



VOL. II.

PORTLAND, OREGON, SUNDAY, JULY 12, 1896.

No. 23.

## 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.

### Anarchy.

What name excites the fear of kings,  
Plotting tyrocrats, robber rings,  
Because their doom to them it brings?  
Anarchy!

What single word with fear inspires  
The soul-enslaving Church, whose spires  
Reach upward to the ariel fires?  
Anarchy!

What name so dreadful to the ear  
Of all who rob mankind by fear?  
What name that freemen all revere?  
Anarchy!

What principle will set us free?  
And give to all full liberty?  
And bring to each prosperity?  
Anarchy!

What sounds for truth a bugle call?  
What makes of liberty a wall?  
What is the foe of despots all?  
Anarchy!

What is the dawning age at hand,  
When freedom reigns in every land  
From frozen North to coral strand?  
Anarchy!

ROSS WINN.

### Anarchist Organization.

It is not enough to have high ideals; it is necessary to know how to work them out in practice. The ideal of the early republicans was anarchistic; but they made mistakes in their reasoning, and on that account adopted a system which, though meant to put their ideal into practice, was like the former monarchical and aristocratic systems, only capable of putting and keeping it out of practice. Besides, they had not seen the whole of the evil in its true light; consequently in their scheme of reform they made no provision for getting rid of some of the worst elements of social enslavement and misery. Unfortunately, at the present time, there appears a tendency in the Anarchist movement toward a similar error.

For some time past there have been meetings taking place at which some "collective action" has been proposed to those assembled, or in a formed group some course has been proposed for the group to take as a body. Those to whom these proposals have been presented have not been all of the same opinion on the matter; and consequently, as the Anarchists have abandoned the system of deciding by majority vote, nothing has been arrived at. Very often the meetings have broken up in disorder, or the group in which this collective action was proposed has been split up into two or more smaller groups entirely separate from each other.

Looking at the facts, it has seemed to certain comrades that the Anarchist idea had been pushed

too far, and that for "collective action" it is necessary that the minority should consent to abide by the will of the majority. In England a society has been formed on these lines with a view to organize the Anarchist movement around this principle.

The fact of the matter is that instead of the Anarchist idea having been pushed too far it has not been pushed far enough, and a certain remnant of the State superstition has not been gotten rid of, and this is the cause of the difficulty in doing anything, and of the quarrels and separations. Suppose a meeting is convened to obtain an expression of opinion on, for instance, the sending of Anarchist delegates to a labor congress. The old habitual style is to consider the meeting as if it were a person with a choice and voice of its own; and so long as this superstition is persisted in there will be no other way of coming to any decision than either for the majority to rule, and utter its own view in the name of the whole meeting (which is a lie), or else for all those present to be able to come to some unanimous conclusion. But a public meeting is only a more convenient way of doing what might be done by sending out canvassers with lists to obtain signatures, or by an appeal through the press. Instead of the proposer of a notion going to the people they come to him, and he doesn't have to repeat the same argument over to each individual separately, but says it once to all; and those who have arguments to the contrary, instead of only explaining them to him, or running about to their neighbors, who may or may not have committed themselves, speak also to all before any one has taken the final step.

Evidently, the affirmation to which two, or two thousand, or two million, people attach their signatures would be a collective expression of opinion, but not the collective expression of opinion of all those who had been invited to sign, unless they had happened to be unanimous. An affirmation to the contrary effect signed by more than one person would equally be a collective expression of opinion. The absurdity of requiring that either all the people in a public meeting shall have one opinion, or that only the opinion of the majority shall be expressed, is equal to that of requiring that before a census return can be made up all the population must be males or all females, or else the population shall be assigned to whichever sex proves to be in the majority. The proceedings at a meeting should be taken in this sense: After listening to the arguments advanced, 2000 persons agreed to the expression of the opinion that delegates might advisedly be sent; 1000 expressed themselves to the contrary, and 500 declined to commit themselves to either statement of opinion. It was then put to those who wished the delegates to go what steps should be taken, with the result that such a proposal was taken up by 1000, another by 300, and a third was agreed to by most of both these sections, whilst such and such other propositions were not carried further at the meeting, there not being enough people in favor of them to encourage the supporters to combine for action. It was then brought before the

meeting (for instance) that a suggestion had been made for raising a statue to the Chicago martyrs; another idea was put forward that it would be preferable to issue a million copies of their speeches; a third idea put forth was that it would be much better to expend so much energy and resources in publishing something calculated to give a clearer and more thorough idea of Anarchy in a more concise form. So many persons expressed themselves in favor of one plan, so many in favor another, including some who supported two and even the three projects. Then the several parties made their arrangements for pushing the schemes further afield.

Similarly in a group. That group is formed in view of a definite purpose, say for establishing regular meetings at which all those who partake in a general way of the same line of thought can make each others acquaintance, exchange ideas, and keep themselves in mutual communication. To bring forward a project of action or of expression of opinion to be taken up by that group is a mistake; it is the same thing in principle as proposing to the members of a building society that the said society take up life insurance and share broking or stock-jobbing. The meeting of the group may be very convenient for bringing a proposal under the notice of those most likely to fall in with it; but each separate purpose calls for a distinct combination to undertake it. There is no reason why those who can agree to unite in establishing a series of good discussion meetings should break up into two parties each of which singly is too weak to hire a hall, simply because those of the one party believe, for instance, in trying to work with the Socialists in the propaganda of discontent, whilst those of the other side prefer to ignore the Socialists except as enemies; or because some would like to purchase the works of Proudhon, whilst others think it more essential to obtain those of Bakounine and Grave and Kropotkin. Neither is there any necessity that to keep the meetings going either the majority or the minority of those concerned in them should give up their views on other matters. Let those who wish to join hands with the Socialists in attacking the outside of the present system combine among themselves to do so in any way they may be able, and so also on the other side; and let those who want to place Proudhon's works in the meeting room open a fund among themselves for that purpose, and those who want other works or collection of works subscribe independently for that. It is a foolish thing for a number of people to say, "Let us combine and act together," and then have to discuss afterwards what they are going to do; or to subscribe to a fund and decide afterward what the fund is to be applied to. When they know what it is proposed to do and how it is proposed to do it, they are in a position to know whether they can join in the work; and when they know nothing about a certain thing being before them they are not in a position to know how they will agree or differ; therefore they can only combine for definitely understood purposes, and the idea of thrusting any new purpose upon a given combination is ridiculous.

It is individuals who do anything, whether alone



or in combination. Such a "group," "society," "club," "meeting," etc., etc., is not a living thing capable of doing anything; it simply stands for the fact that certain individuals are associated together in some particular work, whether that be keeping in touch with each other, or exchanging ideas, or doing certain agreed propaganda. The fact of their habitually coming together in this way may be taken advantage of to enable such of them as are agreed on the subject to combine for some further purpose without at all interfering with the way in which they are already combined with each other and the rest for the purpose common to all, so long as this purpose commends itself to them. But people have been stupid enough to want such or such a thing done in name of "this meeting," or "this society," and therefore they had to arrive at absolute unanimity or else choose between majority-worship and continual secessions. They have failed to discriminate between the collective action of those who all want to do one thing one way, and the getting everybody of a certain lot of people to act in one way whatever their differences be. They have clung to the old State idea at heart and still think it is necessary for those who patronize the hotel bar to decide (unanimously or by majority) as to the furniture of the hotel bedrooms; and it is not at all surprising that State principles refuse to work out satisfactorily on Anarchist lines.

It is to be regretted that the individuals who have failed to see this, and who are trying to reconcile Anarchy with this State kind of idea by abolishing Anarchy, have thought fit to assume the title of "The Associated Anarchists". This title is capable of greatly misleading the public, though those who have adopted it may intend only to imply that those who decline to go backward with them are disassociated Anarchists. Their mode of organization is decidedly reactionary. The members agree to pay weekly according to their means into a fund that will be at the disposal of the majority. The other matters that may come forward each will be free to stand aloof from, but if he desires to participate in collective action he agrees to abide the decision of the majority. Each group is to have certain officials elected by the majority, and rules of its own (called "voluntary agreements") passed from time to time by the majority. No more complete breakdown could be imagined than this. It is a virtual affirmation that in the opinion of Anarchists, from their experience among themselves, Anarchy is impracticable, and a surrender to the advance guard of Social Democracy. Only, as I have shown, whatever they may (like the republicans of old) have thought about themselves, they were never completely Anarchists, and their experience only demonstrates that a rehash of State-like institutions and habits on Anarchist lines is impracticable, as much so as a rehash of theology on atheistic principles. As I said before, it shows not that our ideas have been carried too far, but that they have not been carried far enough.

J. A. ANDREWS.

### Comrade Turner's Propaganda.

ON his way west Comrade Turner spent two weeks in Buffalo, leaving June 21 for Cleveland, on invitation of the Central Labor Union of that city.

In Buffalo he spoke at seven meetings. On account of the intense heat and the short time we had in which to arrange matters, the audiences were small, but his stay has levelled the ground for following speakers. He has gained quite a few sympathisers among Americans, and I am convinced that on his way home he will be invited to speak to the Buffalo Trades and Labor Council, of which event we shall make good use.

It was encouraging to note that the audiences were mostly American, who listened very attentively and earnestly took part in the discussions. The time is coming, I am sure, when even in the conservative city of Buffalo we will have an American movement.

The Social Democrats kept away from the meetings, I presume at the order of their leaders. Only a few had the courage to attend. Even the lecture on "Anarchy an Essential of Socialism", which was expected to draw their fire, had no effect, although their officials were notified.

On June 14 Comrade Turner addressed the Ger-

man comrades, encouraging them and urging them to push on the propaganda in English, calling to their attention how the movement has grown in England and what a difficult task the German comrades had to set it going. I think the comrades have been impressed with the necessity and importance of the American movement.

Western comrades desiring a visit from Comrade Turner may arrange matters through J. H. M. Kelly, 170 Hanover St., Boston, Mass.

Buffalo, N. Y., June 22.

G. LANG.

### Is Study Productive?

IN THE FIREBRAND for June 7, Mr. Morris informs us that "Holders of private property are not Anarchists—they are invaders. Private property is a denial of equality of opportunity." In what I had written about the policy of Anarchistic propaganda with reference to the question of Communism vs. Commercialism, I had started with the idea that the Firebrand group (including Mr. Morris) acknowledged a man's right to hold as private property the products of his own labor. Mr. Morris's present very clear statement shows me that I was wrong as regards him at least. Further discussion between us on this point will have to be on grounds of fundamental principle, if he believes that Anarchistic principles forbid the acknowledgment of private property in any case, while I believe that the same principles require it, there can be nothing but war between us on this point, however much we may agree to cooperate on other points, and there is no reason why either, in his propaganda, should give the impression that the other one's position is admissible in Anarchism.

This makes the question before us a new one, quite distinct from that on which we had already started a discussion. I shall be glad to debate this new question with Mr. Morris, but think we might as well leave it for another time, as I have already controversies enough to occupy all the space that THE FIREBRAND probably wants to give me.

Now as to the question of studies. Certain statements of Mr. Morris's may, I think, be fairly summarized thus: (1) Study is an unproductive occupation; (2) Teaching is an unproductive occupation; (3) there is no reason why men twenty years old should be supported wholly or partly at the expense of others in order that they may devote themselves to study, since men forty or sixty years old have the same right to study; (4) it is the school teacher's special province to teach children to expect excessive benefits from government.

All this I don't believe. For,

(1) Learning is valuable. There may be doubts about the value of Greek or metaphysics, but there can be no doubt of the value of geography, astronomy, chemistry and the numerous sciences concerned in engineering and surgery, nor of the value of skill in blacksmithing and cooking. And this learning is valuable not only to him who has it, but to society; and most so in that society where each is most fully the helper of all.

(2) Learning requires teachers. Even those who are well able to learn from books without teachers—among whom I think I am an extreme case for the extent to which I prefer the written page to the spoken word—find themselves much helped when a teacher is added to the book; and many people are almost entirely helpless when set to get knowledge of an unfamiliar subject from a book alone.

Learning requires study—that is, exertion on the part of the learner.

Since learning is a valuable thing, and exertion on the part of both teacher and learner is necessary to obtain it, it follows that this exertion is productive exertion, producing learning. The fact that the valuable product is an immaterial one makes no difference, so long as it is something socially valuable. If the engineer's knowledge is a necessary factor in the building of a great bridge—as we all know it is—the time spent in getting that knowledge is practically time spent in building the bridge. Sir Henry Bessemer's chemical studies, leading to the invention of the Bessemer process for making steel, have a larger share in the production of this year's output of rails than the labor done this year by any thousand men living; therefore those studies were productive.

(3) Man has two motives for studying: the pleasure of studying (if the study happens to be an enjoyable one) and the hope of the use he will hereafter make of the knowledge that results from his studies. The former motive may be equal in old and young, though I think it is generally said that the appetite for learning

is stronger in the young; but as to the latter, the inequality is glaring. The twenty-year-old has before him the prospect of fifty years' use for what he learns, the forty-year-old of only thirty. Then, since the twenty-year-old is to get more satisfaction from his studies, and his studies are to be more useful to society, I do not see why a society that professes to give to each according to his needs should not give him as much preference in providing opportunities for study as the existing society does.

Besides, the grown man, having a greater power for creative work, and understanding more fully the world's need, has a much greater appetite for such work, which crowds out in part his appetite for study.

Further, since a man who has studied can do more and better work than one who has not, we naturally expect more work from him; and there is more economy in finishing a thorough training as soon as possible, in order that we may as soon as possible have the use of a thoroughly trained workman. That part of study which relates to the mechanical trades used to be managed on Mr. Morris's principle. A boy was apprenticed for seven years to a master who, within that time, was to teach him the trade, and meanwhile make the boy do work enough to pay for his board and instruction. To-day we are beginning to substitute the trade-school system, by which a boy devotes his entire working time to the learning of the trade. This turns out a skilled blacksmith much quicker than the old way, and I understand that smiths trained in schools are generally better workmen than the smiths trained in shops. Carpenters the same. This being so, it is obvious that in ten or fifteen years a young man will have done more work for society because of having been allowed to concentrate his study of the trade in the first two or three of those years and his work in the rest, than if he had to mix study and work through the first half of the time. In the former case all his work is that of a well-trained workman; in the latter the part done during his apprenticeship is mainly that of a blundering beginner, and the whole amount of work is no greater than in the former.

Again, in many kinds of work—such as engineering and surgery—a very considerable time of study is needed to make a good workman; seven years at least—leaving the common school under our present system. Certainly some of this time is wasted in useless or ill-planned studies, but it is not likely that more than one year of the seven could be saved by a more reasonable curriculum. The young man is old enough as it is before he gets really to work; if his time for study is cut down, so as to make his preparation take more years, there is danger that before he has had much of the benefit of actual experience he will be too old a dog to learn new tricks.

In truth, Mr. Morris's demand that everybody should pay for his own support from year to year seems to me exaggeratedly and unreasonably commercialistic. I had supposed that under Anarchist-Communism, of all systems in the world, the less able would be supported partly at the expense of the more able; and certainly half-trained young men are less able, and fully-trained, mature men are more able.

(5) I don't know what a teacher's theoretical calling is, but practically his main business is to teach children what their parents want taught; and what the parents want is the branches that will fit the child for a clerkship in a store. This includes arithmetic, geography and grammar, but no political principles of any kind, good or bad.

STEPHEN T. BYINGTON.

P. S.—Mr. Borland has been telling us what property isn't. Now, if he will tell us what it is, perhaps I can join Addis and Ballou in agreeing to all that he says.

Replying at once to the question with which Mr. Byington heads his article, I must say that it depends upon what is studied. He will notice that in No. 18 I distinctly said that I recognized the usefulness of scientific research. Therefore his imputation that I consider study altogether unproductive is wrong. But research must be voluntary to secure the best results; and since the right of all persons to study, each in his chosen line, is equal, no one may do so at the expense of some one else. Otherwise, there is an end of liberty. And though the study of the younger student may be more materially beneficial to society than that of the older, I must remind Mr. Byington, the Individualist, that the right of the individual to liberty is the supreme right.

If society must support the student, then society



may say what he shall study. Thus, voluntarism is totally destroyed and only the State, in some form, can arrange and carry out the program.

But, putting the matter on a purely commercial basis, as Mr. Byington does—that is, that the future social value of the knowledge acquired by the student is to pay for his support while acquiring it—it is plain that those who are most benefitted should pay the most toward the student's support. Who is most benefitted—the passing or the rising generation? The men of forty and sixty or the man of twenty? The latter, unquestionably. If the younger student will have the longer time in which to apply his knowledge, which is the reason for his greater desire for knowledge, as well as the greater social value of that knowledge, according to Mr. Byington, he will also have the longer time in which to enjoy the benefits thereof. If Bessemer's production is equal to that of a thousand of the workmen without whom his knowledge would be valueless, and he is to "hold as private property the product of his exertions", why should those workmen, or their fathers, have been taxed or otherwise compelled to support Bessemer the student? Whose commercialism is the more logical, his own or that which he (falsely) attributes to me? The present generation is under no greater obligation, commercially or otherwise, to provide for the future generation than it is to pay the debts of the past generation. That it may voluntarily do either will not be questioned.

This is what I contend for: not to lessen education, but to facilitate it by making it wholly free and voluntary. My main effort in this discussion has been to show that students, as such, need not be supported, since under equality of opportunity the exercise necessary to physical health, if devoted to productive pursuits, would provide their own support. It is reasonable to suppose that a free, able-bodied person would not want to be supported; and, anyhow, I deny his right to demand it. But if one is forced into school, even though provided with support, on the ground that his learning will be more valuable to society than his present direct production, then he is no longer a free individual.

It is absurd to suppose that a free individual will apply himself to any but those studies which attract him. We do not choose that which repels us. We study from a single, not a twofold, motive—the desire to satisfy self. The benefit derived by society from that study is a mere incident, not an end. If the desire of the man of forty or sixty for study is less than that of the man of twenty, the older man's right to dispose of his time as pleases himself is still superior to the younger's claim upon him for support. And the social value of the knowledge which the student is acquiring does not entitle society to either dictate the studies to be pursued or to tax the individual for the support of the student.

If society, or the parents of students, must support the teacher, then of course he must teach according to dictation, and State schools are a logical result. As to what they do teach under the State school system, I need only refer to the text books. Before me lies the program of a local public school commencement. Almost every number deals with some patriotic or political subject—"clerkships" and kindred topics receive no consideration whatever. This in a grammar school! I have been through the same mill. But this dependence of students and teacher is death to progress. Pursuits directed by old people are nearly always conservative, sometimes liberal, but seldom progressive. Was it not Bessemer's independent study, without the dictation of a teacher, that led to his valuable discovery? Who that depended on the teachers of Columbus' time would ever have learned that the earth is a globe? There is certain elementary knowledge that must be learned from others, perhaps. But one of the strongest instincts of our nature is the desire to communicate our knowledge, our opinions and our thoughts to our fellows. What parent does not delight in helping an infant to learn to walk and talk? Who that loves the little folks does not enjoy helping their minds to unfold? If society had not an employed teacher in all the world, under free conditions, we need not fear for the result. Association with people who read, write, calculate, etc., begets in the child a desire to understand these things, but an attempt to force

them upon him is a waste of time and an injury to the child. Neither can theoretical education proceed without practice. Unused knowledge is not long possessed. The reason the technical-school student is superior to the apprentice is that theory and practice are combined in the former case, while in the latter both are as limited as possible and the theoretical almost wholly absent. At eighteen I learned the carpenter's trade, beginning at almost no wage with the agreement that I was to be promoted as rapidly as possible. I found that I was very useful to my boss in cleaning up the litter, digging holes and setting fence posts, excavating for foundations, etc., but that he was of little use to me as a teacher of carpentry, never permitting me to touch a tool except when he could find no "common labor" to set me at. The commercial system made it to his interest to keep me ignorant—it was money in his pocket. I am satisfied that seven years of apprenticeship would not have given me the knowledge that I gained in one year when, at the end of six months, I secured another place as "capable of doing outside work." Here I got the medium wage and an opportunity to learn. I found that as an apprentice it was to every workman's interest to withhold knowledge from me—the trade was already overcrowded, I heard them saying, and still every farmer boy in the county wants to learn it; but when ostensibly a carpenter, my fellow workmen appeared not only willing but anxious to give an opinion upon any piece of work that puzzled me.

Now I claim that the abolition of the system that makes it a matter of pecuniary interest to withhold knowledge from the student—the system that makes patents and paid teachers possible—is the most important consideration for the advancement of education; and since the matter of education is not a question to be discussed independently of social conditions, I think we shall make little progress toward agreement when we are at the poles of opposition on the fundamental principles of sociology. So, whenever Mr. Byington chooses to begin, I think the property question may profitably supercede this discussion.

J. H. M.

### The Case Finally Closed.

IN THE FIREBRAND No. 17 Comrade Addis makes one more statement which is all mystification to me. He says: "In a condition of Communism all persons would occupy themselves in such employments as best suited them, etc."

I don't suppose he would abolish the railroads with the parasites, nor the manufactories and other useful employments outside of food-producing labor.

Now suppose everybody in a state of Communism should want to be railroad employes or manufacturers of some kind of useful goods and utensils, who would clean up the land and cultivate the soil that everybody might have bread and butter? As I understand his ideal Communism there are to be no bosses, no director to point out work to any, but each and every one to choose his occupation or no occupation as suits him best, as there is to be no compulsion.

I think under such regulations it would suit some people who are respectable loafers (parasites) now to go to the commune table and satisfy their hunger and thirst without giving any equivalent in return. I will just make the same proposition to Bro. Addis that an old darkey once made to a lawyer. The old man had got into trouble and sought the advice of one versed in intrigue. After stating all the "facts" in the case he looked wishfully at the barrister and said:—"Now boss I knows you's a lawyer, but please tell me the truth about that." Now if Bro. Addis will just tell me how he is going to make things even up without any kind of authority I will not disturb him any more. I don't want any more theorizing, as that is only evasion and not answer. I think his best way out would be to acknowledge that he has a theory, but don't know whether it will work or not until tried. I, too, have a theory and give it as such. My theory is for the government or Commune (its all the same in Dutch) to own the railroads, telegraphs, telephones, all manufacturing and mining interests, all navigation and navigable waters—everything that could be made a monopoly, and operate them in the interest of the people. Allow the employes as much wages, and no more, as a field hand could earn in the same time or hours of actual labor. The land, which should be as free as air and drinking water, to be used by actual cultivators, occupancy and use to be the only title, and they should sell to the employes of public works at prices proportionate to their wages. The government would have the right to collect enough outside of wages paid to defray contingents and no more. You will perhaps call that state-socialism, but I call it co-operation, and that's all we can expect until the hoghness instilled into all is educated out

of us. Of course there would be jobs for professional politicians until we were sufficiently educated to spurn them out of their jobs. In my opinion it would not be long under such conditions, before any able bodied person would be ashamed to live off of other people's earnings. That, however, would depend on the educational methods employed. But Bro. Addis' theory, like Bellamy's dream is not compatible with our surroundings. Indeed the realization of either would be all that is expected by the christian, or mohamedan, when he gets to his heaven in "The sweet by and by". I know that Communism is not impossible, but is very improbable in our present barbarous surroundings. Our students of human character say that traits are seen in the progeny for many generations. Then how long does Bro. Addis think it will take to educate the selfishness out of the offspring of the Goulds, Vanderbilts, Huntingtons and their like?

JAMES BEESON.

I would reply to Comrade Beeson's question thus: I cannot suppose that everyone would want to work at railroading or any one thing, for we are not all built alike, nor have all the same tastes and aptitudes. On the other hand, the diversity of tastes and aptitudes are as great as human needs and desires, and the diversity of employment and production would, in a condition of Communism, be as great as our desires.

Could such a condition be instituted immediately—which I have never admitted—some "respectable loafers" might "go to the Commune table and satisfy their hunger and thirst without giving any equivalent in return", for awhile; but that would not be a hundredth part as expensive as keeping the political and commercial parasites that we now support, and it would not last long. Public opinion would soon start these people to work at something, and their kind would not exist in the second generation.

In this question Comrade Beeson proposes—evidently unwittingly—compelling people to work, i. e., slavery.

I do not propose to make things even up, for that would require authority. I cannot, nor do I desire to, lay down rules or plans of action for the future society. Give us liberty, and experience will show us what methods are best to pursue.

I admit that what I propose is an untried theory, but every advance that has ever been made was at first an untried theory. Comrade Beeson's theory is not untried, is partially in operation in numerous countries, and has proven the reverse of what he predicts for it wherever it has been tried. Nationalization, wherever tried, has carried with it all the evils of political bossism and none of the blessings claimed for it.

On the question of free land we are agreed.

As soon as all are assured of plenty the "hoghness" is gone, for even a hog is contented when he has enough.

Communism is impossible "in our present barbarous surroundings," for Communism, when attained, will be the "surroundings", or social environment, and "our present barbarous surroundings" cannot then exist.

Traits, such as a love of music, or a preference for a certain kind of employment, are selfish, and I don't know that we need try to breed them out of anyone. Selfishness is the mainspring of action, and to breed the selfishness out of people is to breed the life out of them. Take away their privileges and they cannot hurt us.

HENRY ADDIS.

### Pointers for "The Associated Anarchists".

[Translated from "Freiheit" for THE FIREBRAND by Charles Bushweit.]

An organization has sprung up in London, styling itself "The associated Anarchists". It has also issued a manifesto to the world. This somewhat lengthy manuscript, the copying of which is not necessary, begins with a lament that the success of the Anarchists is not in proportion to the material and personal energy expended. Then it proposes a more perfect organization with majority rule and some sort of centralization, and a perfect masterpiece of a constitution. Comrade M. ent has thoroughly criticized this manifesto and pointed out in an elaborate treatise the true



causes of these real or imaginary failures. The following is a translation of the same from the Italian:

I look upon the causes of this stagnation and those various evils complained of as being of two species, viz., the general and the intimate. The first, or general, cause—here I refer to the whole of Europe—is certainly open and secret repression in the past and up to the present in all countries. To those causes that do not present themselves to the observer at first glance, but which, like an organic disease, are the most ruinous—I mean the intimate causes—one must add as the chief, if not the only one, the general methods of propaganda. Propaganda not based on reason but on enthusiasm; propaganda of sentimental talk upon a basis of milk and honey; of sonorous, hollow, terrible phrases; of words a foot and a half long; rhetoric, rhetoric ad infinitum, cadence, Byzantinism.

We are destroyers and rebels, we children of this century of decrepit Christian, bourgeois civilization. We cannot at once usher in a glorious morning—we must tear down, tear down! We are revolutionists and instruments par excellence of destruction—therefore we must be critics. We must ever and always analyze, anatomically dissect that which was and that which is. By means of vivisection we must locate the wound and find the truth regardless of consequences.

Phraseology, sentimentalism, enthusiasm will not accomplish this. It demands common-sense work based upon facts, scientific deductions. And now one observes everywhere, owing to the lessons taught by facts, how the greater number of those disappear that pretended to Anarchy, how the first storm destroys the fruits of a long and laborious propaganda, how enthusiasm has not produced convinced Anarchists. The inebriate is generally, the day after his badly-digested superabundance, tired and sleepy.

Enthusiasm, like every other human sentiment, is a very nice thing, but reason must direct it. If independent and serving as a basis of propaganda, it will only attract weaklings and the irresolute, and these are of no account. They will only obstruct the road, interfere with the movement, go astray and prove treacherous. Here unanimity begets weakness.

This leads to stagnation and indifference, which are certainly results of the causes referred to.

The next intimate cause (next to methods of propaganda), the first that affects the nominal acceptance of our ideas, is the degree of liberty. The revolutionary instinct is in exact proportion to the degree or intensity of oppression. An oppressed people take a greater interest in the idea of liberty. If the repression is less open and distinct, if the pill is sugar-coated, then this falsified and misdirected instinct becomes atrophied, for it is with instincts as it is with such organs as have fallen into disuse—their use and exercise depends on the greater or lesser excitement to activity. A people enjoying a certain degree of real or imaginary liberty will care very little for the prospect of real and full liberty. This is the case in England, not to mention Switzerland, where nearly the same conditions prevail. And the cause of indifference to Anarchist ideas must be ascribed to the bastard liberty it has enjoyed since the thirteenth century, it being in degree greater than that of any other country of Europe. A non-integral liberty must necessarily beget stupidity and indifference. It seems paradoxical, but the greater its tendency toward unboundedness the more a latent despotism manifests itself—the despotism of semi-liberty, more degrading and dismal than pure despotism. The will of one results in the despotism, in the will of the many, the new morality, the law, the oppression of a minority by a nominal majority, it being goaded on by the unbearable weight of a self-willed and a self-created law. And, as according to history, the right of the majority represents the right of mediocrity, nullity takes the place of genius, hence the right of a majority is synonymous with stupidity, tyranny of ignorance, oppression of the individual initiative: Degeneration of the race.

Such a bastard liberty is worse than pure despotism, for one has often beheld in a despot a monstrous genius, but nevertheless a genius, whose oppression often resulted in progress and always in an effort of liberty: Regeneration of the race.

From the above it may be inferred with absolute certainty that the least germ of authority within the realm of liberty, will be productive of the most disastrous results. Yes one may say that the smaller the germ the greater will be the harm. A quagmire is the more dangerous if covered with vegetation.

We may compare a nation with a bird in a cage. If the cage consists of a very fine, large meshed wire net—freely admitting air and light, only an almost im-

perceptible amount being excluded by the wires, the bird will live on contentedly and sing, the more so if it descends from generations accustomed to this mode of life.

If by chance the door of the cage is left open it may venture out but will invariably return of his own accord or in obedience to his master's coaxing. Returned to his prison he will scarcely notice a difference between the free air in the cage and outside of the same.

But if the cage consists instead of solid walls, a crevice admitting a meagre supply of air and light, at first the bird would offer resistance, then become quiet, at last it would sing in a subdued and melancholy strain, always supposing it did not die but became adapted to this sort of life. By chance the door is left open, at first he is struck as if by lightning, then with a bound he leaps into freedom, filling the air with joyous songs of jubilee, of liberty.

## The Letter-Box.

A. S., Wait, O.—You were mistaken in the price of the pamphlets—they are three cents each; Liberty Library, published at Columbus Junction, Iowa, is two and a half cents each in lots of ten of one issue. However, the twelve pamphlets ordered have been sent you.

J. T., London.—Photographs of William Morris, Walter Crane, Louise Michel and Michael Bakunin have been received, for which accept our thanks. A more acceptable collection could hardly have been made. The pamphlets ordered have been sent, with the exception of "Economics of Anarchy," our stock of which is exhausted and we don't know where to get them.

E. H., Big Wausaukee, Wis.—The same scarcity of work and low wages that you complain of prevails here and everywhere, so far as we are informed. There is some government land in Oregon and Washington, but as to making a living on it, we think it would be hard digging unless a man had some money to begin with. There are a number of men now settling in Tillamook County, Oregon, from whom you will receive a letter. You might also correspond with O. A. Verity, secretary of a co-operative colony at Lake Bay, Wash.

C. S., Los Angeles, Cal.—If you attribute the persistent publication of THE FIREBRAND in the face of adverse conditions to "enthusiasm" you are very much mistaken. And if you have considered enthusiasm necessary to continued action in the cause, it is little wonder that you are "sour". But when once we get into the grand truth, the profound philosophy of Anarchism, devotion to it brings its own reward, even though we stand alone and have no hope of seeing it realized in society.

## The Firebrand Account.

For six months from January 1 to July 1, 1896:		
Received subscriptions and donations		\$301.92
Expenses:		
Paper and presswork	\$127.00	
Postage	28.02	
Illustrated head	15.00	
Rent	12.00	
Type, leads, etc.	7.55	
Fuel and light	3.30	
Stationery	2.85	
For our own use	101.33	\$297.07
Cash on hand July 1		\$ 4.95

## Bureau of Translation.

COMRADE SLOVAK informs those of all countries that it is proposed to create an international bureau of translation, where will be received all documents, communications, etc., interesting to the social movement of the entire world, which may be sent in; after being translated into English, Dutch, German, French, Spanish and Portuguese, they will be sent to the Anarchist periodicals of the languages mentioned. It is requested that writings and documents having reference to the social movement be sent in. Address, A. Sanftleben, Stapferstrasse; Oberstrass, Zurich, Switzerland.

WHATEVER arguments can be adduced in favor of freedom for humanity apply to women in common with men. A woman is a human individual, and is no more separated from man in the matter at issue by her sex than one man from another by his strength, his trade, or the color of his hair. What is important, however, is not for women to obtain a social equality with men in respect of existing conditions, but for them to acquire true social equality with men and with each other in a regenerated society. It is to the fact of its being, so far, a mere politicalism, having for its aim nothing better than a readjustment within the present order of affairs, that the "Women's Rights Movement" owes its lack of vitality and its inability to arouse deeply serious interest among either women or men.—[The Radical.

GRANTED that the free activity of man pours into the common stock more than his needs exhaust from it, it

is clear that laws and regulations are pretty well useless, since to every necessary function there corresponds some natural taste, some avocation inherent in the individuals. Nobody will hold himself excused from work that the unanimous concurrence of efforts renders attractive and varied; and the different labors will no longer be tasks, but recreations. Nothing would be easier than the legislation of such a fraternal unity, for from the most unbounded liberty would result the most perfect order.—[Moreley.

## Receipts.

Workingmen's Educational Association, Allegheny, Pa., \$10.50. Buffalo Free Distribution Fund, \$2.35. Mrs. Damon, \$1.00. Hummel, Hentges, Metzkw, each 50c. Kiefer, Vogel, each 25c. Rice, 15c. Severance, Levinson, each 10c.

## Printing-Press Fund.

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

Previously acknowledged.....\$18.00  
Workingmen's Educational Association,  
Allegheny, Pa.....5.00

## Sample Copies.

We send out each week large numbers of sample copies, and for this purpose we ask friends to send names of persons likely to be interested. The receipt of a sample copy has no other significance than this hope of interesting you and securing your assistance in the work. The subscription price is nominally fifty cents, though in reality it is voluntary, for many friends pay more and we send it to all who desire it, even if they feel able to pay only a few cents or nothing at all. No bills are ever sent out.

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. Gorb, 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.

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

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	5c
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, " "	2c
An Anarchist Manifesto	25c
A Sex Revolution, by Lois Waisbroker	5c
Anything More, My Lord?	10c
Wants and Their Gratification; H. Addis	15c
A Secret and Confidential Address, by Gavroche	5c
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. C. Schmidt, 412 South 13th St., Omaha, Neb.  
I. 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 Address North Mount Tabor.