



VOL. II.

PORTLAND, OREGON, SUNDAY, JUNE 7, 1896.

No. 18.

THE FIREBRAND

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

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

Admitted as second-class matter at Portland, Oregon.

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

ON, BRAVE HEARTS!

[AIR: "THE PRODIGAL'S RETURN."]'

On, brave hearts! tho the night and way be weary,
Still press on, for the day of Freedom comes!
Like the lightnings of might from the storm-clouds it
will burst;

Like the floods it will sweep o'er the tyrannies accurs.
Lo, the day of wrath, when the people rise,
Dawns in hues of blood on the fierce black skies
And thunder-like peal the battle cries
Of Revolution's hosts!

On, brave hearts! tho the night and way be weary,
Still press on, for the day of Freedom comes!

Wrong by famine, and pain, and deadly peril,
Still keep heart, for the light and rest are nigh.
From the foul sin of Rule let your inmost soul be clear,
And the weak Mammon-taint, lest it clog your arms
with fear.

If ye hate the evil with all your might,
And live the life that is truth and right,
The guerdon soon shall rejoice your sight—
A smiling land and free!

On, brave hearts! through the famine, pain and peril;
Courage yet, for the light and rest are nigh.

Deeds will grow to the fullness of fruition;
On in strength, that the harvest ye may reap!
'Tis the small seed of lives, with a steadfast purpose spent
Shall make fruitful the world with measureless content;
And the angry fray, when the hosts are riven
Like the ocean spray by the tempest driven,
Is less to make of the earth a heaven
Than lives from Commerce pure.

War without would be barren of fruition;
So endure, that the harvest ye may reap.

Darkness turns to the redness of Revolution!
On in hope! for the day of Freedom comes!
And at length in their strength shall the rebel people
spring,

Drugged no more by the lure of the stealthy evil thing;
Each purified, with the strength of ten,
And the outer foe shall be feeble then,
And men shall win them the name of Men
In glorious victory!

Dawns at last the Triumphant Revolution!
On, brave hearts! for the day of Freedom comes!
J. A. ANDREWS.

NON-PRODUCTIVE PURSUITS UNDER COMMUNISM.

My comrade Steinle has taken a hand in the discussion between Mr. Byington and myself and carries it into the columns of "Der Vorbote." Not being a German scholar it will be difficult for me to engage in a discussion if one side of it is carried on in that language. However, with the help of a German comrade I have gained a knowledge of some of his points and will notice them briefly. Between Mr. Byington and myself the question was as to the relative merits of Individualism and Communism. Comrade Steinle is a Communist, and the difference of opinion between us does not appear to be serious. After quoting what I said in my last reply to By-

ington about non-producers being parasites, their uselessness, the necessity of getting rid of them, etc., he, too, cites Kropotkin and other educated and scientific men and wants to know if I propose their extermination. He says:

A physician, for instance, may expend days and weeks upon the study of microbes; a teacher not do anything else but instruct his pupils in the necessary sciences, or in conducting their physical exercises and games, he may improve their health and add to their physical beauty. This is not productive labor. But will comrade Morris nevertheless devise methods by which physicians and teachers may be exterminated as soon as possible? He can't be in earnest.

I have not proposed the extermination of any man, whether he be a millionaire exploiter or simply a parasitical loafer. It is the parasite I am after, not the individual. The extermination of the one does not necessitate the destruction of the other.

Of course, as my comrade recognizes, physical exercise is necessary to health. I may be wrong, but I believe that a potato patch is as good a place to exercise as a gymnasium, and perhaps a buck-saw would be as good to develop the muscles as Indian-clubs. And since a very few hours of severe mental work is all that ought to be forced upon the brain, and since two or three hours of productive labor per day from every able-bodied person would supply humanity plentifully in that line, I see nothing to prevent physical and mental exercise being combined so as to uniformly develop the human organism and provide for all its requirements. But comrade Steinle anticipates this reply and says that the scientific man cannot leave his desk and help dig a ditch or engage in blacksmithing—that the physical strain would be too severe. I suppose he refers to the physical wrecks of today who call themselves men. No sensible person will undertake to say that a healthy man, who takes proper daily exercise, is incapable of performing a few hours of common work, especially when he has no task-master and may work as he pleases. The healthy organism demands violent exercise. If a man is physically weak he will naturally choose lighter work.

Now I am not saying that these men would be compelled to labor, or that there would be any serious objection if they chose not to work; but the scientific man certainly would have brains enough to perceive that if the rest of society were compelled to support him because he did not choose to support himself, he would be forcing upon them an extra amount of labor, thus to that extent infringing their liberty to devote their time to mental improvement. I believe that any man who had any conception of equality would be ashamed to waste his time in a gymnasium when others were over-exercising to provide his support.

Again let me disclaim any desire or intention of laying down hard-and-fast rules of conduct. I believe in voluntarism to the fullest extent. Unless productive labor shall be considered degrading by the future society as it is by the present, I can conceive of no reason why a professor of science should not choose to engage in it when he felt the need of exercise. I have never said that such men were

useless, but I do claim that the generality of "teachers" today are useless, and not only useless, but actually pernicious and harmful. I recognize the service to society of scientific research, but in a free society that research would not, as now, be confined to a few minds, but it would become so general that no one man would secure any great eminence above all others. Besides, the scientific man would be such from choice, and I fail to see why his pursuit of happiness should lay upon society the obligation of supporting him. Society might choose to do so, but if, as comrade Steinle says, freedom ends when a man "must" do a certain amount of labor, also freedom ends when, as he says again, society "must feed the lazy members who don't want to do any work."

He names many of what he calls unproductive but necessary occupations, some of which are strictly productive (as, for instance, food preparations), and others (for instance theatrical performances) come within recreation and amusement. Here he manifestly lacks clearness. Washing and house-cleaning, which he also names, cannot be distinctive callings then as they may be now, as in a free society it would hardly be the province of one part of the community to keep the rest clean.

My ideal is a social state wherein all shall be fellow workers and fellow students; and wherein the boss, the leader and the teacher, as such, shall have no place. Of course no coercive system can ever bring this about. J. H. M.

WHERE IS HE AT?

E. H. FULTON, in "A Personal Statement", in another column, says, in effect, that we are making Communism too narrow for him, and declares himself an Individualist. He uses the words "contemporary writers", but as he mentions only FIREBRAND writers, I take it he means them alone. I think I will be upheld in saying that we have no intention of making Communism, either broad or narrow, for anybody. But, with apologies to Mr. Fulton, I must say that he does not mean what he says—when he says narrow he means broad. Not only does he fail to point out any "narrowing" particulars, but he shows that his conception of Communism is so narrow as to be State Socialism instead—at least it is far from Communism. For instance, he says that while accepting Communism he recognized in it many things in his opinion hardly compatible with liberty. Now the only thing not compatible with liberty is authority, or invasion. If his conception of Communism included authority I must insist that he was yet a State Socialist and not a Communist at all. And, further, while holding to a social theory that was authoritative or coercive, how could he call himself an Anarchist, if he really knew the meaning of the word? It seems to me that a man who "swallows in a lump" features of a social theory which he does not like (that is features which do not harmonize with liberty) for the sake of those features which he does like is, to put it gently, a very poor advocate of liberty.

Here again is a sample of his logic; "Communism is possible under Individualism; but under Communism Individualism would be out of place." That is to say, Communism is compatible with Individualism, but Individualism is not compatible with Communism. To put it mathematically, twice three are six, but three two are—not six! The only basis for such a course of "reasoning" is his assumption that Communism is authoritative; that is, that choice would be forbidden the individual. Further evidence of the State Socialist.

Yes, I fancy it would be rather "awkward to say Society is Communist, notwithstanding many are Commercialists", etc., because it would not be true. Society cannot be Communist while a part of it is un-Communist. Holders of private property are not Anarchists—they are invaders. Private property is a denial of freedom of opportunity; it is monopoly. Every individual is equally entitled to any and all natural advantages, and under liberty only on condition that he has access to the products of labor applied to the more favorable advantages will any individual accept the less favorable. If the principle of liberty has a basis in nature it lies in this proposition. But this assertion of liberty includes Communism as the only condition of realization.

The only surprise that Dr. Rossi's conclusions after his Caccia experience occasions me is to find him such a superficial thinker. Conditions denied his colony freedom of association, which is an essential matter. The colonists were compelled to associate regardless of compatibility, and the natural result was, and will always be under such conditions, discord and disruption.

Mr. Fulton further shows his misconception of Communism when he assumes that it proposes the equal distribution of wealth—State Socialistic regulation again. Perhaps he never read the Communist formula: "From each according to ability; to each according to need." And it depends upon his idea of an "equitable distribution" whether it would be better realized under Individualism than under Communism. If by equity he mean liberty, I think I have shown that the Individualist private property proposition is incompatible with equity.

J. H. M.

PROPAGANDA IN THE EAST.

NEW YORK AND VICINITY.

PROPAGANDA in New York started with an address on Anarchist-Communism before the Manhattan Single Tax Club, which gave rise to a very animated discussion. The room was filled and the members, while holding to their one idea, had to admit that progress would not stop at its realization. The idea of Anarchy had been discussed among themselves and some had come to the conclusion that it was sound. Altogether they were a very intelligent, earnest lot of men, and there is a good field among them for the spread of our ideas. It is hoped the American Group of New York will not neglect them, as they gladly welcome any one among them.

This was Saturday, April 18th. On the Sunday the Socialist Labor Party was visited, and Comrade Turner took part in the discussion after a lecture on "The Class Struggle", showing clearly that this struggle is only confused by political issues and political action. A very lively time followed.

On Tuesday, April 21st, the first lecture under the auspices of the American Group took place in Clarendon Hall. It was a good audience, mostly Americans, and the subject was "Anarchy an Essential of Socialism", a good discussion and Social Democratic opposition following.

On Wednesday, April 22d, a flying visit was paid to Philadelphia to give a lecture on "The Anarchist Ideal" before the Ladies' Liberal League. This was a success in every way—a good audience, a good discussion, with a little weak opposition from members of the Socialist Labor Party. Though desirous of returning to New York, Comrade Turner was pressed to remain over the 23d to attend a meeting of the Single Taxers, which he did, taking part in the discussion and showing the insufficiency of their teaching.

Returning to New York on the 24th, the second lecture in Clarendon Hall was "The Policy of the Future", reviewing the different methods of the past, pointing out their various strengths and weaknesses, and advis-

ing an active, energetic propaganda both inside and outside of organized labor, so as to create a feeling of solidarity among all the workers, even the tramps and so-called criminals, whom the respectable workers in steady employment have been taught to despise, confident that if they once caught the idea of Anarchism the methods of overthrowing existing institutions would suggest themselves. The abstention from the polls on election days and the holding of public meetings declaring the solidarity of labor, and the class struggle was put forward as an idea to start with.

April 26th, in the same hall, the subject was "The Power of Capitalism", and industry, politics, government, literature, the press, religion and education were passed under review to show how in every department of modern life the poison of this power is felt.

On the 27th a visit was paid to Newark and a lecture on "Church and State, Twin Enemies of the People" was given before a very interested audience, Comrade Lathrop Withington in the chair.

On Wednesday, April 29th, Comrade Mowbray made a trip from Boston and accompanied Comrade Turner to Paterson, where a mass meeting was held at which both spoke, returning to New York next day.

Thursday, April 30th, in Clarendon Hall a farewell meeting and entertainment was given previous to Comrade Turner's leaving next day for Boston. The hall was crowded and, it is pleasing to say, was the largest of the meetings held. Songs, recitations and singing by the German choir, together with speeches by Comrades Edgmann, Lathrop Withington, Mowbray, Turner and Emma Goldman kept every one interested and pleased until eleven o'clock, when the floor was cleared for dancing, which was kept up till the early hours. Thus ended a little over a month's propaganda in and around New York by Comrade Turner, and it shows what could be accomplished if only a few propagandists were in the field. Everything is ready for it, and though the first ones might find it hard work and sometimes discouraging, it would not be long before a strong and vigorous movement would be the outcome.

BOSTON AND PROVIDENCE.

Saturday morning, May 2d, Comrade Turner arrived in Boston and was met at the depot by Comrade Kelly, who accompanied him to the house of J. O'Sullivan, president of the Boston Central Labor Union, who entertained him to breakfast. On the Sunday he was the guest of the Central Labor Union and spoke at the regular session in the afternoon, time being granted for the purpose. Speaking as an Anarchist, he pointed out the strength and weakness of Trade Unionism and showed that unless it was built up with intelligent members who had an ideal of some kind superior to capitalism it would continually crumble up in the conflicts forced upon them in time of trade depression. The rapid growth of Socialist and Anarchist ideas in the ranks of the English Trade Unions was pointed out and a belief expressed that with the same conditions here similar results would follow. He was wonderfully well received.

On Monday, May 4th, a public meeting of welcome was called by the Central Labor Union, at which Comrade Turner delivered a rousing address calling upon Trade Unionists to study deeper the political and economic situation and rise superior to past efforts. A collection was taken for Anarchist propaganda.

Sunday evening, May 3d, a May Day meeting was held in Puritan Hall, at which comrades Miller, Kelly, Mowbray and Turner spoke in English and Most in German. There were also speeches in French and Italian. The meeting was a big success, the hall being packed. All the speakers dwelt on the solidarity of labor and spoke of the aspirations of the workers all over the civilized world. It was one of the best and biggest Anarchist meetings ever held in Boston.

On Tuesday Comrade Turner spoke at a meeting of striking hoisting-engineers, and while encouraging them in their battle, urged them never to be satisfied until they had abolished masters, and in conjunction with their fellow workers established a free co-operative condition of industry.

On Wednesday, May 6th, he also spoke at a meeting of electrical workers who are organizing a union; and there, too, while advising them to combine for protection in their work, and to assist one another in this craft, he urged them to never rest satisfied with mere organization, but to see to it that they should learn how it is that work is always so precarious and men always out of work, ready to snatch at another's job; how it is that the more there is produced in society the more tramps there are, and when they had learned that to

see to it that their organization should become a force to destroy the cause of their misery and at the same time to rebuild a newer and better condition.

Friday, May 10th, a visit was paid to Providence and a lecture on "Anarchism or Social Democracy?" was given, which evoked some opposition from local Socialists, one of whom, however, entertained Comrade Turner that night.

On Sunday afternoon, May 12th, a meeting was arranged by Providence comrades in Onleyville, but when the hall was reached the sweltering heat prevented many from coming inside, so it was decided to try an open air meeting in the shade. This was a big success and Comrade Turner was listened to with great attention, only interspersed occasionally with applause. A solitary policeman came along when the meeting was half through and seemed unable to grasp what was up. After listening some time with evident interest he moved off perhaps to report before taking any action.

At the close of the meeting Comrade Turner took the train back to Boston and lectured in the evening on "Anarchism and Socialism", many of the Central Labor Union officials being present and carefully following the points of the lecture. Questions and discussion followed.

On Thursday, the 14th, a joint debate took place in Clarendon Hall, where the Central Labor Union meets, between Turner and Mr. Spillane, a Socialist, on "Trade Unions or the Ballot?" before a large audience. Despite the fact that Spillane was the strongest opponent the Socialists could put up, they had to admit that he failed to show the use of the ballot to the workpeople.

Altogether the visit to Boston has been a big success, both financially and for the propaganda. If comrades elsewhere would arrange things the same way a most encouraging tour could be carried through. It rests now with them to say how far he shall go on. There has been some delay in New York, necessitated by the fact that things had to be organized a bit before our comrade could leave there. Here he went immediately into the heart of the organized labor movement on account of the influence local comrades have with their unions and the Central Labor Union, and himself being president of his union in England did the rest. Since he has been in Boston he has received a letter from President Gompers, of the American Federation of Labor, who had heard of his arrival here, and who wishes him success, and says he hopes to meet him as he goes west and will send him a letter of introduction to Trade Unionists wherever he may go. If, therefore, comrades who are in the organized labor movement set to work in their unions they can arrange through them for some big meetings.

On Friday, May 15th, an entertainment and social was arranged by the Rebel Group to bid goodbye to Comrade Turner. Mr. J. O'Sullivan and many prominent labor men of Boston were present. They have treated our comrade right heartily, vying with one another in their efforts to make his visit both enjoyable and profitable. A very pleasant evening was spent in song, talk, recitation, and hearty good wishes toward our comrade's further efforts.

He leaves here for New York again to solidify his previous work, then a week in Philadelphia, where six meetings have been arranged as a result of his previous visit to the Ladies' Liberal League. After that, to Buffalo, and then, Westward, ho! It is hoped the comrade everywhere will do their utmost to make the most of his visit. Correspondence should be sent to H. M. Kelly, 170 Hanover St. Boston, who will arrange dates.

A PERSONAL STATEMENT.

Before I became an Anarchist I was a State Socialist. While Communism had its attractions for me, as it naturally would one who had previously held collectivist views, there were nevertheless some things in Communism of which I had grave doubts of being reconcilable with Anarchy or liberty. As I confounded Individualism with the so-called individualism of today, as taught in the University of Chicago, I could not consider it seriously for an instant; hence I took greedily to the many features of Communism which I did like and swallowed the various points I did not like in a lump. The statement of Comrade Owen in The Firebrand some time ago that he found himself gradually slipping away from Communism, kept me from declaring myself in very positive tones as being a Communist. Comrade Holmes in writing to me made it pretty plain that Communism, rightly understood, was not incompatible with Individualism, nor altruism with selfishness. In his book, "Bases of Anarchy," he even shows that groups, as groups, might be in relation to one another as individual to individual. J. H. M., in a recent number of The Firebrand, holds that communes would be composed of agreeable natures to the exclusion of the seriously objectionable. Once the independence of a group were recognized that embrac-

es less than the whole society, there can logically be no limit to its size — groups may become merely a proper family or a single person; save in the latter instance the word group would be improper, as it indicates more than one. This idea expressed by J. H. M. is in harmony with that of Comrade Holmes. But I am of the opinion that Individualism is the proper word, as the communes are based on the mutual agreement of individuals. Communism is possible under Individualism, but under Communism Individualism would be out of place. It would be, I think, rather awkward to say: "Society is Communist, notwithstanding many are commercialists and holders of the wealth of their creation or fair accumulation." More proper to say: "Individualism is the keynote of our society; there are many individuals, however, who live in communes and hold all property in common." The same may be said of Altruism. If Altruism is desirable it is synonymous with real selfishness — of selfishness wisely pursued. I have concluded that "regard for others" carried to excess is a foolish idea, and that selfishness is the proper word. When abused, selfishness is greed and generally reflects against self. When the idea of Altruism is abused — that is, when it ceases to be inspired by selfish notions — it is ridiculously silly, a denial of life itself.

Dr. Giovanni Rossi, as quoted in No. 9 of The Firebrand, says that since the experiment at Caeceffa he is no less an Anarchist, but not quite the same Communist.

I see in "Liberty" occasionally a note by some one referring to erstwhile communistic views; seeing what seemed to me to be the drift of opinion, I secured several dollars' worth of the literature of Philosophical Anarchism, and find that while it does not offer flat equality in property it would bring us so near to it that the evils of excessive riches and dire want would be removed the same as in Communism pure and simple. In fact, the true laissez faire will answer every point (not at once, but a few years after its introduction) that led me to favor Communism. It is evidently the logical step to take next, and as it will permit of Communism by those who desire so to live, as long as they like it, and as it is so much easier to convert the people to it than to Communism, I shall advocate it.

An equitable distribution of wealth seems to me better than an equal distribution, and in Individualism can this distribution be best subserved.

The broad fraternity and all-embracing humanity I once thought Anarchist-Communism to mean, has been so narrowed down by contemporary communistic writers and seems to grow narrower and narrower in each succeeding exposition. I cannot follow it in this slow course, but at once jump to the finale, and declare for Individualism.

E. H. FULTON.

AGGRESSION AND RESISTANCE.

THE use of indefinite terms is often the cause of misunderstanding. It is for that reason, therefore, that I have first made plain what I mean by the word punishment and then proceeded to make my deduction accordingly. But, as the matter stands now, I have been misunderstood and comrade Addis still holds, in a very general way, that "punishment of man by man necessitates aggression". We shall look into this assertion more closely as we go along and see whether it is true or not.

Whatever else Anarchy may mean it certainly does not mean a revival of non-resistance. Although we claim that the causes of aggression will not exist under Anarchy, we do not say that if aggression should exist we will not try to check it. May be some Anarchists would rather be killed than kill others even though these others have attacked them; but from this it does not follow that all Anarchists will meekly submit to aggression. The very life blood of an Anarchist is resistance to aggression and that is just why most of us are revolutionists. We do not want to be exploited by a set of monopolists, and in consequence of this we declare war upon monopoly. We do not want to be ruled by majority or minority and in consequence of this we declare war upon government, whether that government is Monarchical, Democratic, or State-Socialistic. We want to be free and we justify the application of force if necessary, for the purpose of attaining

that freedom.

(2) It is absurd to suppose that the question, what will you do with invaders under Anarchy? can be answered by saying, we hope or we believe there will be no invaders under Anarchy. This is not a question whether there will be invaders or not. The question is what will you do with invaders under Anarchy? And to answer anything short of what you propose to do with invaders is to beg the very question at issue. Of course we desire nothing more than that all men should act in accordance with the principles of equal freedom, but what will you do with those who do not want to "mind their own business," and come to attend yours? What will you do with a man that attacks you with a shot gun? If you are non-resistant and consent to be shot, are you an Anarchist? If you are resistant and refuse to be killed, are you then an Anarchist? The entire question lies there and comrade Morris fails to answer it.

(3) Without entering for a moment into the discussion of the inferiority of an invader's desire, I wish to declare the impossibility of simultaneously gratifying the invader's desire to invade and my desire to be let alone. Since both desires cannot be simultaneously gratified and one must be subordinated, I certainly prefer the subordination of the invader. If comrades Morris, Addis and Isaak think that the subordination of the invader's desire is equivalent to the subordination of the desire of one who wishes to be let alone, because it is subordination of the desire of an individual, then they must maintain that the use of force to secure liberty is equal to the use of force to destroy that liberty. If ostracism of a man who commits murder because he delights in doing so is aggression inasmuch as this hero is being punished for his crime, then you might as well denounce Perovskaya and her comrades who killed the Russian Tsar, as aggressors. You might as well speak of Berkman as of a would-be assassin, because he inflicted punishment upon Frick. Berkman did not act in self-defence; he punished, or rather inflicted punishment upon that beast, Frick. Frick was the aggressor and though Berkman did not act in self-defence technically, Berkman's blow was justifiable because it was punishment to the man who invaded the law of equal freedom. If "self-defence is always justifiable," then Alexander the II was justified in hanging Solovioff, Netchayeff and the rest. But the hanging of these noble youths cannot be justified, because self-defence is but a narrow path of invasion of the law of equal freedom, and whereas the Russian tyrant may be able to advance a plausible justification for the murder of the best of the Russian studying youth on the ground of self-defence, he cannot advance any justification for his atrocious crimes once he grants "the right of each man to do what he wills, provided he infringes not the equal freedom of others." Hence I say that use of force, ostracism, or whatever means wisdom might dictate to resist invasion is in perfect accord with "Anarchist Morality." Resistance to invasion, whether directly in self-defence or not, is always justifiable.

(4) Now a word or two as to punishment or self-defence. While the law of mental association remains true — while we dislike the things that give us pain and delight in those that give us pleasure — and while it is true that the thing which answers its purpose is considered good and the thing which departs from its purpose bad, any violation of what is essential to bodily welfare and is followed by pain, is a true illustration of crime and punishment. Furthermore this reaction entailed by a person's action is a check which preserves our health, or our life would quickly be destroyed by bodily injuries. And whether the running of a pin into a man's finger "is the result of pressure bearing against it" or not, that is to say, whether I stated the cause of running a pin into a finger or not, it will be a violation of what is essential to bodily welfare. And whether there is an intention in nature to inflict pain for the transgression of that law, or not, inasmuch as pain follows in all cases where man transgresses the organic laws, it is perfectly legitimate to say that a man who does not violate the organic laws will not meet with painful results. The same will probably be under Anarchy: any man who invades another by violating the law of equal freedom will be checked by painful results which I call punishment, and whether this punishment is inflicted by the person hurt or he gets some of his friends to assist him in resisting aggression, there is no reason why he should for that reason turn out to be an aggressor. In a word, punishment is resistance to aggression, and such resistance cannot be called aggression any more than we can call the fact that a man when coming

late to theatre must put up with a bad seat aggression, though it is punishment. H. A. KOCH.

(1-2) The claim has never been made in these columns that Anarchy means non-resistance. On the contrary, we are revolutionists and recommend active, violent resistance to invasion. But the claim is that resistance and punishment are as different as resistance and invasion — in fact, that the difference is identical. Now punishment may be inflicted whether or not the person punished has been an invader. For instance, the State makes a law forbidding an act that is not invasive (and there are many such laws); the penalty attached is punishment. By aggression or invasion of course nothing can be understood but interference with individual liberty. If a man undertook to "lick" me, I should certainly resist; but if my blows should be persuasive enough to induce him to give up the undertaking (subordinate his desire), and he should cry "enough", or try to get away, and I kept hammering him, I would be actuated by a desire to punish, the spirit of revenge. That is, I would cease to be resistant, since there is no more anything to resist, and become aggressive. Resistance is the assertion of liberty; punishment is the gratification of the barbarous desire for revenge.

But I must repeat my former question: How can phenomena exist without cause? The claim that the causes of aggression will be non-existent under Anarchy is Mr. Koch's, and his pressing upon me the question as to what I would do if it should appear, is the height of absurdity. Has he so little confidence in his own logic, in his own social theory, that he must provide so far in advance for its going amiss? My question, on the other hand, is a perfectly proper one, and one that would suggest itself to any logical mind. If the cause of invasion is to be non-existent, why waste time and space in discussing the impossible?

(3) If I do not choose to associate with a murderer or other invader, it is from the same cause that would operate in the case of any other individual who might be unattractive or repulsive to me. If a man is "wall-eyed", has an impediment in his speech, a rasping voice, or any peculiarity that is irritating to me, and I do not choose to associate with him, is that punishment, and for what? This natural selection is all there is in "social ostracism".

"Justification" depends altogether on the point of view. Whether the murderers of the Tsar and the would-be murderer of Frick were justified is purely a matter of opinion. In my position I would not feel justified in such an act; in theirs I might. If Frick was the aggressor I must insist that Berkman was resistant — that he did act in self-defence.

We are not lawyers that we should discuss technicalities. If he did not act in self-defence, then he was an aggressor. The hanging of the Nihilists named was not in self-defence, but punishment as accomplices in the killing of an invader in self-defence. Since his whole effort is to justify punishment, it is himself that must answer his question as to the justification of that hanging. The "advocate of liberty" who does not know that self-defence is the broad and only road thereto, but deliberately states the reverse as a truth, is in a pitiable mental condition. The Russian Nihilists certainly act in resistance to invasion, in self-defence; the Tsar, who hangs, imprisons or deports them, does not so in self-defence, but in defence of, or in order to uphold, his invasive acts. If self-defence were the only object of two combatants peace would be the only solution of the question. But fights don't come about that way. It is always a question of liberty, and no writer who is remarkable for mental acumen will assume that the invader acts in self-defence.

(4) Yes, we were told "in a word" before that resistance was punishment, and it might be repeated over and over and still we would have only words. Resistance is a word with a definite meaning, and if Mr. Koch will use it when he speaks of the assertion of liberty he will not be misunderstood. No one has or will assert that either resistance or the pain resulting from a pin-thrust is aggression. Such an assertion would be just the equivalent of the assertion that resistance is punishment. The theatrical "analogy" is too silly for further attention.

J. H. M.

REPLY TO MY CRITIC.

COMRADE Byington is so surprisingly weak in his criticism of my series of articles, "Christianity and the Church" that I could well afford to "smile and pass him by." Indeed, the only reason I do not do so is that my silence might be misunderstood and his nonsense be misleading. I will give the prayer "Kaddish" as it has been found in the Talmud and translated by Rev. John Gregorie:

"Our Father which art in heaven, be gracious to us, O Lord, our God: hallowed be thy name, and let the remembrance of thee be glorified in heaven above and in the earth here below. Let thy kingdom reign over us now and forever. The holy men of old said, Remit and forgive unto all men whatsoever they have done against us. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from the evil thing. For thine is the kingdom, and thou shalt reign in glory for ever and for evermore."

Again my critic is, apparently, ignorant that the early Christian church claims that Ezra (Esdras) reproduced the "burnt" book—the "lost" Old Testament. Clement of Alexandria, Irenaeus (according to Eusebius), Tertullian, Jerome and several others of the Christian Fathers testify to Ezra having reproduced the lost Bible. W. Stewart Ross writes: "Ezra not only wrote the book in Hebrew—a language which, during the Babylonian captivity, had become obsolete—but, apparently because then the Jews did not know even the very letters of Hebrew, he wrote his obsolete Hebrew in Chaldean characters! Fancy what Macaulay's 'History of England' would look like, not translated into German, but printed in German characters, and you will have some sort of vague notion of the appearance of the book which was turned out by Ezra and his five scribes. . . . To complete the analogy we must further submit that Macaulay's History had been burnt, and had been reproduced from memory." W. Stewart Ross gives a number of names as authorities, amongst which are Grotius, Bishop Walton, Louis Cappel and Dr. Prideaux.

It is true that I do not practice phonetic writing, but I think I do know pretty well what it is, and feel sure brother Byington's "stenographer" would be unable to write from shorthand notes centuries after they were taken down or have any idea what the notes were a report of; indeed, Comrade Byington's expert would sadly need "inspiration" to understand and rewrite what had been written ages before in an obsolete or dead language!

My critic cannot hit the mark—he misses wheresoever he aims to strike. He makes mention of "an eclipse local in the neighborhood of Jerusalem so far as appears." A total "local eclipse" (!) certainly was possessed of peculiar powers all its own—it was a "daisy."

Brother Byington is willing to leave my "abstract discussions" to the mental acumen of FIREBRAND readers; so am I. He made such a sad mess of my "historical facts" that I think he decided wisely.

I will inform my critic that according to Max Muller's translation the Golden Rule is to be found in the Rig-Veda: Does my comrade think it an interpolation of his pious fraud and learned Jesuit Missionary?

Indeed, so far from the "Prayer" being all the Lord has stolen from the Talmud, comrade Byington has only to consult honest scholars (not the historical science of Sunday Schools) to learn that the four gospels (Byington's "coherent account") fairly bristle with beatitudes and ethical maxims stolen from the Talmud. As the Golden Rule is in the Talmud, the mystical "Messiah" probably found it there. Also, Buddha gave the Golden Rule certainly 543 B. C.

My comrade staggers weakly all through his criticism. His description of his "modern Hindoo" is much too general—all embracing; and if he be right, indeed the woods are full of him. The pulpits, college and editorial chairs and all the professions are held or occupied by his ubiquitous if not omnipresent modern Hindoo. But I doubt that he writes "texts and commentaries on the Vedas."

In hitting another fellow over my shoulder, my comrade makes the astonishing assertion (by implication, at least) that historical science is to be found in the Sunday School. Bad as this is, it is not the worst: "It is luck that Josephus mentions Jesus and his reputation at all." Pretty bad, as Josephus don't mention Jesus' reputation and, in all probability, never mentioned him at all—but let the "tampered with" allusion pass. The word "luck" as to the man-god, the second person of the trinity, used by an orthodox Christian is enough to make one stare in wonderment. Does Brother Byington consider it "hard luck" that

Jesus was hanged?—or is it that Jesus would not be so fully believed in had not forgeries, silly interpolation, been slipped into Josephus' work to move about among the pages like veritable will-o'-the-wisps?

I will pass by, in sorrow, Brother Byington's ignorance as to the God-in-the-constitution multitude.

CLINTON LOVERIDGE.

The Letter-Box.

J. Koplon, Akron, O.—Send your order to E. H. Fulton, Columbus Junction, Ia.

I. R., New York.—Your supply of No. 14 was broken open in transmission and came back. It has been resent.

J. H. C., Providence.—Your order has not been received. Possibly it went to London instead. Better make inquiry.

C. L., Los Angeles.—Thanks for the names. We are glad you think The Firebrand improving; but you will notice in this number that at least one individual holds the opposite opinion.

W. A. McG., New York.—Back numbers have been sent. The postoffice department had already notified us of your change of address—you see that is a feather in the State Socialists' cap!

A. M., Bridgeport, Wash.—In this issue you will find a list of the pamphlets we carry. Select what you want and send in your order. That will probably be more satisfactory than leaving the selection to us.

J. B., Providence, R. I.; O. L., New York, and others.—Thanks for your reports of Turner's meetings; but we have in this issue a general report of his work, and it will be unnecessary give space to yours. Nevertheless, in the future do not hesitate to report any event that may be of interest. Better a dozen reports of one event than none at all.

O. L., New York.—(1) "Marriage", by O. W. von Gogh, was an article in "Die Fackel", Chicago. The author's address is 330 North Avenue, Chicago. (2) Viroqua Daniels is a Californian (Lake City, Modoc Co.) and no relation to Myriam Daniell. The latter, we understand, is dead. Viroqua is an earnest woman, a vigorous thinker, a clear writer and the especial pride of the movement in the west. We are sorry to say that sickness has stopped her work for the present. Literature intended for her use should be sent to her direct and not to us, and save postage.

NOTE AND COMMENT.

Comrades are requested to observe instructions on first page as to communications and money orders. Comrade Addis is away from the office most of the time, and when letters and money orders are sent in his name it causes us much trouble and inconvenience.

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

FROM a report in the San Francisco Call, it appears that comrade Gori, who has been propagandizing among the French and Italian speaking people in that city for some weeks, has had good audiences and success generally. He was in St. Louis at last reports.

THE FIREBRAND will soon have in operation a new mailing outfit. The list has run up until the mailing has become a serious job—requiring about two days' work. Comrades Addis and Doering have made the cause the very acceptable present of a mailing machine, costing about \$20, which will reduce the work of mailing to a few hours time.

RECEIPTS.

McGee, \$1.00. Hallbeck, Krieger, Durtees, Wilken, Nebe, Prokes, Warren, each 50c. Rozer, Bumstead, Frenzel, Parkins, Anderson, each 25c. Slotkin, 10c.

Printing-Press Fund.

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

J. H. Morris \$5.00
Henry Addis 5.00
Chas. Doering 5.00

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

Agents for THE FIREBRAND.

Charles L. Bodendieck, 1140 Milwaukee Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. C. Schmidt, 412 South 13th St., Omaha, Neb.
I. Rudash, 102 Norfolk street, New York City.
G. Lang, 29 Grape Street, Buffalo, N. Y.
L. Rabotnik, 731 Plover St., Philadelphia, Pa.

OMAHA, Nebraska.

SOCIETY FREEDOM meets every Sunday 3 P. M. at the Labor Temple, 6th floor, SW corner 15th and Forum Sts.

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

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

FIREBRAND LIBRARY.

Bases of Anarchism; Historical, Philosophical and Economical, by Wm. Holmes	5c
God and the State, by Bakounin	5c
The Commune of Paris, by Kropotkin and An	
Anarchist on Anarchy, by Reclus, both in one	5c
The true aim of Anarchism, by E. Steinle	5c
Revolutionary Government, by P. Kropotkin	5c
Anarchist-Communism, " "	5c
The Wage System, " "	5c
Expropriation, " "	5c
A Talk about Anarchist-Communism, Malatesta	5c
Anarchy, " "	5c
Revolutionary Studies	5c
Anarchy on Trial	5c
Economics of Anarchy; a study of the industrial	
type, by Dyer D. Lum	
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 Michael Bakounine. No. 1 contains 16 pages of solid reading matter and is one of the best pamphlets for missionary work extant. No. 2 contains 44 pages and is the cheapest edition of "God and the State" ever issued. No. 3 contains two important essays: "The Commune of Paris," by Peter Kropotkin, and "An Anarchist on Anarchy," by Elisee Reclus. No. 4 contains The true Aim of Anarchism, by E. Steinle. These numbers contain 16 pages, and are excellent to lend the prejudiced. They are uniform in style, neatly bound, artistic title page, and sold at the remarkably low figure of 5 cents per copy, or 2½ cents each in lots of ten or more; 100 copies or more at 2 cents each. No better means of propaganda is to be found. Orders received at this office.

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