



VOL. II.

PORTLAND, OREGON, SUNDAY, JULY 5, 1896.

No. 22.

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 soc. al 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.

Kropotkin.

AN ACROSTIC.

KINGS fear thy brave and noble words—
Right well, indeed, they may!—
O thou pleader for the Right!
Prince indeed art thou this day
Of men, for in thy might
The foundation stones of States—
Kingdoms and Republics—quake.
In vain their bars and prison gates,
Nought can stay thy work, or make
Enlightened France forget thy deeds,

ROSS WINN.

Items of Anarchist History.

IF Mr. Priestley wants more instances of nations
without government or crime, besides those given
by Mr. Morris, he can find some excellent ones in
Herbert Spencer's book "Justice." The inference
Spencer draws from the facts is that war is the
cause of both government and crime, so that tribes
which never fought their neighbors have neither
the one nor the other.

To Mr. Anderson's questions I would say that the
earliest commendation of Anarchy I know is in the
Bible, where once "there was no king in Israel;
every man did that which was right in his own
eyes," and when the people wanted to establish a
regular government God said they were "rejecting
him," giving the king the allegiance that belonged
to God. The texts are Judges 17: 6; 21:25; 1 Sam.
8:7; 10:19. The earliest argument for Anarchism
is at Athens, about B. C. 450, recorded in the sec-
ond chapter of Xenophon's Memorabilia, as follows:

"It is said that Alcibiades, before he was twenty
years old, had with Pericles, who was then his
guardian and the chief of the State, the following
conversation about laws: 'Tell me, Pericles,' said
he, 'could you inform me what law is?' 'Certainly,'
said Pericles. 'Do then,' said Alcibiades, 'for I hear
some men praised for being law-abiding, and sup-
pose that this praise could not rightly be given to
one who does not know what law is.' 'Well, Alcibi-
ades,' said Pericles, 'it is no hard thing that you
desire in wishing to know what law is, for whatever
the body of the people, having met and come to a
decision, enacts, declaring what must be done and
what not,—all these are laws.' 'Meaning that we
should do the good or the bad, which?' 'The good,
boy,' said he, and not to do the bad.' 'And if it is
not the body of the people, but, as where there is an
oligarchy, a few meet and enact what must be done,
what is that?' 'Everything,' said he, 'that the rul-
ing power of the State enacts, after considering
what should be done, is called law.' 'Then, even if
a despot, ruling a State, enacts for the citizens what
should be done, is that, too, a law?' 'Whatever a
despot enacts when he is in power,' said he, 'this,
too, is called law.'

'And,' said he, 'what is violence and lawlessness,

Pericles? is it not when the stronger, not by per-
suasion, but by force, compels the weaker to do
whatever he chooses?' 'I should think so,' said Per-
icles. 'And whatever a despot, without persuading
the citizens, compels them to do by enactment, is
lawlessness?' 'I should think so,' said Pericles, 'for
I take back my statement that what a despot enacts
without persuasion is law.' 'And what the few en-
act for the many, not by persuasion, but by the
possession of power, shall we call it violence, or not?'
'It seems to me,' said Pericles, 'that everything that
anybody compels anybody to do without persuading
him, whether by enactment or not, is violence rather
than law.' 'And then whatever the whole body
of the people, because it has power over the wealthy,
enacts without persuading them would be violence
rather than law?' 'Decidedly, Alcibiades,' said Per-
icles, 'and we at your age were good at such things;
for we practiced and argued such matters as you seem
to me to be practicing now.' And Alcibiades said:
'I wish, Pericles, I had met you then, when you
were at your best in these things.'

To see the point fully it should be understood
that Alcibiades inherited a great deal of property,
and that in the Athenian style of taxation it was
customary to charge a single rich man with the
whole expense of some important public work for
one year.* Alcibiades and his rich young friends, of
course, would have their eyes open to see the faults
of that system.

The first who called himself "Anarchist" and his
doctrine "Anarchism" was, I believe, Proudhon.

STEPHEN T. BYINGTON.

Notes from England.

THIS year will undoubtedly be the most important
for the Anarchist movement in this country, and
especially in London, because in the course of the
next few months the International Congress will
take place here, and, judging from the present con-
dition of affairs, it will be the liveliest and longest
of its kind ever held. Of course comrades in Lon-
don will not let the opportunity go by without mak-
ing good propaganda. Already things are assuming
an unpleasant aspect for the gentlemen who label
themselves the "organizing committee." They assert
that only those organizations which advocate parlia-
mentary action are eligible to representation. This
means that the Dutch Socialists, who are advocates
of revolutionary action, with Domela Nieuwenhuis as
their principal exponent, will be excluded. The rev-
olutionary labor organizations in France will share
the same fate, together with numerous other anti
political working class societies in Germany, Bel-
gium, Italy, Spain and America. Yet this cunning
clique of dictators have the audacity to speak in the
name of the proletariat of the world!

* And to avoid confusion, it must be understood that
Alcibiades had not by his logic established his right to
undisturbed possession of his great wealth. He inher-
ited the wealth, but it must have been accumulated as
a result of enactment, rather than persuasion, and violent
invasion justifies violent resistance. What he
really did establish by his logic, though he appears not
to have had his eyes open to the fact, was that he had
no right to the inherited wealth. Being a rich man, he
was not concerned about the invasion of the poor mem-
ber of the community; in fact, being a rich man, he
twisted the logic a little bit in his own favor. Had he
followed logic for its own sake, he would have seen that
only the non-invasive individual is entitled to be un-
disturbed.

J. H. M.

This time it is certain that the representations of
the German Social Democratic party, headed by such
common place liars and scoundrels as Herr Bebel,
Liedknicht, Auer and Singer, who have so long
made these assemblies hunting grounds for political
socialism, will have a hot time throughout the con-
gress, and I should not be surprised to see some very
deadly blows dealt at Social Democracy as a result
of the follies of its advocates.

In spite of all their rules and regulations the An-
archists will be there and in all probability our prin-
ciples and policy will have as good a show as they
have had at any previous congress. This will result
from the well known fact that the organizers, with
their customary lack of good tactics, have made so
many opponents, one way and another, that all the
discontented workers will unite with the revolution-
ary Anarchists in opposition to the exclusivists.
The London Anarchist committee have had some
very valuable correspondence with several well
known men in the socialist and labor movement, and
I might mention here Kier Hardie, Tom Mann, Mor-
rison Davidson and John G. Kenworthy have declar-
ed themselves in favor of admitting Anarchist-Com-
munists; so it will be seen that in England we have
some friends in a very valuable quarter. On April
29th a meeting was held in London to protest against
our exclusion, which was attended by Anarchists,
State Socialists and a few Trade Unionists. J. C.
Kenworthy, Carl Quinn, Miss Marant, Alice Krano,
D. Nicoll, Will Banham and several others address-
ed the meeting, and a resolution was carried in
favor of the admission of delegates from all non-
political labor organizations.

THIS year the May day demonstration, insofar as
the Anarchists are concerned, was a great success.
In the first place, we were admitted to the demon-
stration committee, which has heretofore been com-
pletely bossed by the Social Democrats. This time,
however, owing to "the better spirit" prevailing in
certain sections of the labor movement in London—
notably, the Independent Labor party—the Social
Democratic bossing was greatly modified and we
were, for the first time, enabled to hold a united
demonstration. We had a separate platform, which
had by far the largest crowd around it; our speakers
were in good form and, altogether, in my opinion,
this was the best demonstration we have yet held.

THE amnesty agitation for the release of the Wal-
sall Anarchists, who, it will be remembered, were
condemned in 1892 to penal servitude for having
fallen victims to the machinations of a police agent,
still goes ahead by obtaining increasing numbers of
friends and sympathisers in the demand for complete
and immediate amnesty. Comrade Deakin was re-
leased at the beginning of the present year, but not
until the infernal prison system had nearly killed him.

ON the 19th of March we commemorated the Com-
mune of Paris by holding a mass meeting. It was a
grand meeting from beginning to end, proving that
the seeds we have sown have not fallen on stony
ground in London. The hall was packed and litera-
ture—including The Firebrand—sold like hot cakes.
Our speakers were listened to with extreme interest,
and loud applause greeted the appearance of Lo

Michel. Kropotkin wrote a letter which was read to the audience. He expressed regret at not being able to speak, owing to illness, and pointed out the causes which led to the failure of the revolutionary movement in 1871. Short speeches were made by nearly a dozen well known comrades, and the meeting broke up at a late hour, all being apparently well satisfied with the entire proceedings.

WM. BANHAM.

Opportunity and Profit.

J. H. M. writes, "it will be a great favor if G. will inform us how people are to form a joint stock company who have nothing but their labor to subscribe, and no opportunity to exercise that." I am not aware that I ever made such a proposition and believe that I had rather take things as they are and "buck" with the restrictions that are placed upon us by the state, than attempt such a thing. I would suggest however, that brains may at times be made take the place of both labor and opportunity. Such transitions have been known, and the results have been not altogether unfavorable.

(2) Opportunity is certainly the fruit of profit. Nor am I obtuse to the fact that profit is equally the fruit of opportunity, at times. If Smith owns land beyond his requirements and applies the rental of his surplus land to the purchase of more land; the rental, or profit, certainly begets further opportunity. It may be claimed that his owing land in the first place includes both the opportunity and the profit, but that I deny. The profit does not absolutely follow; possession (let possession constitute opportunity, or monopoly partial or complete), does absolutely follow profit.

(3) In his conception of opportunity, monopoly, and the functions of the state, it strikes me that the Anarchist, like the Single Taxer, is altogether too absolute, not to say dogmatic. If the state possesses a positive force for evil it may be made an equally positive force for good, because good and evil are but different conceptions of the same thing under varying conditions, and reform via the ballot-box becomes logical. At the last analysis we find evil conditions the result of evil desires (profit) things not amenable to legislative logic one way or another, and we have never yet found ourselves totally unable to do right in some degree, and doing right, increase our privileges in that direction. Let us not be too positive. As Bolingbroke says, we construct our syntheses too hastily, base them upon too few facts. A little reflection should convince, I am sure, that there is still opportunity, that monopoly is still far from complete, and the State still far from absolute. Not only so, but the opportunity may be enlarged as far as education will allow, and the State virtually abolished.

I did not say that the State does not interfere with our liberties. But, both interference and liberty are subject to degrees of modification. One may possess a greater or less degree of liberty even if liberty in the abstract be not subject to qualification.

I claim that the State does not materially interfere with our liberties. The laws are not exactly the same for all, as we have reason to know, still, the special privileges that have been gained, have obviously been gained, to a great extent, by superior cunning, and that cunning must be met by equal cunning according to the law of competition, in order to equalize, or nearly equalize, conditions.

(4) For instance, the law bestows titles to land, the base of all opportunity, but land titles do not constitute absolute land monopoly, much as it might horrify a Single Taxer to hear one say so. In the first place, there is an abundance of land, not exactly where we want it perhaps, still an abundance. Nor is it absolutely necessary to get off the earth to avoid paying rent. One may devise and carry out schemes to become one's own landlord, privately or publicly, and scoop the rent-profit himself, or themselves. Taxes then come in as a confiscator—not that I advise taxation in any form, only, as we have taxation we might as well use it as a means to an end while it lasts. And, it is to be noted that the more progress we make in this direction the easier it becomes, both good and evil being cumulative forces.

That there are barriers in the way goes without saying, but that those barriers are absolute few will say. We have departed considerably from "the straight and narrow path" and there's a long way to walk back, but the more we walk in the right direction the sooner we will get there. That I believe is good arithmetic.

(5) If we wait for "propaganda" to take effect, I fear

we shall wait a long time, and however pleasant these discussions may be, the atmosphere of the west favors doing something, if it is only blundering about 'til the open door is found. Let us beware of constructing "synthetic philosophies" lest we find as did one Spencer, that Paul, an ancient and itinerant preacher, on Anarchy bent, crammed the whole business into a single line. This loving one's neighbor as oneself—with-out profit—is a terrible dangerous thing in the hands of an expert, unfortunately we have not yet learned the use of the article to any great extent.

Then as to "propaganda"; present conditions are constructing a propaganda a thousand times more effective than any we may expect to send forth in the next five centuries, a propaganda that is sending us to perdition without ceremony.

Yes, organize by all means and in all places to destroy profit, the devil that is destroying us, and bestowing opportunity—special opportunity, perhaps I should say—upon a few. Since the formation of this republic we have done little but organize for the devil, let us now organize a little on our own account. It is not organization, or monopoly so-called or legislation, that we need fear so much as our own ignorance, our own desire for profit. We let names frighten us too easily. The devil is profit and profit the devil.

(1) G. did not state his proposition in just that form, but that is what it amounts to. His proposition was that we are still free to organize stock companies. Since there are millions of "us" who have nothing to subscribe but our labor, which we have no opportunity to exercise, I asked to have the liberty pointed out; but G. evades the point. The proposition that brains may take the place of labor and opportunity is entirely too occult for me. We could not make much of opportunity without brains, it is true; and without opportunity brains can do nothing. At any rate, I never saw a loaf of bread that was the product of brain alone.

(2) Profit may be the means of monopolizing opportunity, certainly. But it is equally certain that profit cannot be realized without the possession of opportunity. Profit depends upon opportunity primarily. Opportunity does not depend primarily on profit. If opportunity were not monopolized neither profit nor the acquisition of opportunity through profit could exist.

(3) The Anarchist does not admit that the State may become "a force for good", for the simple reason that the invasive force by which alone the State can exist is fundamentally bad. The use of force is justifiable only in resisting invasion. The good the Anarchist strives for is the absence of force, hence the absence of the State. But if G. sees in the State possibilities of great good, why does he wish it "practically abolished"? and if he believes "reform via the ballot box logical", why does he write articles condemning majority rule? Though to some of us is still left a little opportunity, to the millions mentioned above monopoly is complete, the State is absolute, and the number who find themselves in this predicament is daily increasing. Surely the liberties of this growing number is "materially" interfered with. In what way could a joint company of such people secure opportunity? By direct expropriation only.

(4) May I ask where to find the abundance of land that may be had without paying rent? If he has in mind government land, he forgets that government ownership is monopoly, and that in order to secure himself in the possession of this land he must not only fee the officials to begin with, but he must ever after pay a rental called a tax. Besides, tools are necessary to work the land, and who has no tools and no means of obtaining them is still excluded from the use of the land, even though the land itself were free. The "rent-profit" he speaks of is dependent on land monopoly. If all were possessed of equal opportunity there would be no rent-profit to scoop.

(5) The command to love your neighbor as yourself has no place in Anarchist philosophy. Since love is a thing not to be compelled, that command goes with the rest. Love of self, or self-interest, is the basis of Anarchism; as it is the basis of all human effort. One will love his neighbor if he is lovable; otherwise he cannot. Neighborly love is too unreliable an article to serve as a basis for a social system. But independent of love or hate, we can

come to mutual recognition of each other's rights; and even ruling out the question of rights, it is still true that in equality of opportunity is our best insurance against personal deprivation or restriction of opportunity.

H.

Reward and Punishment.

Address before the court in France by Comrade George Etlevant, sentenced to five years imprisonment as being concerned in the robbery of dynamite cartridges.

GENTLEMEN:—I wish to make a few remarks as to my position here at the bar on trial, and as to yours, gentlemen of the jury, as my judges. I want to say that our ideas are so different that we should at least make the attempt to comprehend the forces that have influenced and controlled us both. We are not born into the world with any preconceptions; no ideas are innate in us. They come to us by means of our senses, through the environment in which we lived.

So true is this that if we are devoid of a sense we can form no conception of the sensations resulting in that sense. For instance, a person blind from birth can have no idea of the variety of color, because he is devoid of the faculty required for perceiving the color of objects. Besides, according to the abilities with which we are born, we possess, in a greater or less degree, in one line of thought or another, a power of assimilation arising from the greater or less degree of receptivity which we possess on that subject. Thus, for instance, some learn with ease mathematics, while others show a great aptitude for languages. This power of assimilation which we possess can be developed in each of us to an extent varying ad infinitum by means of the multiplicity of analogous sensations which we receive.

But just as, if we use our arms almost exclusively, they will acquire greater strength to the detriment of other portions of our body, they will become more apt to fulfill their office in proportion as our other limbs become less so, even so the more our power of assimilation exercises itself in consequence of the multiplicity of analogous sensations produced by one line of thought, all the more, relatively to the whole of our faculties, shall we resist the assimilation of ideas derived from an adverse line of thought. Thus it is that if we have come to consider one sort of thing or idea true and good we shall be shocked at all contrary ideas and oppose a great power of resistance to their assimilation, although to another they may appear so natural and so just that he cannot in good faith understand how one can think otherwise. Every day we see examples of this, and I do not think any one will seriously deny its truth. This fact once formulated and admitted, as each act is the result of one or several ideas, it becomes evident that in order to judge a man, in order to understand the responsibility of an individual in the accomplishment of a deed, we must be able to know each of the sensations which have led to the accomplishment of that deed, appreciate their intensity, know the power of assimilation or force of resistance which each of them has encountered in him, as well as the time during which he has been under the influence, first, of each of them, then, of several, and last, of all.

Now who can give you the faculty of perceiving and feeling what others perceive and feel or have perceived and felt? How can you judge an individual if you can not know precisely the causes which have led to his act? And how can you get to know all these causes as well as their relationship to each other, if you cannot penetrate the hidden workings of his brain and identify yourself with him so as to know his inner self? But in order to do that it would be necessary to understand his disposition better than one often understands one's own; much more than this—it would be necessary to have a similar disposition, to subject oneself to the same influences, to live in the same environment for the same period, for that would be the only way to become aware of the number and strength of the influences of the environment when compared with the power of assimilation which those influences have encountered in the individual.

It is thus impossible to judge our fellow creatures, as it is impossible for us to know precisely the influences which they obey and the strength of the sensations that determine their acts when compared with their power of assimilation or their forces of resistance. But if this impossibility did not exist we should, at the most, only be able to appreciate exactly the various influences which they obeyed, their mutual relationship, the greater or lesser power of submitting themselves to these influences; but, for all that, we should not be able to judge of their responsibility in the accomplishment of an act, for this good and great reason—responsibility does not exist.

To understand well the non-existence of responsibility it suffices to consider the various intellectual faculties displayed in man. For responsibility to exist it would be necessary that the will should determine the sensations, just as these determine the thought and that determines the act. But, on the contrary, it is the sensations which determine the will, which give rise to it in us, and which direct it. For will is only the desire which we have to accomplish something destined to satisfy one of our needs—that is to say, to obtain a pleasurable sensation, to avoid a painful sensation; consequently, we must feel or have felt these sensations in order that will may rise in us. And will, created in us by sensations, can only be changed by new sensations; that is to say, it can only take a new direction, pursue a different object, if new sensations give rise in us to a new line of thought or modify our former line of thought. This has been recognized in all ages: you yourselves recognize it; for, after all, do you not hear pleaded before you the case for the prosecution and the defense, that new sensations, reaching you through the sense of hearing, can give rise in you to a will to act in one way or another, or modify your former will? But as I said in the beginning, if one is accustomed, in consequence of a long succession of analogous sensations, to consider one idea good and just, all contrary ideas will shock us, and we present a great force of resistance to the assimilation of them.

It is for this reason that old people adopt with difficulty new ideas because, in the course of their existence, they have been subjected to a number of sensations arising from the environment in which they have lived, which have led them to consider as good ideas those which are in accordance with the generally accepted idea of right and wrong prevailing in that environment. It is for this same reason that the conception of justice and injustice has constantly varied in the course of centuries, that today it varies greatly in different countries, in different nations and even in different men; and as these diverse conceptions can only be relatively good and just, we must conclude that a great portion, if not the whole, of mankind are yet at fault on this subject. This also explains to us why an argument that will convince one man will leave another unmoved.

But, whatever happens, he who is struck by an argument will be unable to prevent his will being influenced by it in some direction; and he whom the argument has left unmoved will be unable to prevent his will from remaining in the same condition as before; consequently the one will be unable to prevent himself from acting in one way, the other in a contrary way—unless new sensation should intervene to modify their will.

Although it may sound like a paradox, we perform no act, good or bad, no matter how insignificant it may be, which we are not forced to perform, since every act is the result of the relationship which exists between one or more sensations arising from the environments in which we live and the greater or lesser power of assimilation which they may encounter in us. Then, since we cannot be responsible for the greater or lesser power of assimilation which we possess with regard to some order of sensations, nor for the existence or non-existence of influences arising from the environment in which we live and for the sensations which result from it, any more than for their relationship to each other or for our greater or lesser respective faculty or force of resistance; neither can we be responsible for the result of this relationship, since it is not only independent of our will, but determines our will. Hence, any judicial act is impossible, and punishment and reward are alike unjust, however slight they may be, and however great the good or evil of the deed.

By the mere fact of birth every human being has a right to live, labor and be happy. This right of circulating freely in space, the earth under one's feet, the sky above one's head, the sunlight in one's eyes, the air in one's lungs, this primordial right, this inexpressible and natural right anterior to all others, is today denied to millions of human beings.

These disinherited millions, from whom the rich have taken the earth, the common mother, cannot take a step to the right or left, cannot eat or sleep—cannot, in a word, give free play to their organs, cannot satisfy their needs and live without the permission of other men; their life is always precarious, at the mercy of the caprice of those who have become their masters. They cannot circulate in the great domain of humanity without encountering barriers at every step, without being stopped by the words: "Don't go into that field, it is So-and-so's; don't go into that wood, it belongs to this one; don't pick that fruit, don't catch those fish, they belong to that one."

And if they ask, "Why, then, what have we got?" they will be answered, "Nothing! you have nothing." And already, while still quite small, their brains are so fashioned by religion and law that they may accept without murmuring this outrageous injustice.

The earth revolves around the sun and presents alternately each of its sides to the vivifying influence of that star, but this great revolution is not made for the equal benefit of all human creatures; for the earth belongs to some and not to others—men have bought it with their silver and gold. But by what subterfuge has this been accomplished, since gold and silver are contained in the earth with other metals? How is it that a part can equal in volume the whole? How is it that after buying the earth with their gold they still possess that gold? Mystery! All, from the depths of the earth and the bottom of the seas to the tops of mountains, all belongs to them. Forests formerly grew so that this man could give a dowry to his daughter; geological revolutions took place that that man might give a palace to his mistress; and it was in order that they might drink champagne that those forests were slowly converted into coal.

While they are able to traverse the earth in all direction, to enjoy all horizons, to live in constant communion with nature, and to seek at the inexhaustible source of poetry the most refined and sweet sensations that can thrill a human being, you shall have for all your horizon the four walls of your hovel, your workshop, the penal settlement or the prison; a mere human machine whose life consists of one act indefinitely repeated, you must recommence each day the task of yesterday, until some wheel breaks in you, or worn out and old you are cast into the gutter as unable to provide them with sufficient returns. Woe to you if illness cast you down—if, young or old, you should be too weak to produce at the good pleasure of the possessing classes! Woe to you if you find no one to whom you may prostitute your brain, your arm, your body—you will fall from abyss to abyss; they will make a crime of your rags, a reproach of your pangs of hunger; the whole society will hurl anathemas at you, and Authority intervening, law in hand, will cry after you: "Woe to the homeless! woe to those who have no roof to shelter them; woe to him who has no bed on which to rest his weary limbs! woe to him who dares to be hungry when others have overfed! woe to him who is cold when others are warm! woe to vagabonds! woe to the vanquished!" Law will strike them for having nothing when others have all. "It is just," says law. "It is a crime," say we; "it must not be—it must cease to exist, for it is unjust."

Too long have men accepted as a moral law the impression of the will of the few and powerful; too long has the wickedness of some found accomplices in the ignorance and cowardice of others; too long have men been blind to the voice of reason, justice and nature; too long have they accepted lies as truth. And here is the truth: What is life but a perpetual process of assimilation and dispersion which incorporates with the human being molecules of matter in diverse forms and then snatches them away to combine them anew in a thousand different ways; a perpetual process of action and reaction between the individual and his environment, which is composed of all that is not himself; such is life! All things animate and inanimate perpetually tend, by their continuous action, to the absorption of the individual, to the dissolution of his identity, to his death. Nature only fashions new from old; she always destroys to create; she brings life out of death, and she has to kill what is to give birth to what shall be. Thus life is only possible to the individual through perpetual reaction between himself and the totality of things that surround him. He can only live on condition of combating the decomposition which all things subject him to, by assimilating to himself new molecules which, in his turn, he must borrow from everything.

And, indeed, all animate objects, at whatever stage of organization they may be, from zoophytes to men, are provided with requisite faculties for combating the decomposition of their organisms by incorporating in themselves new elements borrowed from the environment in which they live. All are provided with more or less perfect organs designed to prevent the presence of causes likely to bring about too swift a decomposition. All are provided with organs enabling them to fight against the disorganizing influence of the elements. Why should they be provided with these organs if they are not to use them—if it is not right for them to make use of them?

Let the one side cease to deny the other the right to life and happiness, and prostitution and murder will

disappear; for all are born equally free and good. It is the social laws that make men bad and unjust, slaves and masters, robbed and robbers, murderers and victims. Every man is an independent autonomous being—that is why the independence of each should be respected. Every attempt against natural liberty, every enforced restraint, is a crime which calls for revolt.

I am well aware that my argument bears no relation to the political economy taught by M. Leroy-Beaulieu, nor to the morality of Malthus, nor the Christian Socialism of Leo XIII., who preaches the renunciation of riches while himself surrounded by wealth, and humility while proclaiming himself first of all men. I am well aware that this natural philosophy runs counter to all generally accepted ideas, be they religious, moral or political. But its ultimate victory is assured for it is superior to all other philosophical theory, to all other moral conception, for it vindicates no right for one that it does not equally vindicate for others; and it means true equality, it implies justice. It does not bend before either time or environment—and does not proclaim the same action both good and bad. It has nothing in common with that double-faced morality common among men now-a-days which decides an action to be good or bad according to the latitude or longitude in which it is performed. And as it does not admit of either punishment or reward, it does not call for the guillotine on the one hand and an apotheosis on the other. In place of the innumerable and ever-changing moral laws invented by some to enslave others, and proving their frailty by their very number and instability, it substitutes natural justice, the immutable law of good and evil, which is the work of no man, but results from the internal organization of each. The good is that which is good for us, which procures for us pleasurable sensations, and as it is these sensations that determine our will, the good is that which we desire; evil is that which is bad for us, that which gives us painful sensations, that which we do not desire. Do as you wish, is the only law our justice recognizes; for it proclaims the liberty of each in the equality of all.

Those who think none would work unless compelled, forget that inaction is death—that we have energies to expend in order to renew them continuously, and that health and happiness can only be preserved by activity—that as none wish to be unhappy and ill, all will have to use their organs so as to enjoy all their faculties; for a faculty which is not used does not exist, and that means one source of happiness less in the life of the individual.

Tomorrow, as today, as yesterday, men will wish to be happy, they will always expend their energy, they will always work; but as the work of all will be productive of social wealth, the happiness of all and each will be augmented thereby and thus each will be able to enjoy the luxury to which he is entitled; for there is no such thing as the superfluous, and all that can exist is necessary.

Man is not only a stomach—he has also a brain; he requires books, pictures, statues, music, poetry, just as he requires bread, air and sunlight; but, just as in his consumption he must be limited only by his power of consumption, so in his production he must be limited only by his power of production, and as he consumes according to his needs, he must produce according to his capacity. And who can know his needs better than himself? Who can know his capacity better than himself? No one: consequently man must produce and consume according to his own will.

Humanity has always had the latent knowledge that it could only be happy and that all the beautiful qualities of human nature would only be able to expand under Communism.

Thus the golden age of the ancients was based on common property, and it never occurred to the choicest natures who have poetised the past that the happiness of man was compatible with private property. They knew by intuition or experience that all the evils and vices of humanity arise from the antagonism of interests created by individual appropriation unlimited by needs, and they never dreamed of a society without wars, murders, prostitution, crime and vice which was not also without property-owners.

It is because we wish for no more wars, murders, prostitution, vice, and crime that we struggle for human liberty and dignity. Our enslavement teaches men to revolt; our imprisonment that they have a right to liberty; and by our death they learn that they have a right to live. Presently, when we shall return to prison and you to your families, superficial observers will think we are the conquered. An error—we are the men of the future, and you are the men of the past. We

represent tomorrow, and you yesterday; and no one has the power to prevent each minute that goes by from bringing nearer the morrow and distancing yesterday. Yesterday has always tried to bar the way of the morrow and it has always been conquered in its very victory; for the time it had passed in conquering had brought it nearer its defeat.

It made Socrates drink the hemlock; it made Galileo recant under pain of torture; it burnt John Huss, Stephen Dolcet, William of Prague, Giordano Bruno; it guillotined Herbert, Babœuf; it poisoned Blanqui; it shot Flourens and Ferre. What were the names of the judges of Socrates, of Galileo, of John Huss, of William of Prague, of Stephen Dolcet, of Giordano Bruno, of Herbert, of Babœuf, of Blanqui, of Flourens, of Ferre? No one knows; they are the past; they were dead while yet they lived. They have not even attained the fame of Erostrates, while Socrates is immortal, while Galileo yet lives, while John Huss exists, while William of Prague, Giordano Bruno, Stephen Dolcet, Herbert, Babœuf, Blanqui, Flourens and Ferre live.

Thus we shall be happy in our misfortune, triumphant in our misery, victorious in our defeat. We shall be happy, whatever happens; for we are certain that at the breath of the renovating idea others will be brought to the truth, others take up our interrupted task and bring it to a good end; and that a day will come when the star that gilds the harvests will shine on humanity without armies, without cannons, without frontiers, without barriers, without prisons, without magistrates, without police, without laws and without gods; free at last intellectually and physically, and men, reconciled with nature and themselves, will at last be able to quench their thirst for justice in the universal harmony.

What matters it if this great day be impurpled by the glow of fires? what matters it if in the morning of that day the dew be bloody? The tempest is also useful to purify the atmosphere; the sun shines more brightly after the storm.

And the glorious sun of liberty shall shine and humanity be happy. Then each sheltering his individual happiness behind the universal happiness, no one will do evil because it is to no one's advantage to do evil.

Free man in the midst of enfranchised humanity will be able to march unhindered from victory to victory for the good of all toward the unbounded infinity of his intellectual powers.—(Slightly condensed, from "Anarchy on Trial".

July the Fourth.

ONE more anniversary of our glorious "national birthday" will have passed before this paper goes to press. Again the great American eagle—the robber of both land and sea—will have screamed of liberty and a thousand cannon will have thundered forth in glorification of the shaking off of the British yoke by the American colonies.

Strains of music will have noated out upon the air from tens of thousands of brass instruments, and wild and florid flights of rhetoric will have been indulged in by hosts of politicians and pettyfoggers. Millions of dollars will have been spent in fireworks and costly street parades.

And all for what? Is the right of revolution the theme of the orator, or revolutionary songs the music discoursed by band and chorus? I should say not.

This gala day, this great American holiday is supposedly a celebration of the heroism and courage of our forefathers who dared to revolt against him whom God had appointed to rule over them, and to launch that famous revolutionary document, the Declaration of Independence, upon the sea of adventure, and teach and foster a love of liberty and a spirit of rebellion against tyranny. But is that the purpose today? I should say not.

Long ago the old fire of enthusiasm burned out in the breasts of the American people. No longer do people assemble to express their love for the "land of the free and the home of the brave". But the merchant, steeped in the greed of gain, the politician, anxious for popular applaud and cheap notoriety, and the real estate shark, desirous of increasing the value of his town lots, get together and arrange a program and advertise their "celebration"; secure reduced rates of transportation on the rivers and railroads, and work their venture for all it is worth.

The farmer, weary of following the plow, the mechanic, anxious for a little recreation, and the chil-

dren, attracted by the blare of bands and the gay colored bunting, all flock to the city to see and hear and to spend their hard earned dollars and pennies.

This is the average Fourth of July celebration of today. A farce, a humbug. It is prompted by the commercial spirit and contributes to the support of present methods. While the glitter is dazzling the eyes and the strains of "Hail, Columbia" and the beautiful words of the silver-tongued orators are beguiling the ears of the listening multitudes, there are other forces at work unseen and unrecognized. While the government is being glorified and lauded to the skies, the insidious power of that government is depriving thousands of their homes and preventing millions from earning a living, and as surely as time goes on and effect follows cause rebellion against such conditions must come. For every shout of praise there are a million groans of agony; for every word of eulogy there is a curse of hatred, and as the band plays "My Country" the sensitive ear can catch the wail of starving children and the moans of disconsolate mothers. Thus the farce of glorification of our country's greatness goes on, and the fires of revolution smoulder below. Henceforth let every fourth of July celebration close with a dirge in mourning for the loss of true manhood and the love of liberty, while labor, clothed in rags, drapes the Goddess of Liberty in black.

HENRY ADDIS.

Note and Comment.

AN illustration of how much may be expected from political action can be seen from the present attitude of some of the democrats, as well as that of the Peoples Party National Executive Committee. Henry M. Teller, the bogus silverite from Colorado, is being favored by them for presidential nomination as the combined silverite candidate. He is a republican in every sense, his record on the silver question very faulty, and should he be elected he would unquestionably use his patronage to build up the silver wing of the republican party, and yet the party that four years ago was declared to be revolutionary, by its leaders, now proposes to elect him to the presidency of the United States. Thus political action has turned what at first was a revolutionary movement in a time serving hypocritical effort to gain a little power.

If the money that has been and will be wasted by the workmen this year on election campaigns was expended in co-operative efforts and for radical propaganda, much good would undoubtedly result therefrom, the day of emancipation be brought much nearea.

H. A.

The Letter-Box.

L. E. P., Chicago.—Your photograph is a desirable addition to our "crank gallery." Accept thanks and an exchange.

J. A. P., New York City.—The gold pin and locket, to be raffled for the press fund, received. When the articles are disposed of we will give you credit in the press fund. Thanks.

O. W. v. G., Chicago.—Your manuscript received and will "keep" until we have room. Articles should be confined within as small a space as possible until we are able to enlarge to eight pages.

J. M. P., Los Angeles, Cal.—You will notice in the discussion going on that we agree with you that "there is no middle road between tyranny and liberty," and are doing our best to convince others of the fact. Thanks for subscriptions.

H. A. K., Boston.—It appears to me that your article in reply to Morris is simply a reassertion of your former contentions, and a reply would simply be a reassertion of the former reply. This, it is evident, would be a waste of time and space, and I fear our readers would tire of so monotonous a discussion. We have already been accused of having too much discussion of what we will do under Anarchy. I think that people who know how to secure Anarchy will know how to deal with invaders. Read "Reward and Punishment" in this issue before carrying the discussion any further.

A. I.

The Free Initiative.

This is the name of a new association of French, Spanish, German, Italian and Jewish Anarchists, who intend to join some colony or establish a new one, to be conducted on Anarchist-Communist principles, with the special purpose of furnishing a home

and school for orphans of comrades and children of imprisoned parents. In order to obtain means for the undertaking it is proposed to issue 5000 shares or memberships at one dollar each, which will be paid back from a fund to be provided for the purpose. These arrangements are made to enable any comrade to become a member. For further information address L. Rudash, 162 Norfolk street, New York. The committee meets every Saturday, 8:00 p. m., at this address.

An Anarchist Allegory.

DESIRING to make an allegory with the titles of all the periodicals, past and present, which defend and have defended the Anarchist idea, all groups, editorial boards and comrades are requested to send a copy of each periodical to G. R., La Voz de la Mujer, A. Barcla, Casilla de Correo 1277, Buenos Aires, Argentina.

The Anarchist press of Europe and America are requested to copy.

Printing-Press Fund.

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

Previously acknowledged.....\$16.00
C. Pfuetzner, Chicago.....2.00

Receipts.

Pfuetzner, \$2.00. Morwitz, \$1.00. Masur, 75c. Klos, Allen, Enright, McGraft, Coyle, Johnson, Fuller, Klein, Frank, Soupel, Novak, each 50c. Teary, Taylor, Maja, Dubinsky, Neff, each 25c.

OMAHA: PROGRESSIVE CLUB, meets Wednesday, 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.

Agents for THE FIREBRAND.

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

C. G. Schmidt, 412 South 13th Str., Omaha, Neb.

L. Rudash, 162 Norfolk street, New York City.

G. Lang, 29 Grape Street, Buffalo, N. Y.

L. Rabotnik, 731 Plover St., Philadelphia, Pa.

B. Morwitz, 1141 E. Lombard st. Baltimore, Md.

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