I read your paper. You are doing a lot of good, and I am with you for liberty; as far as I can see, that is the only way to secure to the toilers the fruit of their labor. We are being ground down deeper and deeper all the time, and if it goes on this way much longer, the producers will all starve to death and then what will become of our social oppressors; who will feed and clothe them. On with the fight. Give me liberty or give me death!

Bossko, S. D.

MATILDA C. WILKINS.

HAS HIS OWN IDEAS,

Comrades,—I herewith send you sixteen cents. This will help you a little in your fight for liberty.

You were so kind as to send me THE FIREBRAND all last Summer without my having paid for it. I thank you very much. I have derived much benefit from it.

In your letter you say: "If you agree on sex freedom, why should we not be just as free in ALL relations, economic, social, industrial etc.?"

For several years past I have realized the necessity for perfect freedom in all these relations, but the question with me has been, how to attain this freedom. Now, I agree with you in the method as well as in the idea. I wish I had time to give my definition of Anarchism-Communism as I believe in it. I will only say that I consider some peoples "Anarchism" a denial of Liberty (Benj. R. Tucker's, for instance).

There is nothing that is so much misunderstood as Anarchism, and those loose careless writers who imagine

*) Thirteen dollars have already been promised and sent in to us for this purpose, besides an amount promised and sent to comrade Fulton, which will appear in THE FIREBRAND.

themselves to be Anarchists are large responsible for it. As I understand it, the true Anarchist says:

"I will not invade the rights of anyone, neither will I allow anyone to invade my rights, without protest and resistance".

I cannot at all agree with those "Anarchists" who deny that there is such a thing as duty; who would deny the right of self-defence, or who would claim that a man has a moral, natural right to do a wrong to himself. No true Anarchist believes such things.

Poplar, Cal.

W. P. AUSTIN.

STAY AT HOME.

Dear Firebrand, Is mankind getting entirely off its base? Everybody who can, and has got a few cents to get away on with taking to his heels, seems determined to support the combinations of transportation, and hunt for gold. Instead of uniting the little they have, and combining their money and their forces, and taking possession of those idle factories and natural resources and producing necessities, and making the part of the country where they live an Eden, they run away into a still worse wilderness, to endure more hardships, and dig gold for the goldbugs. Stay at home, let the capitalist dig his gold, and take care of your loved ones. Don't let them become a prey to some soundrel you dig gold for, and see how he likes it.

It is about time we gained our senses.

Tacoma, Wash.

E. F. ROTSCHEK.

AN IMPOSSIBILITY.

I have received several copies of your little paper and want to send you 25 cents in stamps, which you will find enclosed. You and I are aiming for the same thing,—individual liberty; but our methods are different, I being a Socialist. I believe in individual sovereignty and I believe it is the function of the state to maintain that; the other functions being to furnish money sufficient to transact all business; and to see that employment is provided for every one.

I put the individual first and the state next,—the latter being the servant of the first. Any government that invades or ignores individual liberty is a despotism. Perhaps some other word than government would fit me better. But I must close. Believing we are brothers in the great struggle, I toiling with my hands as farmer and day-laborer, and you in the higher calling of shedding light on the beclouded minds of men.

C. L. PENHALLOW.

Portersville, Cal.

Comment.

Individual liberty is what we are striving for, and we know that it cannot be attained while there is any kind of sovereignty, or any kind of government. The State is, and always must be, for the maintenance of privilege. Abolish privilege and there remains no need of government. Without the privileges granted and upheld by government it would never be necessary to furnish either money or employment to anyone, for, being free to arrange their affairs to suit themselves, and to use the natural resources freely, no one need be idle. You unquestionably mean association instead of government, for by association every human need can be fully supplied and all assistance in time of need—sickness, death, fire etc. secured, while government secures none of these, but imposes taxation, restrictions and despotic interference; abridges individual liberty, restricts association, and creates poverty, vice and crime of every description.

HENRY ADDIS.

The Letter-Box.

Rt. B. Chicago, Ill.—Sample copies will be sent for a while regularly to the addresses you sent in.

H. R. Vancouver, B. C.—We were glad to hear that you are located and "fighting for liberty." We also hope that you will be able to cure a few thinking individuals in that locality from the dangerous disease that liberty can be obtained under any kind of government.

BARBARA, White Ash, Pa.—Don't worry about the money, comrade. Your subscription is not expired yet, and there are many, many readers on our list that have received the paper for months and have not paid yet. As long as we are able to issue THE FIREBRAND, you shall have it.

W. D. B., West Newton, Mass.—As to your agreeing with us, our columns are open to all comers, on equal terms—they will be given a hearing in their own language, nothing that they say being suppressed. The sect of State Socialists, I thought had become too respectable to be persecuted.

Ch. L., Butte, Mont.—Yes, money and subscriber received a time ago. stamps will be sent to Nzw Hu-

MANITY. Thanks for your good wishes. The prospects for Anarchism are the best,—it shows in the daily increase of our subscription list, but there is one obstacle—the income to cover the expenses is not increasing as fast.

J. H. Wood, Detroit Mich.—Your extended replies to criticism relieved, but they simply recite what you had said before. This convinces us that if what you write was admitted, with the replies it would draw out, the paper would be filled and leave but little room for anything else. In some of your letters you admit that government cannot exist without taxes, and yet you vehemently uphold government, and insist that it issue all money.

RECEIPTS.

Koch, \$1.50; Loveridge, \$1.20; Lee, \$1.00; Borst, Healy, Rotcshek, Hannon, Delcour, Lang, each 50 cents. Kisloff, 30cents. Fiege, Mar tin, Ornsurd, Berteaux, Cerezo, Priestly, Busold, each 25cents. Klemencic, 20cents. Kowell, Smith, Williams, Krum, each 10 cents.

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

LIBERTY LIBRARY MONTHLY

E. H. FULTON PUBLISHER

Columbus Junction, Iowa.

SUBSCRIPTION

50 CTS. PER YEAR.

In this Library Mr. Fulton brings out one or more volumes of anarchist literature every month. It is printed on fine book paper, in new clear type, and is a model of neatness and artistic skill. No. 1 contains Wm. Holmes' "BASES OF ANARCHY: Historical, Philosophical and Economical." No. 2 contains "God and the State," by 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 cts each in lots of ten or more; 100 copies or more at 2½ cts 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, 162 Norfolk street, New York City.

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

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