



VOL. II.

PORTLAND, OREGON, SUNDAY, JUNE 23, 1896.

No. 21.

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.

The Triumph of Anarchy.

[AIR: PARADE MARCH.]

Into the world a light hath shone—hath shone!
Forth we go, the Anarchist band,
Waking Freedom over the land!
Law and Rule shall fall at our hand,
And Triumph shall Liberty!

On, on, on!—we are marching on to death!
On, on, on!—we are marching on to death!
On, on, on!—we are marching on to death!
To death—our own or death of Tyranny!
Light our hearts, the battle is near;
The Tyrants rage and tremble with fear;
The people rise the banner to rear
Of Freedom and Anarchy!

Go! form your ranks, the time is come—is come!
Earth too long hath slavery known,
Why yet longer suffer and groan?
For our anguish blood shall atone
Till in our own strength we are free!
On, on, on!—let us shout the battle song!
On, on, on!—to the victory over Wrong!
On, on, on!—for the day shall not be long
Ere Right in Might shall vanquish Slavery!
Hope shines bright in battle's fierce gleam;
Fight on! fight on, till Freedom's supreme—
Till War's red rain sends Plenty's full stream
To gladden Humanity!

Forward the rebel army gathering goes!
On in strength, no more to endure
Sins of wealth and woes of the poor!
Brothers' rights in Man's full store
Shall overthrow Property!
On, on, on!—till we make the Tyrants flee!
On, on, on!—for the People shall be free!
On, on, on!—till we gain the victory!
All hail the day of conquering Anarchy!
Bright the world before us shall glow,
And gladness, peace and weal overflow,
As o'er the earth we kindle the glow
Of glorious Liberty!

Onward! In life or death we win—we win!
Forward, then, our Anarchist band!
Revolt is surging through the land,
And soon in Freedom's pride we shall stand
Triumphant o'er Slavery!
On, on, on!—we are marching on to Life!
On, on, on!—till we win the glorious strife!
On, on, on!—we are marching on to Life!
In death or life we win for Liberty!
Light our hearts—no foe can appall!
In Freedom's might we'll vanquish them all,
Or dying, sing, as raptured we fall,
The triumph of Anarchy!

J. A. ANDREWS.

Liberty and Opportunity.

THE "Individualist school" of Anarchists make a distinction between liberty and equality of opportunity. Mr. Tandy, in his "Free Competition" (Liberty Library No. 6), in fact, claiming that equality of opportunity is unattainable. This rather surprising proposition is made in his application of free competition to the land question. It appears to me that the land question is the principle point where Mr. Tandy's school goes astray. I think it worth while quoting the principal part of his dis-

cussion of land tenure for the purpose of making a few observations thereon:

"There is, however, a value which attaches to land, which, if it is not the product of labor, is due in a large degree to the presence of the people in its vicinity. This is what our single tax friends call the economic rent—the price that a person is willing to pay for a piece of land, in addition to what he would be willing to pay for the poorest land in use. This value, it is claimed, being created by the community (this is only partly true) should be taken by the community and expended for the benefit of the community. It is further claimed that this is necessary to the establishment of a condition of equality of opportunity. I have no time to criticize this theory as it deserves, but I would remind the followers of George that equality of opportunity can never be attained—the most we can hope for is equality of liberty. The George theory is based upon a question of ethics which we cannot recognize. It looks upon the community as a distinct entity and not as merely an aggregation of units. And, in doing so, upholds the state as being of greater importance than the individuals. Hence we must consider this reform as being inconsistent with the true line of development.

"If all the laws relating to land tenure were repealed, occupancy and use would constitute the only valid title. What constituted use and occupancy would have to be determined by the courts. As long as the present jury system is in vogue, this would probably necessitate a rigid law upon the subject in each locality. But as soon as the real jury system would be established, the decision of the jury would be on the merits of each individual case under dispute. True, this system would not secure to each individual in the community an equal share in the economic rent of that town; but it would secure for him a permanency in his abode. It would make it impossible for anyone to tax him for the use of the natural resources of the country. And it would not necessitate an army of non-productive officials, who would be supported by the labor of the producers. Thus rent and interest may be abolished and liberty maintained. When this is done, two of the three channels into which wealth flows will be shut off and wages alone will be left to absorb the full product of labor. The cost principle would be reestablished, and free competition, in its fullest sense, be possible for the first time since we emerged from savagery."

This does not harmonize with the proposition that every individual is equally entitled to the use of any and every natural opportunity. It is a declaration that the title of one may be superior to that of another, which title is to be determined by jury and protected by the protective association. Under "free competition" I can conceive of how the stronger might establish his claim to the most favorable piece of land; but it seems here that competition is not to be free, but limited by a jury and other governmental machinery—that monopoly is to be established. Does this denial of opportunity mean anything but a curtailment of liberty?

The Single Taxer is perfectly correct when he says that every individual is equally entitled to the advantage of the superior location or productiveness of one piece of land over another. To deny this is to deny equality of rights. But the individualist will tell me that right inheres only in conquest. Very well, but why provide means of interference with free competition for the conquest of the most favorable opportunities? Now, the jury is to award possession to the occupier and user, also to determine the fact of occupancy and use, and the protective association is to protect the possessor. But he pays for protection; does he also pay for a jury decision—to order? It is done now-a-days—why not in the future?

But if the first comer is entitled to all the fruits

of the most favorable opportunity, as population increases less and less favorable opportunities must be accepted until those opportunities remaining unused will barely and even fail to support life; in which case those possessed of the best opportunities would be able to secure the labor of the unfortunate for a bare living in return as wages. This, no one will deny, would be slavery re-established. But if the surrendering a part of his land thus to the labor of another invalidated his title to the part so surrendered, it is evident that, if he believed himself entitled to all he could use regardless of the needs of others, he would refuse to so employ the starving. Thus, under individualist land tenure it would be altogether within the possibilities that we should see starvation in a land of plenty! Is this the "equal liberty" that we hear so much about? If so, I'll take mine plain—without any trimmings or qualifications.

Whether the Single Taxers, in assuming that the community and not the individual who happens to work it is entitled to the fruits of the more favorable opportunities, look upon the community as a distinct entity I do not care to discuss; but I want to say that it is not necessary to so look upon the community in order to see the truth of the proposition. Of course the community has no rights which the individuals composing it do not possess. The proposition is that every individual is equally entitled to all opportunity. This does not admit that by any process whatever the title of one may become superior to another. But the Single Taxer bases his theory upon the commercial idea. He assumes that there will be bids for the more favorable land because men hope to gain by possessing it. But if the bid is to reach the value of the more desirable land above the value of the poorest land in use, which it must do in order to do what they claim for their system, it is evident that there will be no bid because no possibility of gain and hence no choice. It is pertinent to point out here that cities and the fictitious values they create are the direct result of land monopoly and when that no longer exists population will be so distributed as to render productivity the only advantage worthy of consideration.

Now, if I am right what would be the result? Evidently one result would be the speedy downfall of the Single Tax. What then? The individualist ideal could not be realized, because the community is already convinced that it is fallacious. The old system of property in land has already been discarded. How shall each individual realize his right to the most favorable opportunity, which is co-existent with the rights of all other individuals? Simply by, either singly or in association with others, applying his labor to any unoccupied opportunity; thus, production being free and unlimited, values will disappear and all will consume freely. This is a natural and logical conclusion, because, when all are free to consume as they will, choice of land will not be sufficient to interfere with occupancy and use. Under the individualist proposition, choice would be sufficient to cause interference, hence their proposed jury and protective system.

J. H. M.

Practical Anarchy.

As to what would be the immediate result were we to "abolish all restriction and then see what would turn up," it is perhaps hard to say. I shall not venture on a prophecy. The average man, looking at the "dangerous classes" in our big cities, opines that the result would be disastrous—assumes that there would be wasteful consumption with a predominance of indifference to measures of production. In the country, where about half of my life has been spent, I have seen practically very little need for our costly and cumbrous methods of government even under present social conditions. Some seventeen years ago I went west into one of the unorganized counties of Kansas, to take up land. The status of these counties did not seem to be very well understood as regarded the State law. Having no mechanism of judges, sheriffs, justices and constables, it seemed to be an open question as to whose business it was to deal with "crime." The consequence was, we didn't have any to speak of. Each man being, apparently, the guardian of his own rights, either the fear of retaliation or a disinclination to infringe kept men from imposing one another to any great extent. I heard of one knockdown and one case of horstealing during this anarchic period, both of which were settled without appeal to "law."

But certain sharks, with office and increased land values in mind, started a village near the center of the county to agitate for county organization. I remember that I was a staunch opponent of the same. I argued that we had better "let well alone;" that we were now without taxes or lawsuits; that organization would mean both; for as soon as we had justices and constables in every precinct, and law petty-foggers at the county-seat, men would be tempted to appeal to law in every petty dispute, etc., etc. I was of course overruled and outvoted, but lived to prove myself a prophet. Suits multiplied and the dockets were laden with criminal cases, some of which cost the county thousands of dollars. County seat parasites worked up bond schemes for one thing and another, until taxes are so onerous there that men can hardly stand the pressure in that drouthy country. If society be a compromise, I am sure that the pursuit of happiness was a much easier chase under Anarchy than it has since proved under the "blessing of civilized government."

The above recital is injected into your discussion not to bolster up any theory I may have formed, but as a presentation of facts for your readers to "chaw over."

WALLACE YATES.

Anarchy not Secrecy.

Those who have read Anarchist literature attentively and who have attended lectures by Anarchists, who have conversed and argued with Anarchists of all shades and opinions and of many nationalities, must be surprised to be told, as they sometimes are, that Anarchists are members of a secret society. The writer of this article holds Anarchist opinions, but he belongs to no society of Anarchists, nor is he aware of any Anarchist who does. It is quite true that there may be found a group of Anarchists as there may be a group of friends, or a pack of politicians as there may be a pack of wolves, or a flock of voters as there may be a flock of geese, or a swarm of officeseekers as there may be a swarm of locusts. But because a few Anarchists, for local reasons, form themselves into a group it by no means follows that they are a secret society. To belong to a society—such an organization as the word implies and especially a secret society, would necessitate that which we Anarchists are averse to, namely, to commit ourselves to a number of rules and regulations drawn up by a committee. Is it likely that Anarchists, above all others, who deny the right of any set of men to make laws for others, who are non-invasive, to obey, would commit themselves to such rules and regulations under any conditions? No, certainly not. Such a thing would be impossible among Anarchists. In the first place, Anarchists would not be such fools as to set about manufacturing a number of laws with penalties, and in the second place no Anarchist would consent to obey them or commit himself to them. I am an Anarchist, thou art an Anarchist, he is an Anarchist, and so on, but I, thou and he is committed to no rules and regulations. Leave such things to simpleton voters and reasoning wolves. Anarchists will have none of them. We have seen quite enough of law and its offspring,

"order". It is such order that we want to get rid of.

We quite admit that there are secretive Anarchists, as there are sure to be men of Anarchist opinions who are non-secretive, and to whom it would be folly to confide anything which was to be kept a secret. But because there are Anarchists who keep their own counsel and act in the dark, it by no means follows that Anarchists are in any way pledged to secrecy. Anarchists are so from conviction, and not because they have signed their names in a book, taken an oath, etc. Anarchy means an absence of all government—liberty pure and simple. Anarchists by belonging to a secret society would be placing themselves at the mercy of their non-secretive confederates. The babbling friend, however honest and good intentioned he may be, is more dangerous to his comrades than all the government spies and detectives, who can obtain access to almost any secret society.

The southern Irish, who as a race are incautious and non-secretive, have ever been ready to join secret societies in their struggle for liberty as they conceived it. And what has been the ending of all their rebellions and conspiracies? Betrayal, both by friend and foe. Under the soothing syrup of secrecy Irish patriots have marched to imprisonment and death. Governments have been able to undermine and destroy nearly every society the existence of which was objectionable to them.

Why are governments unable to suppress Anarchy? Because it has a scientific basis, being the result of a close study of human society and an accurate perception of those principles which if applied to society would be conducive to human happiness, those principles being believed in by men who, as a body, have no secrets to betray, oaths to break or documents to sign. Dealing with Anarchists governments have to deal with a number of independent thinkers, who object to being governed, that is, to being dictated to. As Anarchist opinions spread the difficulties of government will increase.—[Ireland, in Liberty (London).]

Questions for Anarchists.

THE following questions were submitted to and ignored by "Liberty", New York, by H. J. Chase, Cambridge, Mass., and then taken up by W. L. Crossman, Boston, and injected into a discussion of Anarchism in the "State Labor Journal," Dallas, Texas:

(1) Supposing the State to be abolished, production will be carried on by the same, better or worse methods; but whatever the methods, some locations will be more desirable than others for the transaction of business; e. g., Manhattan Island will probably continue to be the most desirable business location on this continent; but if not Manhattan, then some other area of practically the same limited extent. In other words, there will not be enough of it for more than a small portion of the community. Who are to have this best location and the advantages arising from its possession, and under what conditions are they to hold it?

(2) In what way is the position of a new roadway to be determined? It is not likely that it can be located just where each member of the community would best like to have it. Is its location then to be determined by the will of a majority or a minority, or are there to be as many different highways as there are different ideas of where one ought to be laid out?

(3) Suppose that under Anarchy the people of this country continued to keep to the right when passing each other on the highway. Suppose that, I am of the opinion that the English way is better and insisted on keeping to the left, even in the most crowded thoroughfares. What is to be done about it? To prevent me from having my way in this matter would be to compel me to submit to the will of the majority, and this I understand is contrary to Anarchist principles.

The putting of trifling questions, like the second and third above, is prompted by a spirit of trickery—they are "catch questions" and are asked by persons only capable of trifling with the great question of human liberty and happiness. They betray a total ignorance of Anarchist philosophy.

The "most advantageous business location", to answer as briefly as possible, would disappear with the "business" that creates it, which cannot exist under conditions of liberty. The freeing of opportunities for production would reduce the population of cities probably nine-tenths, which change alone would destroy business advantages, and the liberty to produce would at once destroy profit, because no one would pay more than cost for goods, and "business" would disappear totally.

The distribution of population would also equalize social advantages largely, so that fertility would

be the main if not the only advantage to consider in the selection of land. Unrestricted production would destroy price as well as profit, and the consequent free distribution and consumption would destroy competition for possession of the most productive land—the best out of use being always selected.

The trouble apprehended in locating a roadway arises out of the idea of special or property interests, which would disappear with the State, for property property cannot exist without the State in a more or less pronounced form. In selecting a route between two points you would proceed in a direct line naturally; in case of a marsh you would keep to the high ground; you would not cross a growing crop nor particularly fertile land when you could as easily avoid it. Nothing could be more simple or, in a free society, more practicable.

I cannot answer for others, but if I met a man on the road who, contrary to common custom and understanding, persisted in keeping to the left and unnecessarily inconveniencing me, I should probably yield to him as a very bad mannered person. I think that would be preferable to supporting some sort of an institution for the compulsory regulation of manners. Even the horse I drive will exhibit a better disposition and turn out to the right of his own accord after having met a few teams and learned the custom.

J. H. M.

"Where I Am At."

IN No. 18 J. H. M. criticises to some length the statement of mine in the same number that I had given up Communism and embraced Individualism. He heads his criticism "Where Is He At?" I will endeavor to briefly answer the question. Let me first reply to the criticism. The reader will please turn to Nos. 13, 15 and 18 of THE FIREBRAND to save me the trouble of lengthy quotations. Concerning the criticism in No. 18: (1) I used the words narrowed and narrower in a sense warranted by the dictionary—viz., "to draw into a smaller compass," "to lessen the extent of," "embracing a smaller area," etc. I did not say nor mean narrow-minded, as the very last sentence of my statement shows, to wit: "I cannot follow it (Communism) in its slow course, but at once jump to the finale, and declare for Individualism." M. gives evidence of knowing this, therefore his words in this connection smack of the artifice of a partisan. (2) It was not necessary for me to point out any narrowing particulars, as my point was that contemporary communistic writers (this includes J. H. M.) were defining Communism far different from the broad fraternity and all embracing humanity I once thought Anarchist-Communism to mean. Seeing that I was mistaken in what it meant it was only in fairness to myself that I should renounce it. (3) Yes; it was the fear of authority that led me to entertain some objections to Communism. I shall not make any statement at this time as it is so easy to say—whether true or false—that "he don't understand Communism," or that "he is a State-Socialist," etc. I will content myself quoting from M. to show that his "Anarchist"-Communism was compulsory and not voluntary. This point will be developed near the close of this letter. I mention it here to show my chief objection to "Anarchist"-Communism was compulsion or authority. (4) One will in most any instance endure some pain in anticipation of great good, and that is how I was led to favor Communism in spite of my several objections. When I became convinced that Individualist-Anarchism would give as many good results with less bad ones, I chose the latter theory. (5) Again M. shows a partisan spirit in juggling with one sentence of my statement, viz.: "Communism is possible under Individualism; but under Communism, Individualism would be out of place." The two sentences immediately following this one in my statement make my meaning clearer. In admitting that "under Communism, Individualism would be out of place," M. gives evidence of understanding the word Individualism as I meant it. The idea I would set forth is merely this: Certain members of society, as believers in private property, could, as a matter of expedience, renounce their private claims and put it in common, without losing their identity as individuals; but the moment a person would choose to hold his own products for his own benefit he would cease to be a Communist. (6) By equal distribution I meant a condition where each should have equal liberty to use an equal amount of wealth (not necessarily a division or separation of the wealth), irrespective of his effort in its

production; by an equitable distribution I meant where the one who would make the least effort would have the least wealth, and should not be given a right to the fruits of the energetic and industrious. Where there is inability or misfortune it could simply be taken care of by the sympathetic natures of friends, especially where people were free and prosperous—even today in face of slavery to privileged capitalism, and in face of general poverty, the helpless fare about as well as many able ones not eligible to aid. I am not recommending State charitable institutions, for they are abominable—what I have in mind is private hospitality. Note well that I did not say in my statement that Individualism would insure equitable distribution, but said such distribution could be thus “best subserved”.

Now, a few words as to M.'s position. He is very earnest in his aim to make out that I was a State Socialist and not a Communist at all. He ridicules what he facetiously calls my “logic” and “reasoning”. I have already shown that he is one blindly devoted to defending a cause by fair means or unfair means, and I shall now proceed to show that he is inconsistent; that he is a compulsory Communist, and that he virtually favors in one place what in another he brands as invasion and in still another that it should be met with “active, violent resistance”. I will first quote a few of his statements as a basis for my remarks:

1 “I did say that Anarchism would not interfere with those who wished to practice commercialism, because non-interference is the principle of liberty.” (No. 13, vol. 2, “Communism vs. Commercialism”).

2 “To be a success the commune must be an association of compatible natures—that is, each must be free to choose his associates. . . . If two or more persons can increase personal enjoyment by communal association, let them do it—neither I nor any one can find a valid objection to it.” (No. 15, “Note and Comment.”)

3 “Yes, I fancy it would be ‘rather awkward to say Society is Communistic, notwithstanding many are commercialists,’ etc., because it would not be true. Society cannot be communistic while part of it is uncommunistic. Holders of private property are not Anarchists—they are invaders.” (No. 18, “Where Is He At?”)

4 “The claim has never been made in these columns that Anarchism means non-resistance. On the contrary, we are revolutionists and recommend active, violent resistance to invasion.” (No. 18, answer to Koch).

Observe now that M. says in the first quotation that “Anarchism would not interfere with those who wished to practice commercialism”; that he says in the third quotation that “Holders of private property,” meaning commercialists, as you will see by the first of the sentence, “are invaders”; that in the fourth quotation he “recommends active, violent resistance to invasion”. In one place he says commercialists who wished to practice commercialism would not be interfered with, and in another place he says they would be actively, violently resisted as invaders. In these quotations M. contradicts himself.

Note what he says in quote 2 about the minimum size of a commune—“two persons . . . by communal association,” etc. Now M. does not say so directly, but I think it only fair to assume that these communes embracing less than the whole population would have control of their produce, for the objectionable persons a commune might withdraw from certainly would not be allowed to come to them and enjoy the fruits of their labor. I will take it for granted that M. will not deny a given commune the control of its produce. He will not, I trust, take refuge by defining property in the shade of meaning a legal title to anything, whether in one's possession or not, as Proudhon, the father of Individualism, used it in some instances; but that he means it in the generally accepted sense warranted by dictionaries, viz., “An article formed by a person from raw material or gathered from the natural resources of wealth.” Therefore, if it be invasion for one person to hold the wealth of his own production as his private property, it is likewise invasion for a commune of two or more persons to do so, and finally, should the commune embrace all but a few objectionable personages, it would be one gigantic association of invaders. In order to be a success, M. says, the commune must be composed of compatible natures—that is to say, stated negatively, it should expel the incompatible. If this commune should refuse to disgorge its products, or part of them, to the expelled ones, it would by implication claim property in the same—an invasion to be actively, violently resisted. Hence it appears to me from his words M. favors in one place what in another he brands invasion, and in yet another recommends its active, violent resistance.

By branding private property as invasion and recommending its violent, active resistance (see quotes 3 and 4), he is a compulsory Communist and not an Anarchist

at all—a decidedly poor advocate of liberty. But if we accept his contradictory statement in quote 1, he is not a compulsory Communist, but perhaps an Anarchist; but as quote 1 is taken from No. 13 and 3 and 4 four from No. 18, the latter must be taken as the most mature thought and accepted as his position. Another view: In quote 1 he says that Anarchism would not interfere with commercialists; in quote 3 he virtually calls them invaders; in quote 4 he recommends active, violent resistance to invasion. The conclusion to be drawn from this is plain, viz., that M. has repudiated voluntarism and now advocates compulsory Communism. And when he says in quote 4 that “the claim has never been made in these columns that Anarchy means non-resistance” he seems to have forgotten about writing quote 1. (He tells us plainly in quote 3 what commercialists are.)

I think I can define my position in a few words: I am an Anarchist; I believe the individual should be free to practice Communism or Commercialism as he shall choose and not be compelled to pursue either method. I despise alike the dogmatic despot who would force people to be Communists by denying private property as a right and advocating its abolition, and the authoritarian who would prohibit free or voluntary Communism.

There is one branch of Communism that is called authoritarian; it holds that not only property is to be common, but individuals will be compelled to work according to ability, to produce it. There is another branch called “Anarchist” Communism. It holds that the individuals should not be directly compelled to do anything, nevertheless should have equal access to the products of all. The former would directly compel the individual to work for the common good of all, while the latter would not, but would see to it that should he work his products should not be held as his own. To me it seems both are compulsory and coercive, and I repel them both with horror.

I will close by stating the very thought I had in mind when I began, that should I positively know either Individualism or Communism to be the true method, I would strongly oppose the idea of forcing people to live up to it—either directly or indirectly. I ask for all people what I ask for myself—liberty.

E. H. FULTON.

Even if Mr. Fulton could show that I am utterly at sea on the social question, writing in a rambling manner and contradicting myself at every turn, that would not make clear his own inconsistencies, which, just now, are under discussion. In his “personal statement” he said in effect that after he became an Anarchist he advocated a social system (Communism) which he regarded as, in many respects, inconsistent with liberty. In the light of this (shall I say contradictory?) statement I question his Anarchism, because to me Anarchism means liberty. He answers that one will endure some pain in anticipation of much pleasure. I grant it, but the whole process can no more be called pleasure than a mixture of compulsion and voluntarism can be called Anarchy. The inconsistency remains unexplained.

The fundamental point throughout my criticism was that compulsory cooperation, which is advocated by some people under the name of Communism, was State Socialism, and that if Mr. Fulton advocated compulsory “communism,” which he admits he did, he was still a State Socialist essentially. It is easy to say this, sure enough, but it would be hard to reach any other conclusion. And if he can show that my Communism is compulsory he will only prove me his brother in error and confusion and not clear himself from the charge.

I did not and do not admit that under Communism Individualism would be out of place. As Mr. Fulton himself has admitted, Communism is not incompatible with Individualism. This admission inspired me to have a little fun with his formula; “Communism is possible under Individualism, but under Communism Individualism would be out of place.” My fun he calls juggling. Now juggling is always funny, but fun is not always jugglery. I maintain that if Communism is compatible with Individualism, Individualism must be compatible with Communism. I claim further that Communism offers the best and most perfect condition for the development of the individual.

I must insist that “equal liberty to use an equal amount of wealth” is not Communism. I also deny

that under Mr. Fulton's Individualism “the one who makes the least effort would always have the least wealth”. The one who managed to monopolize the most favorable opportunity might have the most wealth with the least effort, and the one who was compelled to accept the least favorable might have the least wealth with the most effort. Individualism, so-called, utterly fails at this point. Those certain members of society who believe in private property must reply to this proposition (which I made in my criticism of Mr. Fulton's statement, and which he avoids in pointing out my “contradictions”): Every individual is equally entitled to the use of 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 will any individual accept the less favorable. On this proposition the Communist may rest his case. If it is admitted, then private property is destroyed ethically; if denied, then liberty as a principle has no basis, and the monopolist of today is in the right. Slavery is nothing more nor less than denial of equality of opportunity, and government can be effective only by means of restriction of opportunity. So, liberty—absence of government—can only be realized through equality of opportunity, notwithstanding the “Individualist” formula: “Equality if we can get it; liberty at any rate,” and their dismissal of equality of opportunity as unattainable.

Now, as to my “contradictions”. When I say that property is invasion (I might have quoted Proudhon, “the father of Individualism”: “Property is robbery”), I have in mind the above proposition. Now property is that to which a person has an exclusive right. The “right” must be established. The “Individualists” recognize this point, hence their proposed jury and protective system. Property is a denial of equal opportunity, because if all men are equally entitled to opportunity all are equally entitled to the fruits of opportunity. Denial of one is denial of the other.

Mr. Fulton's definition of property is the proper or economic definition of wealth. Webster defines property as “that to which a person has a legal title; exclusive right of possessing.” This discrepancy may not be jugglery, but it is funny.

When I said Anarchism (I should perhaps have said Anarchists) would not interfere if some individuals wished to practice commercialism (of course, so long as they made no attempt to force their practice on others) I meant that, since we were able to exert the force of example that were preferable to expropriation. And the only reason I am for active, violent resistance to present-day monopoly is because that seems to be the only means left us. It was clear (at least I thought so) that in the former case I simply expressed an opinion as to methods after the revolution, and in the latter my way of securing the same. My opinions as to methods are a purely personal matter and have nothing to do with the communistic principle.

I did not say nor indicate that groups or communes of two or more persons were to have exclusive control of their products, and Mr. Fulton's assumption is wholly without foundation; it is simply a preconceived idea which he carries over into this discussion. Neither did I say or imply that producers must work or associate in groups two or more. I said “let them” if they could increase personal happiness thereby. I do not attempt to deny the right of the individual to “gang by himself”—that would be a denial of his right to choose his associates, which I emphatically assert. No one who had ever understood Communism would so misconstrue me. What nonsense to suppose that Communism necessitates or implies the breaking up of population into “communes” of maximum and minimum size. Communism is a social ideal whose basis is equality of opportunity. The grouping of individuals is merely an incident, depending on mutual choice and pleasure. Then as now cooperation in production would be necessary in certain lines and perhaps desirable in nearly all; but all this is incidental. This phase of the question has been dwelt upon to the exclusion of positive philosophy until it is generally accepted that Communism is a mere scheme to realize the “cooperative” and “brotherhood” sentiment of the time. I find no fault with the sentiment, but it is

not the basis nor the important consideration in the Communist philosophy.

Because the commune is to be composed of compatible natures it does not follow that the undesirable person is to be forcibly ejected, any more than choice of association entitles a person to force himself upon those who do not desire his company.

Mr. Fulton thinks that because I advocate resistance to invasion I am "a compulsory Communist and not an Anarchist at all". Then does he take the position that an Anarchist is of necessity a non-resistance? If he believes in resistance, as liberty (non-invasion) is the only alternative to invasion, is he not then a compulsory Anarchist according to his own reasoning? Is compulsion Anarchistic? Nonsense again. Resistance is not compulsion. Compulsion is invasion. These distinctions are recognized by all Anarchists. Has Mr. Fulton a partisan purpose in confounding them, or is he really unacquainted with Anarchist terminology? If we negate the right of resistance we posit the right of subjugation (instance, the Christian philosophy), and abandon the whole Anarchist theory.

I need not stop to comment on the paragraph in which Mr. Fulton states his position, as it is evident from what has already been said that if he believe in equal rights or opportunities his belief in property is without foundation, and if he denies equal rights his Anarchism is destroyed. And let me throw in the statement here that property in the products of land implies property in land, in the same sense that we say today "who owns the land owns the people who work it". Occupancy and use, to be established by jury and upheld by protective associations, differs in no material sense from paper titles upheld by courts and police.

Mr. Fulton gives us two branches of Communism as he understands them. The head of the first, or authoritative is A. Longley, of St. Louis. Strangely enough, Mr. Fulton and Mr. Longley some time ago had a discussion of the question. Reading his comparison of the two branches, in which he finds so little difference, one wonders why Mr. Fulton should have upheld the one as against the other. Reading his fairly logical defense of Anarchist Communism, one wonders that he is now able to find them so similar. Altogether, one wonders where he will "fetch up".

J. H. M.

Prison Reflections.

Through practicing what I and others have preached—that is, ignoring government and doing as I pleased, regardless of the laws—I have been compelled to exchange the larger prison of our rotten society for a small steel-barred cell. Though deprived of the few privileges granted citizens, my mind remains free and unshackled and flies beyond the bars. Visions of freedom tantalize me—of riding across boundless prairies, climbing snow-capped mountains, listening to the murmur of running waters, to the song of birds, of sitting by the seashore watching the breakers or gazing at the stars. But when I look around me nothing but steel and iron greet my longing eyes. Fragments of speeches come to me in which I heard men talk glibly of the glories of our civilization. Give me the barbarism of the South Sea Islander, of the Indian, of all those races that know no law but their own free will, and take all the arts and achievements of civilized society.

What are we but game for fee-hunting officials and lawyers? Innumerable traps in the form of statutes, unknown to most of us, are set in our way to commit us to the power of these modern freebooters. Verily, we have become a race of serfs; oppression is called justice and slavery freedom. Even the prisoners, not content with the restrictions already placed upon them, have established a court among themselves, patterned after a law court. Rules, laws, statutes innumerable are considered necessary by the very class—the poor and unfortunate—against which they are relentlessly executed. No thought of revolt enters their minds; no conception of a more justly arranged society makes them dissatisfied with present conditions.

Unceasing labor only on our part can ever permeate such an unyielding mass with our ideas. Let us arouse ourselves, comrades; do not put too much on the shoulders of the few faithful who are carrying on the propaganda; let each work according to ability. The distribution of literature, the collection of funds for the support of our papers, the conversation with fellow

workmen, the dropping a word, an idea, here and there, are as valuable and necessary as the efforts of the best orators and writers in our ranks. All who have the desire will find an opportunity to further the cause, and help bring nearer the day when slaves and masters shall be no more, when misery and despair shall have fled forever and peace and happiness shall be with us all.

E. S.

Note and Comment.

I AM advised to drop Communist advocacy because, forsooth, we will in all probability pass through State Socialism, Individualism or what not to reach my ideal. But no one points out how anything is to be gained by advocating an illogical proposition which must be torn down again before the logical one can be established. I cannot see how the longest way around is the shortest way through. Let those who can be honest in advocating error do so, but do not expect me to become a hypocrite. If State Socialism is to be the "next step" (backward), so far from helping it I prefer to do what I can to retard it, in order that if possible enough people may become sufficiently enlightened that we may hope for sufficient opposition from the start to prevent the utter extinction from the human mind of the logical faculty and the spirit of resistance.

RECURRING to the colonization or present-day commune question, I want to say I am sorry I cannot see in these attempts more promise of success. I am not prejudiced. The publication of *The Firebrand* is a striking instance of success in a voluntary venture. The association is purely anarchistic, purely voluntary and quite congenial. Under similar circumstances ventures in other lines not requiring competition with the outside world may be similarly successful, but the necessity of congeniality is what I insist upon, and the likelihood of failure as often as success in securing it in a promiscuous assemblage is the cause of my reluctance to engage in such efforts. I do not care to court disaster—it is not helpful to the cause and is wasteful of means and energy. I prefer to be reasonably sure of success, and this is impossible unless I know those with whom I must associate. Notwithstanding lack of faith in certain methods, the colonists everywhere and all those who are trying to better their condition and assist in the spread of radicalism in whatever way have my best wishes for success. To Mr. Verity I will only say that when he succeeds in inducing men of any considerable means to invest in his colony without seeking to control and direct the same I will gladly admit that I have misjudged the modern business man.

J. H. M.

Notes from England.

ALTHOUGH I promised Comrade Addis some time ago that I would regularly contribute to *THE FIREBRAND* some notes on the movement in England, I have been unable to do so owing to the pressure of this monopolistic system which crushes us all. Nevertheless, I have now managed to find time to record some of the most important items of interest to comrades in America.

Since my last notes comrades here have been working with their usual vigor for the cause in many directions. At the end of January several London comrades who have been active propagandists for some considerable time past came to the conclusion that the time had come for organizing all comrades, friends and sympathizers in order to more effectively carry on the propaganda, so they accordingly formed themselves into a group and issued a manifesto explaining their ideas. This has been circulated all over the world and interesting as well as heated discussions among comrades in various parts has resulted. In "Les Temps Nouveaux", A. Haman wrote an article in support of the "Associated Anarchists", quoting considerably from their manifesto; in No. 7 of *THE FIREBRAND* it was also favorably reviewed; in London two capitalist papers gave it a brief but fair show, but as for the English Anarchist journals, they seem to be too deeply interested in academic questions to give much space to discussing such important questions as the organization of comrades or the best means of utilizing the propagandist forces in this country. Still the comrades who have founded the "Associated Anarchists" have been from the outset well aware of the numerous difficulties which must be

surmounted before their organization can obtain a firm hold in this country of apathetic wage slaves and sleepy Anarchists. Therefore, since they thoroughly understand the position they are taking up, and have started to work with the determination to make their organization successful, there is every reason to think that the "Associated Anarchists" have come to stay.

Herr Liebknecht, the leader of the German Social Democrats is at present disgracing the labor movement of England by his appearance on these shores. The State Socialists through Dr. Aveling and his satellites have imported Liebknecht in order to fire their apathetic and exploited dupes with that enthusiasm which is essential to keep the gods of Social Democracy on their pedestals, and so far, I must admit, they have been highly successful.

Liebknecht's first public appearance was at Queen's Hall on Tuesday evening May the 19. At this meeting he gave off in parrot-like fashion the tame, stale and willful misrepresentation of Anarchism which has characterized the speeches and writings of Marxists since the days of Bakunin and the old International. Some few comrades were present and dissented at those parts of his speech which concerned us, with the result that the angelic and moral Dr. Aveling who occupied the chair, let it be known that they had in waiting behind the scenes a large staff of Social Democratic policemen, drawn principally from the slums of East London who were willing at the command to forcibly eject any obnoxious Anarchist. And such is some of the latest tactics of the apostles of "the coming slavery" in this country. First attack a man, patiently wait until he repels your abuse, then throw him out of the meeting and triumphantly declare that he came to cause a disturbance! How great is the likeness between the Social Democrats and our present tyrants!

WM. BANHAM.

London, England, June, 6, '96.

Printing-Press Fund.

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

Previously acknowledged.....\$15.00
Tacoma Firebrander.....1.00

Receipts.

Anderson, Combs, Frank, Johnson, Aldrin, Soupel, each 50c. Marcus, Shilling, Prehler, Redmond, each 25c.

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

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
Anarchist Morality, " "	5c
A Dialogue, by L. S. Bevington	5c
Fundamentals in Reform, by W. H. Van Ornum	5c
A Talk about Anarchist-Communism, Malatesta	5c
Anarchy, " "	5c
Revolutionary Studies, " "	5c
Anarchy on Trial, " "	5c
An Anarchist Manifesto	2c
A Sex Revolution, by Lois Waisbrocker	25c
Anything More, My Lord?	5c
Wants and Their Gratification; H. Addis	10c
A Secret and Confidential Address, by Gavroche	15c
Revolution, a lecture by S. H. Gordon	5c
Fundamentals in Reform, by W. H. Van Ornum	5c
Life of Albert R. Parsons, with brief History of the Labor Movement in America. Beautiful illustrated. Nicely bound. 290 Octave Pages.	\$1.50
Albert R. Parsons' book on Anarchism; Its Philosophy and Scientific Basis (English and German Editions). Handsomely bound in Cloth and Gilt, 75 cts. Paper Cover	35c

LIBERTY LIBRARY MONTHLY

E. H. FULTON, PUBLISHER
Columbus Junction, Iowa.
SUBSCRIPTION 50 CTS. PER YEAR
WITH *THE FIREBRAND*, 80 CENTS A YEAR.