



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, DECEMBER 27, 1896.

No. 47

THE FIREBRAND

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

Address all Communications and make all Money Orders payable to The Firebrand, P. O. Box 477, Portland, Or.

Admitted as second-class matter at the Portland, Or., postoffice

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.

The Turkey's Appeal.

AS HIS ARISEN SPIRIT PRAYS TO GOD ON CHRISTMAS EVE.
BY T. A. STONE.

Oh! God, hast thou one child among this murderous assembly? Can any one here enter the pearly gates of purity? In the sight of Heaven and Justice they are all guilty of murder as principle or accomplice. We the spirits of their victims accuse them of being lying hypocrites when they say they are washed pure and white in the blood of Christ, (their brother). Their hands are red with the blood of the innocent victims they have murdered. Because thou hast blessed them with superior strength and sagacity they claim to be better than we.

They put ten thousand times ten thousand to death,
Then waft hymns to thee with their carrion breath.
Hades they say is for the infidel,
Their hideous stomachs is Turkey hell.
They claim to-day's a day of thanksgiving,
'Tis but a day of riotous living.
Can their bigoted souls be pure and clean
When they are acting so wicked and mean?
They are full of hatred, murder and strife,
Constantly taking some innocent life.
They speak and sing of God's Mercy to man,
Then act as unmerciful as they can.
If thou didst make them, thou makest us too,
And our lives too, must be precious to you.
Didst thou give souls to such a cruel set,
And then the rest of thy children forget?
Man shifts his sins on an innocent one,
Then sins again with murderous gun.
Mothers too, so little of justice know,
That they often strike us the cruel blow,
Stamping in the heart of an unborn child
The scene of her action wicked and wild.
Man claims that a savior to him was sent,
And he needs but to believe and repent,
And salvation to him will be given
Accompanied with a pass to heaven.
If none enter heaven but the just and true
What wilt thou do with this murderous crew?
If they must die once, for each life taken,
When, Oh Lord, when will their souls awaken?
Lord cleanse them with fruit like the pinn and date,
And let their souls live in a purer state.
Had a loaf of bread been stamped on their coins,
Eagles would never have been born from their loins,
Not content to take their red brother's land,
The eagle's claws and beak must rule their band.
The eagle principle in men of earth
Curses their children before they have birth.
The fangs of the earth display talons and claws,
Carnivorous teeth and murderous jaws:
The nations of earth are ruled by greed,
Oh God, plant in their hearts another seed;
Let this fair earth so beautiful and wild,
Be the God given home of every child.
Then will men emulate the Christ of old,
Be just, and live and do so as they were told:
Then, as their inner sight thou dost restore,
They will cease thirsting for their brother's gore.
Oh! stay their hands from the murderous blow,
As thou didst Abraham long years ago.
Now Lord, at the altar this Christmas Eve,
Please open their hearts that they may receive
The spirit of the American bird,
Whose agonies on the block the've oft'n heard.

"Government is the great blackmailer."—[Buckle.

"Look at the Post Office!"

WHEN a Nationalist or State Socialist exhausts all the arguments he knows of in combating the theories of Anarchy, he will invariably tell you to look at the Post Office, with a wise look, evidently expecting that that settles it. To him the Postal system is the model institution. He thinks it is a symbol of the entire machinery of socialist production and distribution in the Co-operative Commonwealth. He will say that it may not be perfect, but that is because of the fact that the capitalist system prevails, and not because of any internal defects.

All this praise of the Postal services is due to a prejudice that is born of ignorance of the facts in the case. The postal system is cumbersome, costly, and not calculated to secure the best results with the greatest despatch and least labor. It is run in the interest of the commercial class, is beyond the reach of the people, is irresponsible and fails to pay expenses, the deficit being taken out of the general revenues, thus putting a burden on the general public for the benefit of the class that uses it most. Its money order department is encumbered with a lot of senseless requirements, and instead of being secure, as is generally supposed, is insecure, not being responsible for any losses which the senders of money may sustain because of the loss, by theft or otherwise, of the money order he may send.

Express companies issue money orders that are much more convenient and absolutely secure. Every convenience that will save labor or increase the security of express money orders is adopted by the companies, when brought to their notice, but if the postal money order system undergoes changes it does so very slowly, if at all.

Lest some one might say that I am mistaken in these matters I will cite two instances that have come under my personal observation of late. A year ago last May I sent a money order from Tacoma to J. H. Morris, at Portland. When I returned to Portland I found that Mr. Morris had never received the money order. I found further that a man by the name of Riddell had taken the order from the letter and forging Mr. Morris' name on the back of the order had collected it. I presented the matter to the foreman of the money order department at the Post Office and he referred me to the Inspector. After awhile I found the Inspector in his office and presented the case to him. He wanted evidence which I furnished him. I was then informed that the only way for me to get the money back was to find Mr. Riddell and put the Inspector onto his whereabouts and he would try and bluff the money out of him. I found him and told the Inspector where he was. More than a year afterward the man who paid the order to Riddell asked me if I had received my money yet, and advised me to write a letter to the Postmaster. This I did. I found that the Inspector had twice tried to bluff the paying clerk into paying the amount of the order over to him. I found him in his office one day and he told me he had seen Riddell, and that Riddell refused to give up the money on the plea that Mr. Morris had signed it over to

him, although he had abundant proof to the contrary. Since then I have refused to have anything to do with it. This shows the security of the money order department of the Postal service.

The Postmaster in this city got up a postal directory, which, if used, would save at least sixty dollars per month for the Portland Post Office. He wrote to the proper authorities, offering to get the directory out at his own expense if it did not prove a success, and save as much expense as he claimed, in addition to making the delivery of mail much more expeditious and sure. After a long delay he was informed that if it proved a success every first class office in the nation would want one. Concrete wisdom, is it not? An improved system that would save thousands of dollars annually in all the large cities, and secure a much more certain and expeditious delivery of mails is rejected because it would come into general use.

Employees are not secure in their positions. I know a letter carrier who belongs to a number of Lodges, and to a P. O. Employees Band, as he confessed to me, in order to hold his job. I know other letter carriers who are afraid to speak their honest sentiments for fear of losing their jobs. Employees in the mailing division are over-worked, have no holidays, and receive poor pay considering their work.

The intermeddling of the postal Authorities is outrageous. If the Comstock laws were rigidly enforced, if the power placed in the hands of the postal Authorities was fully exercised by them, thousands of the best and brightest of our land would be in jail, or serving prison sentences. Witness the suppression of Kreutzer Sonata and other books. The imprisonment of Harman, Heywood and Bennett. And remember that any Postmaster can exclude almost anything he chooses from the mail as being "indecent."

The Postal service is a huge monopoly, and run so expensively and unsatisfactorily that all competition is prohibited. Were the prohibitory mail laws repealed a more satisfactory and inexpensive service would grow up and that would make the government service a greater expense to the general treasury than it now is.

Then, too, it is class legislation. The man within four blocks of the Post Office in a city, with good sidewalks all the way, has his mail laid down on his desk three times a day, while the man four miles away can wade the mud for his mail.

Thus we see that if the Postal service is a model of what Nationalists and State Socialists hope for we had better stand from under. Excuse us from putting any more public necessities into the hands of the government.

There is not a feature of the Postal service but what can be improved upon and operated more satisfactorily in every respect if freed from the encumbrance of official red tape, and authoritarian intermeddling and supervision.

HENRY ADDIS.

"Under any government, whatever it may be, nature has set limits to the miseries of the people. Beyond these limits lie death, fight, or revolt."—[Diderot.

Fruitless Controversy.

If Mr. Morris and I could agree as to the meaning of words, I should still feel that there is too little real disagreement between us to justify controversy; but as he thinks otherwise, I will do my best to understand him.

I did not, in the article which he criticised, say things that I did not mean to say: nor did I say things I did not mean. The truth is, he intimates that I said things which I did not say. I repeat that I did not say Communism is impracticable. What I said was, that it is practicable only at the sacrifice of individual freedom and aspiration. He admits, unequivocally, that with my definition, communistic experiments have all been failures. But he insists that they were not truly Communistic, and that they failed for that reason. So the issue, if there be any issue between us, is about the meaning of a word.

Mr. Morris superciliously contends that I know nothing of Communism; that none of those old veterans knew anything about it: that what we call Communism is not Communism, at all, but only Communityism. And he pronounces us ignoramuses for failing to make that distinction. Possibly, he is right. It is always well to try to see ourselves as others see us. And possibly, the Shakers, the Zoarites, the Icarians, the Oneidans, and numerous others, not to mention the Berlinites, who have called themselves Communists, and whom everybody else have called by that name, are not Communists, after all. If all these, and all the world, except Anarchists, are fools, I need not complain of being classed with them.

I must not, however, neglect to inquire what it is that my enlightened critic regards as the genuine article, the Simon pure Communism. In the Firebrand, No. 23, he uses this language: "Communism, then, means equality of opportunity, and what follows; free production, free consumption, and the grouping of individuals according to congeniality and mutual choice." He now refers to articles of his in No. 25 and No. 33; but I have not seen those. If he said anything in them, contradictory of what I have quoted, I will except the correction.

Assuming that he has not done this, I proceed to remark that equality of opportunity implies individuality, which is Individualism. So does the phrase: Free production. Combined production is not free production. So it seems individuals are to be free to work, each on his own account, the same as at present, but with the understanding that there is to be no monopoly of natural opportunities, which includes everything not produced by labor. A logical inference is, that each person may appropriate the product of his own labor; for without this right, equality of opportunities would be but barren nonsense.

This is what we fools call Individualism, the exact opposite of what we understand as communism. If Anarchist-Communism means Communism, it must mean it by virtue of the second item of my friends definition, namely, free consumption. He now says that Anarchist-Communism does not mean this. Then it does mean what he said it meant. If he has said things which he did not mean to say, he should not blame me for it. But it does mean that. It runs all through the Firebrand, and it is shuffling to say it does not. Free production is going to make the products of labor so plentiful as to destroy their commercial value. When this occurs each will help himself to whatever he needs or fancies he needs, wherever he finds it, without the formalities of exchange.

Now, if it be true that the abolition of monopoly will result as these wise ones predict, this free consumption may become practicable, if not actually convenient; and in that case, the condition of society would be, virtually, somewhat analogous to Communism. But will there be, under any conceivable circumstances, any such abundance as is claimed? How can it be shown that there will be? My critic admits that human wants are insatiable. How, then, can abundance eliminate value? What is to hinder free consumption from becoming simply free plunder? That is what is bothering us now; and, if wants are insatiable, how can it be otherwise under free consumption? If wants are insatiable, how can free production supply them? Merely to say that I am color blind will not answer these questions. Before your system will become practicable, other blind people, besides me, will have to be made to see; and very few are ever convinced by contemptuous and insulting language.

* This reply has been delayed on account of the absence of Comrade Morris.

If then, there be any doubt about equality of opportunity, and consequent free production, bringing abundance, sufficient to banish want, it follows that free consumption is only a phantom of the imagination, and Anarchist-Communism is the bogus article, after all. So, whether it be I or Mr. Morris who calls black white is, at best, a question open for debate.

To review my friends hair-splitting as to government will require too much space for this article. I will therefore only remark, that he tacitly admits that he believes in governing children; and if so, I again ask, why not adults, for the same reasons? Does the freedom of one individual never conflict with that of another? A. WARREN.

Mr. Morris is out of the city, and not in a position to write, and so cannot reply to Mr. Warren's rejoinder. I do not care to take up Mr. Morris' controversy, but there are a few points in Mr. Warren's rejoinder that I cannot refrain from calling attention to. He says: "Combined production is not free production." I cannot conceive on what he bases that assertion. To assert that two or more persons cannot combine their efforts freely in production is an assumption which cannot be proven.

It does not seem to one who is acquainted with Anarchist-Communist philosophy that each individual will be free to work on his own account "the same as at present," for the simple reason that the conditions will be so different that nothing will be the same as at present, and herein lies Mr. Warren's error. He confounds the present with the future. It is because of this failing to grasp the conception of the future society that animates the Anarchist-Communist, that leads him to consider Individualism as the extreme opposite of Communism.

Mr. Warren's fear that production cannot keep pace with consumption is as groundless as the fear of the faithful that without Sunday laws people would become so immoral that life for them would be unbearable. Anyone at all acquainted with the actual power of production with the machinery now invented, and who takes the number of non-producers who would, in a condition of freedom, become producers into account, can have no fears of a lack of abundant production to supply all wants. If wants are insatiable, production is constant, and the one would offset the other, which fact the objectors to Communism never seem to realize. As far as convenience is concerned, if it is more convenient to keep accounts, to lock and bar all doors, to hire men to carry guns, and to weigh and measure everything, than it is to produce and consume so freely that all these things will be unnecessary and unthought of, then I don't know the meaning of convenience.

There can be no doubt, when all the facts in the case are considered, about equality of opportunity "bringing abundance sufficient to banish want." Consequently, Anarchist-Communism, according to Mr. Warren's reasoning, is the genuine article, and there is little room for debate on that point. H. A.

An Instance of Modern Freedom.

On the 8th of December, in the evening, a man by the name Mr. Marks and his wife went to a theatre. Going home about 11 o'clock, Mr. Marks went in a tobacco store for some tobacco, leaving his wife outside on the sidewalk. On coming out he saw her struggling and remonstrating with a man. Of course Mr. Marks went to his wife's rescue as any husband would do; but he soon learned that the man who had hold of his wife was an officer of "law and order," although being dressed as a civilian. In an instant there were two more policemen on the scene and Mr. Marks and his wife were hurried away to the station house.

She was charged with approaching men on the street, he with assaulting and resisting an officer, although he did not know that the man who was dragging his wife was an officer. They were arraigned in Essex market Police court, before the Hon. Judge Mott, a well known man for his love of Justice. (?) The hearing was held in the following way: Mrs. Marks' father, a respectable man, swore that she was a very good girl before she was married.

"Did she live with you then?" demanded the Justice.

"Yes," replied her father.

Judge: "Didn't she live with her husband?"

Father: "Yes, she lived with me until she was married."

J. "You said just now that she lived with you?"

F. "Yes, Your Honor, I said that she"—

J. "Now don't you come here to tell lies."

F. "I said that she"—J. "Shut up, shut up, I don't want to hear another word."

Off from the stand he was ordered, another witness called. He testified that he knew Mrs. Marks for 13 years, and knew her to be a very respectable woman.

Judge: "How often have you seen her since her marriage?"

Witness: "Every day."

J.: "Can you swear that she has not been out nights?"

W.: "Well, no, how could I do that, not having any business to spy her?"

The husband had sworn to that only a few minutes before. The witness was likewise ordered from the stand. Before the Marks got through with the case, the woman was sent to the workhouse and the man fined \$10 for assaulting an officer of "law and order."

How long! Oh, how long, will you free born Americans stand by and look on calmly as your most sacred rights, your most sacred feelings are interfered with?

Wake up you mighty men from your slumber. Lool around and say, this is enough, stop or we'll—

L. H.

Jersey City, N. J.

Personal Liberty.

I was surprised to find my letter to you published in your paper. My letter was as any one will see, not meant for publication—it was of a private nature. But since it has been published and declared a puzzle (at least to the signature A. I.), I will shortly give the following response:

"Personal liberty" can, according to my ideas, only exist when a person has indisputable right to the control of his or her means of living. As I have understood Communism, this will not or cannot be so. I might not as A. I. puts it "be quite clear" on this question, in all events not so clear that I don't stand to reason, but I have come to my conclusions by reading Communistic books and papers.

As you will find by this, I am not a convert of our friends in London, that I mentioned in my letter, but still do I regard them, as well as all Communists, as friends, yes, as my personal friends, because their ideal is mine, it is only the means of finding our way to personal liberty, that I do not really agree with, hence I am not a Communist.

A. I. says that Individualists are only in the a b c in their conception of a condition of freedom, . . . as shown when they try describe a free society; and I say amen, because outlining and describing a free society is only a speculation. To build a house, we need material fit for that purpose, and to build a free society we also need material fit for that purpose, and that material is—free persons. It seems that society composed of individuals will also depend on these individuals and not visa versa. To me, personal liberty is the aim and the motor, and when people once become free, they will surely know how to solve the social question that confronts them. OLOF P. VICTORIEN.

Hillman, Minn.

Correct, my friend, personal liberty can only exist when the individual has an indisputable right to control the means of life, and to indulge in all enjoyments a person might be able to obtain or have a desire for. This is only possible in a condition of freedom—Communism,—hence I am a Communist.

The motto of the Communist is: "Produce and consume according to your desire," i. e. there shall be neither restraint in production nor in consumption. To say that this means compulsion or authoritarianism, as the Individualists do, can only be explained by their greedy and insatiable nature. They want the liberty and privilege to exploit their fellow men, which they cannot accomplish in a condition of freedom. If my accusation is groundless, then it is their ignorance that prompts them to object to real freedom.

But I think my opponent has the old conception of Communism, which we call State Socialism to-day, in mind when he objects to its realization. We claim that, when the means of production and distribution are free, the products will be so plentiful that they will become valueless as the air is to-day;

that each individual will be at liberty to produce and consume according to his notions and desires, and that such state of affairs constitutes Communism. The individual might live alone in a house in the community or way out in the woods as a hermit, and work by himself without being interfered with by anybody, and it would be still a state of Communism, as nobody would charge him for anything he would need nor pay him for anything he would want to dispose of. To deny that there would be enough produced in an unrestricted society, is an assertion that has to be proven yet. If it can be demonstrated satisfactory, then it contradicts also the assertion of the Individualists that the establishment of their proposed institutions will relieve mankind from want and misery. Or will they have some means for compelling people to produce sufficiently of everything?

The so-called Individualists are very well aware of the fact—at least some of them—that the idea of private property, which in reality amounts to the same thing as legal property, is unjust and against the realization of freedom, and therefore try to influence and impress men with ethical phrases as "equal freedom," "not to infringe on the liberties of others," "to respect the rights of our neighbors," etc., etc. Why? Simply because they know that without vaccinating mankind with such relative terms as right and wrong, they will live in constant warfare. "Right," "justice," "equal freedom," is their scarecrow, just as priests scare their dupes with the devil and hell. And they know also that these teachings of conduct will not suffice to keep the "unit" in submission, and therefore propose "Protective Associations" and "Juries" in order to keep those of a more or less rebellious character in obedience.

On the other hand, the Anarchists are aware of the fact that the conduct of people depends largely upon the social and economical conditions, and that freedom is the only equilibrium of all those "infringements" the Individualists lay so much stress on. Their fear, that the "equal liberty" will be violated, demonstrates the fact, that their social theory does not propose the removal of the causes which bring such violations about. Aggressive acts will occur as long as there is an incentive to them. When mankind reaches the stage of free production and consumption, the cause for cheating, stealing and murdering is removed.

The living together in small or large communities, the using of one towel or the eating together at one large table, does not constitute Communism, not even if the gathering or association is called "voluntary." Freedom is not a phenomenon that can be established or secured by ethical declarations or constitutions on paper, but must result from the social and economical conditions essential to free production and free consumption.

As to A B C of the Individualists in "outlining and describing" a free society, I did not express myself correctly. The question is not, how a free society will be, as such outlining can only be of a speculative nature, as my opponent truly says, but the question is "What constitutes freedom?" And what I meant to say is, that when the Individualists try to define freedom, they are in the A B C, as I am in the English language.

The theories of the so-called Individualists resemble exactly those of our present governments, and if it was possible to carry their theories out, the final result would be same. In theory our governments are for the protection of life and property, for the weak against the strong, etc. But in reality governments protect nothing but property, i. e., they give to the rich the privilege to rob the poor.

No, my friend, the so-called Individualists are not Individualists at all, in the real sense of the word. I admire Nietzsche, Ibsen, et al, just as much as they do, but I am aware of the fact, that my individuality can only develop and extend itself fully, when my fellow men have the same opportunity to the enjoyments and sustentations of life that I have, independently of their abilities or "fitness." I cannot really enjoy life as long as there are any suffering men around me. Science and art cannot develop freely as long as scientists and artists have to struggle for the means which sustain life. Communists

are the real Individualists.

To conclude with, let me say that the controversy between the so-called Individualists and Communists is fruitless as long as we hold a different definition of the word Anarchism. The Communists mean a condition of freedom when they use the term Anarchism, while the would-be Individualists simply mean the right or liberty to choose or consent, no matter what the conditions are, forgetting that the outcome of their propositions would destroy these liberties. This ought to be taken into consideration in future controversies.

A. I.

The Proposed Anarchist Convention.

I THINK Comrade Leontieff's criticism of the comrade who proposed the "general convention" rather severe and in bad taste. The comrade was very fair in his proposition, made no pretensions of authority, and asked for the expressions of opinion. This is according to my memory of the matter.

The proposition was, I think, made in the proper spirit—that of individual initiative. And while there is no doubt that good would result from a general gathering of the comrades, I would suggest that it is absolutely impossible for an Anarchist meeting to be a "delegate" affair. The ball being started by individual imitation, why should that excellent and undeniable Anarchist principle be at once abandoned? Can an Anarchist be represented except in his own proper person? If we abandon Anarchist principles in our methods of propaganda, what may we expect as a result of the revolution?

The meeting should be composed of volunteers. Any other method would smack too much of parliamentarism. But, the objection is raised, no individual can bear the expense of a trip from the West to New York. True, and since all cannot go, let groups form for the purpose of aiding certain volunteers. But again, there might be a division of the comrades of a town, and the consequence be that no one be enabled to go. I do not see how this is to be remedied, except by adopting authoritarian methods and compelling, by majority vote, some to contribute to the expenses of a comrade in whose going they are not interested. But, once more, this is a small matter and the importance of having as many as possible at the meeting outweighs it? I say no; nothing is of greater importance than the purity of the movement at its inception. Now is the primitive period, and if we build up a heterogeneous mass of Anarchist theory and Anarchist practice, it must inevitably topple and fall of its own weight. A little error today means little but error tomorrow. Habit is the strongest thing in life. If we fall into the habit of laying aside our principles when they stand in the way of the desire of the MAJORITY, in small things, that habit will lead us about in a circle until we find ourselves at the point from which we started.

Anarchy means the abolition of the representative and all parliamentary systems. It aims as certainly at the annihilation of the ballot as a method of determining yea and nay as at the sceptres of kings.

J. H. M.

Ryngton Replis.

I AM sorry Mr. Morris finds me remiss in continuing my discussion with him, and especially sorry that my remissness is going to deprive me of the pleasure and profit of having him for an opponent. Although Mr. Morris is not always sensible, there is a good deal to be learned by debating with him. But I really have not so much time for writing as Mr. Addis kindly credits me with.

Since he is not to answer me, I cut short my answer to him; but I want leave to answer briefly, and shall be glad to be answered in turn by any of the Firebrand's contributors, as Mr. Morris suggests.

He says of natural opportunity, "The only condition (barring the use of force) on which one will accept the less favorable opportunity is that he has free access to the products of labor applied to the more favorable opportunity." But surely the woods are full of men willing to forego the more favorable opportunity on receiving a certain compensation in cash (single tax) and Mr. Tucker and many others are willing to forego it simply to avoid the alternatives of such a course, single tax and Communism.

He says: "Natural opportunity is invaluable because a primary condition of existence itself. When Mr. Byington can estimate the value of life, I will consider his estimate (in nickels) of the value of the opportunity to live." But theoretically there is no reason why I should hold beyond price any natural opportunity except such as are absolutely necessary to life itself; and practically we know that all sorts of natural opportunities are constantly traded in at a well-known and moderate market value. If private property in any necessary of life did in fact constitute such a monopoly of its natural source as to deprive the propertyless of their original possibility of access to that opportunity, I should acknowledge the validity of this argument. But this is precisely what I deny; and Mr. Morris undertakes to answer my denial in his next point.

I deny that private property in "personal property" constitutes or implies any monopoly of natural opportunities at all. He answers, first, "If I own a crop of wheat, I have monopolized the land the time the crop was growing." I reply that it is all right if he has received the consent of the rest of the people that he may monopolize this land this year; and that if some of the people refuse such consent, but have no better plan to propose on their part than that his labor (or its products, which is the same thing) be put at the disposal of all comers, then those who thus propose to enslave him cannot reasonably complain of any monopoly by which he defends his liberty. Next he argues that profit in itself implies monopoly, because "if the opportunity to make chairs were free, the present unemployed would make chairs so plentiful that there would be no profit on them." I want the premise proved. The rest of his argument rests on his final assertion that "the effort at distinction between opportunity and the tools of production is an economic fallacy." But, inasmuch as my whole contention is that labor products should not be treated like natural opportunities, this is begging the question.

The amazing thing in his article is his closing paragraph. If he could not otherwise immediately supply the need of a man with a sprained ankle, he would take away by force the walking-stick I was using, the product of my labor. Why, if taking a thing out of a man's hands by force to relieve the needy is not government, what is government?

I was surprised at this, having never known Mr. Morris to go so glaringly astray from the path of Anarchism before; but after reading Mr. Andrews' articles on "Liberty and Property" and comparing them with what else he has lately written I think I see what is the matter. Mr. Morris has been led astray by Mr. Andrews' sophistry, and has adopted the Andrewsian view of the essence of Anarchism.

Mr. Morris commends Mr. Andrews' article to my special attention. The first four of his six sections, however, call for no answer from me except to say that Mr. Andrews is attacking a doctrine which I do not hold, nor do I know of anybody who holds it. There may in Australia be such "Individualist-Anarchists" as Mr. Andrews describes (though I doubt it, seeing that in his article of Oct. 11 he describes the single tax doctrine as being something which I know single taxers do not believe even in Australia) but the Individualist-Anarchists of the United States, at any rate, do not hold that doctrine of "to each according to his work," meaning that each must be allowed to consume just as much as he produces. Ours is the shorter principle, "to each his works"; and we recognize the making of a good or bad bargain as part of a man's works. Therefore, if two men make a bargain in which unequal labor values are exchanged, the first gets the fruit of his total works—production and good bargain together—and the second gets the fruit of his total works—production and bad bargain together. And anarchistic principles have been perfectly maintained.

In his fifth section he argues that the principle of property will not work in certain particular emergencies. But Tucker has been proclaiming for a long time that all principles must give way in great emergencies. Victor Yarros and I stood out against him for a while, but Yarros has not answered Tucker's latest on this subject, while I have formerly acknowledged myself beaten. Those who have not been heard from are most probably on Tucker's side, so I think it quite safe to say that this is now the generally accepted view among American Individualist-Anarchists. So I need not oppose Mr. Andrews here either.

It is in his sixth and last section, where he stops fighting imaginary enemies and begins the positive development of his own philosophy, that we see the real trouble. It is in what Mr. Andrews calls Individ-

nalism—the doctrine that we should not let our actions be directed by principle.

Now, in the first place, I want to make a protest on behalf of our poor English language. The word "Individualism" has a settled meaning. It is everywhere understood to mean the doctrine that we should be directed by a certain principle, to wit, that we should let each other alone to a certain defined extent. Mr. Andrews might have used the word "Autonomianism," which expresses his idea much better, or he might have invented any new word he chose. Why need he throw us into confusion by putting a new meaning on an old word? It raises the suspicion that, in spite of Mr. Andrews' opposition to Individualism in its accepted sense, he finds that this word has earned for itself a reputation worth taking advantage of, or else that after all the word had pleasant associations in his mind before he invented its new meaning. Just so every agitator proclaims his scheme in the name of liberty, however tyrannical it may be—because our fathers learned from bitter experience that liberty is a good thing, and impressed this so deeply on our minds that the word is still dear even to those among us who have entirely forgotten what it means.

(I want it understood that I make no charge of insincerity either against Mr. Andrews or against those who call that money liberty. I am only pointing to the unconscious workings of the law of association in their minds, causing them to use words in a sense which the original and usual meanings of these words never could have suggested.)

But, aside from the word, the thing for which Mr. Andrews uses it is bad. Man can live better by making up his mind in cool and careful moments what is the best course in certain classes of cases, and afterwards acting on these conclusions, than without doing so. The complications of human nature do not make such generalizations impracticable. Mr. Andrews himself generalizes as to the impulses of human nature, saying "We desire to satisfy our own needs, to passively respect each other's needs, and to actively assist towards the satisfaction of them." If such generalizations are possible, it ought to be at least as possible to go on and say "If I do so desire, then I shall find such and such a course of conduct most effective in satisfying such desires." But this is what Mr. Andrews calls "the acceptance by somebody of the doctrine that his will ought to be according to the dictum of some rule whereby he hypnotizes his faculty of will, so that circumstances affect his conduct in an inappropriate manner, very differently from how they naturally would if he had not so tampered with himself.

And Mr. Andrews says that the adoption of such rules indicates, or even constitutes, insanity. Rather, the absence of such rules is insanity. Suppose, instead of having it for a general rule not to kill each other, we should practice killing anybody whenever we had any reason for wishing him out of the way. Would that not be a lunatic condition of society? We have rules for the mere sake of having some rule; for instance, the rule that a driver always turns out to the same side in meeting another team. Would Mr. Andrews say that a driver was more sane if he refused to "make this rule the test of conduct," and practiced turning out on whichever side happened to be more convenient?

But Mr. Andrews will say that I misrepresent him; for he has declared that an association may well put forward "some formal statement of the general lines they think well to follow," in which case they obviously must have thought well to follow certain general lines. So he does not mean that they are not to generalize their principles of action, but only that they are not to let these generalizations determine their actions. Precisely; that is what I mean to. The rule of turning out to a certain side of the road has no value whatever as a generalization without binding power; it is only as this rule causes men to turn in a way that they would not otherwise have turned that it is useful to society. The rule of not killing each other would have some value if it were only a statement of what men are likely to do, but comparatively little. Its use to decrease the amount of killing by causing men to refrain from killing in cases where they would kill if they were not restrained by the existence of a general rule on the subject. One of my pupils is a half-witted girl who is very troublesome both to her teachers and to her school-mates. I am not cruelly disposed toward her—witness the fact that I succeed in being a favorite of hers, and have less trouble with her than any one else in the house—but, if I were not guided by a general rule of not killing, I am quite sure I should decide that the happiness of all concerned would be best served by giv-

ing her a poisoned bonbon; even she herself, with her constant quarrels and complaints, would miss more suffering than pleasure by being put out of the way. Does Mr. Andrews think that if I were sane, and not restrained by the state, I should kill her?

Perhaps he does. Certainly he must if he is going to be consistent. But I think I do better to maintain the rule for several reasons. First, I am very likely to be mistaken as to what is best in the individual case; and this rule is so well approved by experience that I am sure the chances of its being wrong are much less than the chances of my being wrong. Second, the fact that this rule is observed makes the people about me feel safe; and if I broke the rule, the mere knowledge that it was broken would throw them into a condition of fear much worse than any trouble this girl makes. Observe, it is not my action individually considered that will cause this fear, but the fact that the rule has been broken. Neither will the fear be unreasonable; for nothing else can give them the same security of life that this rule gives. If it is known that I do not hold myself bound to obey the rule, nobody can be sure whom I shall find a reason for killing next. Third, the general acknowledgment of this rule is my security for my own life and the life of my friends. If every one is to follow what seems to him the most convenient course in the individual case, without being directed by a general principle, then I live in a considerable constant danger of murder. For there are all around me men of such a great variety of tempers and interests that I can hardly avoid being obnoxious to some of them in one way or another—especially if I want to change society, for the agitator is all the time stepping on somebody's toes. Therefore it is highly to my interest that my neighbors should respect this rule; and if I want them to do so, I must respect it myself.

All these reasons seem to me good; and every one of them bears solely on the value of the rule as a rule, and on the circumstances of the individual case.

No game of ball, no prize-fight, could be carried through without the presence of men who are certain to make their regard for an abstract principle—to wit, that the rules of the game must be obeyed—master the impulses arising out of sympathy for either side. What can be more contrary to Mr. Andrews' principles than for an empire to give judgment against those whose success he most ardently desires, just because the rules of the game require it?

I said a moment ago that we have rules for the mere sake of having rules. The rule about turning out when you meet a man on the road is a very perfect example both of the nature of such rules and of their necessity. It makes no difference what the rule is—we turn to the right here, to the left in England, and one way is as good as the other—but some rule we must have, simply because we cannot do business (the business of driving in this case) with any convenience unless we know to a certain extent what our neighbors are going to do. All our other rules have the same use; and since the most important thing to every man's happiness is that he be able to do his own business (serious or sportful) under as favorable circumstances as possible, it follows that this use of rules gives them a very high value if only not the score of politeness.

But why argue so for what man's nature inevitably drives him to? Mr. Andrews' resolution to have no rules, is itself a rule which he has adopted for himself. Every reasoning being has such rules,—principles of action which he has once settled on good grounds, and does not thereafter take the trouble to think them out again whenever he has to act. And Anarchism is simply the doctrine that among the rules of life that of not interfering with each other's liberty holds a fundamental position. The word "Anarchism" does not, either by its derivation or by its usage, admit any meaning that does not imply the domination of one person over another. When Mr. Andrews tries to give it such a meaning, this proves that he does not understand the English language. He is excusable for not knowing that there is already a name in English for his idea, but he is not excusable for not knowing that "Anarchism" is the name of something else.

Yet, after all, the surprising thing is not that Mr. Andrews should have revived the old notion of going without rules, nor that he should have called it by a name that belongs to something else,—both are such freaks as human nature must be expected to produce now and then,—but that he should have been able to convert those who believed in the very rule whose name he stole. Oh, Mr. Morris, come back to your principles! You were not ideally perfect when you were proclaiming 'occupancy and use the sole title to

anything," but you were a much more valuable member of society than now when you come telling me that neither my occupancy and use nor any other title shall restrain you from taking a stick away from me whenever you take a fancy. Don't let this Australian student of lunacy hypnotize you. You knew more about Anarchism before he began writing for The Firebrand than he ever knew since he was born, to judge by the first paragraph of his article of Nov. 15, with its extension of all the evils of government except the codification of principles of conduct—that is, of all its real evils.

STEPHEN T. BYINGTON.

A Splendid Book.

The Old and the New Ideal. A Solution of that part of the Social Question which pertains to Love, Marriage and Sexual Intercourse. By Emili F. Ruedebusch. Paper cover 60 cents. Cloth, nicely bound \$1.00.

Order from The Firebrand.

Receipts.

Allen, Schulman, Berg, Kirschbaum, Karl, Hettner, Lene, Weidenmüller, Sach, Soc. E. Hirsch, F. Hopfen, Karpas, Schneider, Banduhn, Ulanoff, each 50c. Subscribed but not needed for Turner's meeting in Buffalo, 75c. (The account was given of one dollar, but owing to the poverty of one contributor 25c not collected.)

Printing-Press Fund.

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

Previously acknowledged \$123 17
I. Ulman, New York, 8 00

FIREBRAND LIBRARY.

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

Agriculture. By Peter Kropotkin.....	5c
Anarchism and Violence. By L. S. Bevington.....	5c
Let us be Just. By W. Tcherkoff / [An open letter to Liebknecht].....	5c
The Wage System. By Peter Kropotkin.....	5c
Expropriation. By Peter Kropotkin.....	5c
A Talk About Anarchist Communism. By Malatesta.....	5c
Anarchy on Trial. Speeches by Paris Anarchists.....	5c
Common Sense Country. By L. S. Bevington.....	5c
A Plea for anarchism from the masses. By L. S. Bevington.....	5c
Bases of Anarchism: Historical, Philosophical and Economical. By William Holmes.....	5c
God and the State. By Michael Bakounin.....	5c
The Commune of Paris. By Peter Kropotkin, and An Anarchist on Anarchy, by Elisee Reclus (one volume).....	5c
The True Aim of Anarchism. By E. Steine.....	5c
Anarchist Communism. By Peter Kropotkin.....	5c
Revolution. By S. H. Gordon.....	5c
Social Democracy in Germany. By G. Landauer.....	5c
Liberty Lyrics. By L. S. Bevington.....	5c
Socialism in Danger. By Domini Nieuwenhuis.....	5c
The Why I am.....	5c
On the Definition of Crime. By H. Hamon.....	5c
Anarchist Morality. By Peter Kropotkin.....	5c
Why Labor is Robbed. By Peter Kropotkin.....	5c
Evolution and Revolution. By Elisee Reclus.....	5c
Anarchism in Socialist Evolution. By Peter Kropotkin.....	5c
Wants and their Gradification. By Henry Adams.....	10c
Secret and Confidential Address. By Gavroche.....	15c
Albert R. Parsons' Book on Anarchism, its Philosophy and Scientific Basis. German and English Editions; handsomely bound in cloth and gilt, 50 cents; paper cover.....	50c
Life of Albert R. Parsons, with a brief History of the Labor Movement in America. Beautifully illustrated and nicely bound; 290 octavo pages.....	75c

The two books last named are slightly damaged, but readable.

Mrs. Waisbrooker's Books.

My Century Plant.....	\$1.00
The Occult Forces of Sex.....	.50
The Fountain of Life.....	.50
A Sex Revolution.....	.25

Those who desire to study the Sex Question will find ample food for thought in the above four books.
Grandmother's Lessons to Men, Young and Old, on the Basic Principles of Marriage Happiness..... \$ 1.00
One has but to read the above and then be told that the positive statement of its contents is sufficient to see how much government stands in the way of human happiness.
Send orders to The Firebrand, Box 477, Portland, Or.

ADVERTISEMENTS.

Anarchist Headquarters in San Francisco, 1232 1/2 Folsom St. Open every evening from 7 till 9 P. M.

The Independent Educational Club meets every Sunday evening, at 7:30 p. m. at 192 G St., Tacoma, Wash.

The Peoples Union, a free discussion club, meets every Sunday evening at 8:30 Westminster St., Providence, R. I.

International Group Free Initiative meets at 64 Washington St., New York City, every Monday at 8:30 p. m.

Radical Literature of all kinds, including English periodicals, can be found at the new stand of comrade R. Bush, Cor. Essex & Division Streets, New York City.

Independent Theatre (Freie Bühne) will be opened in Shoenhofers Hall, Cor. Milwaukee and Ashland Avenues, Chicago, Ill. Details will be given by Otto Wichers von Gogh, 83 Dean St.

Reinicke's Listy is an eight page Anarchist weekly paper published in the Bohemian language at New York City, 266 Ave. B by the International Workingmen Association of America. Send for sample copy

"The Famous Northern White Owls" make a beautiful attraction for the Parlor, office or counting room. Sent on approval to reliable parties. Address for prices and full description. Ed Goss, Tascidermal, Warren, Minn.

The Alarm is an Anarchist weekly paper for the workers and is published at 35 Ludd Street, Euston Road, London, England. The editorial policy is Anarchist-Communist, and each issue contains twelve columns of eye-opening and thought-provoking matter. Two cents weekly, or sent through the post for one dollar a year. With The Firebrand \$1.50.