



An Exponent of Anarchist-Communism: Holding that Equality of Opportunity alone Constitutes Liberty; that in the Absence of Monopoly Price and Competition Cannot Exist, and that Communism is an Inevitable Consequence.

VOL. II.

PORTLAND, OREGON, SUNDAY, AUGUST 30, 1896.

No. 30.

## THE FIREBRAND

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

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

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

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

### Tyranny and Fraternity.

The earth so perfect, fair and fruitful grown,  
As the home of happy people should be known.  
Knowledge has thrived and waned now spreads apace;  
Love speaks from land to land, from race to race;  
Yet, thirst for power and gold, pride, customs vile  
Hold coward victims tame by fendish guile;  
Disease, vice, grief and want, mock life the while.  
To civilize the State, the down-held raise  
From Misery's palmed night to strength of days,  
The brave refute the false, zealously plead  
That liberty is Life's divines need.  
While forceful darkness clouds the dawning light,  
A valorous few are laboring with the might  
That Truth and Justice wield to win the Right,  
And crown freed Humanhood with Honor bright.

—Mary E. Tillotson.

### Relations of Opportunity and Liberty.

"LIBERTY alone is just: the absence of all force and all coercion. Equality of opportunities for all constitutes its basis. On this basis of equal opportunities, the free, independent, sovereign individual whose only claim on society is that it shall respect his liberty, and whose only self-given law consists in respecting the liberty of others,—that is the ideal of Anarchy."  
—[John Henry Mackay.

"Equality of opportunity can never be attained—the most we can hope for is equality of liberty."—[Francis D. Tandy.

"A foolish consistency is the hobgoblin of little minds, adored by little statesmen and philosophers and divines. With consistency a great mind has little or nothing to do."—[Ralph W. Emerson.

"You pay your money and you take your choice."—[Swami Vive Kananda.

Comrade Morris is quite right in his belief that, "the land question is the principal point where Mr. Tandy's school goes astray," and he did not need to push his reasoning to a Malthusian conclusion in order to show the unscientific character of the so-called Individualist-Anarchist's position on that question.

Absolute freedom of competition is the fundamental tenet of the Individualist's faith. In order that freedom of competition may be attained it is essential that certain prior conditions be established. These prior conditions may be included under the broad general classification, "Liberty,"—the ideal of Anarchy.

Mackay is quite right in affirming that, equality of opportunity constitutes the basis of liberty. It, therefore, follows that, when Mr. Tandy affirms the possibility of existence of "equality of liberty" while denying the possibility of existence of the very basis of liberty itself, he is delivering himself of an absurdity. It isn't "Liberty" he has in mind: he's thinking and talking about something else.

The Individualist "use and occupancy" theory, as at present conceived, denies equality of opportunity, —and I flatly contradict Mr. Tandy's assertion that, "Equality of opportunity can never be attained." It is a mere assertion, utterly incap-

able of scientific proof—and thus denies liberty and makes freedom of competition an unrealizable ideal. Now, let me state a specific instance of the appearance of the phenomenon of economic rent, which will answer to illustrate the point I desire to make, and which can no doubt be duplicated within the experience of most persons who have paid any attention to the subject. I call to mind two store buildings, exactly equal to each other in amount of floor space, trimmings, and appointments for carrying on business; in fact, the buildings are both owned by the same man, were constructed from the same set of plans, and there is probably not ten dollars difference in their cost. The only difference in these buildings is that they front on different streets,—but the front of one is not to exceed one hundred and fifty feet from that of the other, and the effect of such difference is this: One store commands an annual rent of eighteen hundred dollars, while the other rents for twelve hundred; furthermore, the 1800 dollar building has been continuously occupied since its erection, and it is within my knowledge that the cheaper building has remained unoccupied for as long a single period as six months, while it is by no means uncommon for it to stand vacant for one or two months during the year. It is safe to say that, on an average, it has not been occupied more than three-fourths of the time since its erection. With respect to investment of capital, talent and energy, those two locations are exactly on a par with each other; the only thing which makes one building more valuable than the other for competitive business purposes is a difference in a location, site value. This difference is pure economic rent. The present system tends to equalize the competitive conditions for doing business of the respective occupants of these sites,—altho its manner of doing so is crude, non-ethical, and absurd—by compelling the occupant of the more favorable site to pay more for the privilege of doing business. But, with the destruction of the present land policy and the establishment of a tenure based on unrestricted occupancy and use, this factor of equalization of competitive conditions would cease to operate, and the economic rent of sites would fall unconditionally and unreservedly to their users and occupiers, thus giving the occupiers of superior sites a competitive advantage which no conceivable application of talent, capital or energy on the part of their competitors would be competent to overcome. Free competition would be denied just to the extent of this economic competitive advantage. It must be remembered that, scientifically, economic rent reflects not merely the difference in money value of different sites for doing business, but also the difference in degree of departure from absolutely free competitive conditions inherent in such sites. Thus, with all rent and taxes absolutely abolished and a use and occupancy tenure alone generally recognized, we might establish the point of absolutely free competition, so far as competition is affected by conditions of land tenure, at 1; then, taking the two cases specified above, we might give one site a mark of 3 and the other a

mark of 2, having regard for the proportions of site value which they bear with respect to each other, and the degree of departure from the theoretical point. The relative advantage which the user of one of these sites would then have over the user of the other in the competitive market would be expressed by the equation 3:2. An infinite number of such equations may be constructed by anyone who cares to investigate the subject, and they will all mark the impossibility of free competition under the proposed theory. There are other points, but I will rest the case here for the present.

W. P. BORLAND.

### Lake Bay Methods.

Government means to govern, some must have power; if power is given some to govern those governed must submit to the power governing; to submit to any power is slavery, hence all governments consist of rulers and slaves.

A has no natural right to dictate to B what he shall do as long as B does not interfere with A's rights, neither has B any natural right to dictate to A. Where do A and B get their right to dictate to C what he shall do? Is it not an assumed right? Hence, is not dictation by the majority always an assumed right and all powers invested in a government an assumed power? Do not all officials assume powers not conferred upon them by the government? Is it patriotism to submit to an assumed power and traitorous to resist, or vice versa?

All laws are special privileges granting favors to some and abridging others' rights.

I once asked a lady, who was defending law as being just, but who however, was firm in the belief of a woman's having a right to vote, "Well, why don't you vote?" She replied: "The law will not let me." "Then the law does restrict your rights? Well, if that law was repealed you would then be free with man. So with all laws either so-called good or bad."

Man, from the fact of his birth on this earth alone obtains the same natural right to enough of the land, air, and water to maintain an existence that any other man has either before or after him. No one has any right to abridge his right or curtail his opportunity, at least until there is a shortage for all.

No divinity has ever conferred power upon any individual to oppress his fellow man or restrict his rights, but through fraud, deception and cunning, these powers to oppress have been obtained or assumed and by force are now maintained. Therefore believing that these are truths which all can unite upon and, as you have practically decided upon discussing the question, "How to get Anarchy," it might be of some interest to some of your readers to learn how we here are trying to solve the problem under existing conditions.

Some may object to our incorporating under the state law, to these we say that to-day a community cannot hold land in common except through an incorporated body. True we have a president, secretary, treasurer and three trustees, the smallest number of officers the law allows, but as the powers are all taken away from them there remains but little for them to do and what little there is, is obligatory by virtue of our agreement, and there can be no other assumed.

With personal property it is different in a measure. The restrictions of government is taken from that as no deed or article of conveyance is needed and the reason is plain; personal property is nearly all the product of

man's labor, can be sold or exchanged at will, but not so with the natural resources. They have been stolen in the first place by the government, all the artifice of man must forever after be called into play to defend one another in the possession of the property stolen lest an outraged public wrest it from them.

This alone is our object in incorporating; abolish the laws and we as a company cease to exist.

Our chief aim being to make land free, we attempt this by organizing a company expressly to hold a deed to land and nothing more.

After land is once paid for and deeded to the association it virtually becomes free, for instance: A buys a membership sufficient to cover the cost of two acres of land; we give a lease of two acres to A for life; at his death the land he occupied will be leased to his heirs or assigns and a membership issued them free. If there be no heirs then to some one applying for membership, it being our agreement to charge no more for a membership than the land chosen costs the association, and as the first party paid for the land at first, all occupants thereafter in reality step upon free land.

This secures a safe title under law and whenever law is abolished each one will be left free in the occupancy and use of the tract they may be using at that time. Thus under government you will perceive our ability to free land except for the taxes which, like all others, we must pay until such a time as unitedly we can do away with them in the form that they now exist.

We now turn to our internal affairs which are all under voluntary agreement. That agreement is not binding any longer than one chooses to remain steadfast thereto. We pass no laws or rules that cannot be immediately abolished by mutual consent. One may unite with others on all public or private improvements or only on a part. Thus, should I deem the construction of a steamer unnecessary I would not be asked to contribute to its building and could not be expected to share in its receipts. If one chooses to help start any industry he or she will be expected to do their share towards its construction, and if they choose to remain out entirely it is their privilege to do so. Thus the individual is left free to do as he may choose.

Our ideas are first to get Anarchy, then the people will from practical experience ascertain which (Individualism or Communism or any other ism) will be best, and we hope will have by that time common sense enough to retain the best. If some wish Communism they have a natural right to work out their ideas and no Individualist has any right to prevent; if, on the other hand, some wish to practice Individualism the Communist need not interfere, neither of course holding through force or otherwise the natural opportunities from the others' use.

Under freedom monopoly cannot exist, but if an Individualist constructs a machine that will with the aid of one man turn out one hundred tubs a day it matters not to me, a Communist, if he runs his machine every day and stacks his tubs sky-high, so long as he does not restrict me in the making and using of a similar machine to furnish myself and comrades with what we actually need.

Now the tendency with us in practice is towards Communism of all the means of production, but Individualism as regards the fruits of one's labor, at least while and of what there is a scarcity, and Communism of what we produce in abundance, and it matters not what one does with his products or how much he may produce and hoard if his comrades are not restricted in the opportunity of supplying their own needs. Therefore it seems to me, let us free the natural resources first by establishing Anarchy, then systematize the production and distribution to our needs on a just and equitable basis, leaving those who can work together in harmony to do so and those who cannot, to produce as they list and to enjoy as they wish. Any other idea than this, to say I am right and you are wrong and vice versa, would establish authority, which is in direct opposition to the basic principles at first enumerated and the self-destroyer of the principles of freedom.

OLIVER A. VERITY.

Lake Bay, Wash.

Comrade Verity seems mixed. He says "A has no right to dictate what B shall do as long as B does not interfere with A's rights." The implication is that if B does interfere with A's rights, then A has a "right to dictate to B what he shall do." I do not think that is what comrade Verity meant, but his language throws his argument open to that criticism. If an interference with A's rights by B gives A the right to dictate what B shall do, then all present

governments find justification in the fact that somebody has interfered with somebody else's rights.

It is hard to distinguish just when comrade Verity is referring to what they are doing in their Association, and what he proposes in a general way. It seems to me that their Association is not revolutionary enough. If they practice Communism amongst themselves, they are separating from present methods, and contributing something to the revolutionary movement. Otherwise their practical experiment, if followed by any number of similar associations, would still leave us in our present conditions. I would like to see their Association become more revolutionary, and more communistic.

"Let us free the natural resources first," and then try and establish Anarchy, is what I suppose comrade Verity really meant. If not I would call his attention to the fact that the establishment of Anarchy contemplates not only the freeing of natural resources, but also the systematizing of production and distribution on a "just and equitable bases."

HENRY ADDIS.

### More Concerning Methods.

THE logical result of the present trend of events must eventually bring about a decisive struggle between the people and the government; between those who want liberty on one hand, and those who desire to rule and their dupes and adherents on the other hand. The chances are that this struggle will come at the time of industrial warfare; that the discontented mass will seize upon some period of industrial trouble in which the government is playing its historic role of an oppressor of the people and upholder of privilege, to strike a blow at their enemy; that those who have been contending for the right to use the land and those who have been struggling to make their exchanges without paying the money lenders for the privilege will join their forces with the other victims of government, and at a time of disturbance caused by a strike that, owing to the general discontent, has spread until it has become well nigh universal, strike as vicious and sweeping a blow at present arrangements.

The railroad men will in all probability refuse to run trains, and will positively refuse to run trains that carry soldiers from one place to another. Thus the government will be weakened, for even if the government can induce a considerable number of men in each locality to enlist in the army, it would yet be unable to move its guns, ammunition, etc., and when as a last resort it undertook to possess itself of such guns and ammunition as was to be had in each particular locality, a few daring and determined men could, and unquestionably would, blow up all power houses and arsenals.

Encouraged by the disorderly conditions and the general excitement the man with a mortgage on his home, and the fellow who is tired of paying rent, or being chased off one piece of land after another, will quite readily come together and raid the court houses and destroy all records of titles, deeds, mortgages, stocks, bonds, etc. Realizing that as long as copies of these records exist there will be danger of their reestablishment, the raiders will extend their operations to the safety deposit vaults and bank vaults, destroying all evidences of enslavement which they can find.

The incentive to "employ labor" being gone, every fellow will have to look out for himself, or combine with his fellows in providing the necessities of life.

"The earth is now ours, let us use it," will be shouted by the free lander, and he and the others who desire to till the soil will immediately take possession of such portions of it as are unoccupied and begin to make improvements. But to successfully till the soil they must have tools, seed and food and clothing.

The operatives in factories will be urged to take possession of, and operate them in their own interest. They too will find that they must have food and clothing. So throughout society the necessities of life would be required, and the necessity for some adjustment of affairs that would provide these necessities to all until the new methods of production and distribution can be established and a new supply of commodities produced will be apparent.

This would lead to expropriation, and all the persons affected can gather, en masse, or mass meetings of each locality can be called, and determine how best to act under the emergency. The various co-operative societies and communistic associations would be examples which will be looked to in determining what to do next.

The State Socialist will undoubtedly be on hand with his schemes of nationalization, and it will behoove the

Anarchist to never tire in his advocacy of voluntary association, and his opposition to all attempts to establish authoritative committees, provisional governments and the like.

Socialist organizations on a small scale will in all probability be formed here and there, and effort be made to establish a general Socialist State, but experience will soon show the despotic tendency of such organizations, and internal disagreements, caused by the schemes of ambitious leaders, each trying to put himself at the head, will shortly cause their abandonment.

The Individualists will undoubtedly organize their protective Associations, Mutual Banks, etc. and begin business on that plan.

The Anarchist-Communists, the free landers and industrialists who have taken possession of the mills, shops and factories they work in, will be natural allies, and will very easily combine, both in expropriation and re-construction. The Labor Exchangers will likely split, part of them going with the Communists, part of them with the Individualists. Thus Anarchist-Communism, though not universal, will have a fair start, and will have an opportunity to prove itself the most desirable form of association.

For a time communication, and the transportation of commodities between different localities will be disturbed and uncertain. Government will undoubtedly linger in some localities longer than in others, and constantly try to reestablish itself. This will prevent any speedy reorganization of transportation by rail, and the lack of communication will encourage the establishment of as great a variety of industries as the resources of the country will permit of.

Anarchist-Communist groups will affiliate with each other, and while all are engaged in the various productive enterprises, they will all deposit their products in convenient warehouses, and soon they will have a network of groups extending all over the country, and the simplicity and desirability of such an arrangement will soon win all the wise, unprovided for population. The State Socialist will find a choice between the hated Anarchist-Communist, without rules or rulers, on one hand, and the Individualist with his code of rules for the government of his association on the other, and his equally hateful competition open as an alternative despotism, or chaotic condition of his co-operative commonwealth schemes. Some of them will choose Communism, while others who still fear to try to live without some sort of a State to protect them will join the Individualists.

Gradually communication will be reestablished and the last of the present government be extinguished and the free, broad life of Communism will then be seen in contrast to the sordid life of the Individualists, entrenched behind their protective associations, defending their "property rights" by jails, and "adjusting" all disputes concerning property interest by jury decision.

The love of freedom from care, and the desire for comfort outweighs the love of formality in the average person, and so we may reasonably expect to see the dissolution of the protective associations and the gaining of a condition of universal Communism.

HENRY ADDIS.

### "Honest Money."

ONE of the strangest facts of life is that everybody pretends to be governed by some conception of right and wrong, while scarcely anybody can give a sensible account of how it is that he conceives certain things or actions to be good and certain others to be bad. We are forever hearing every body, of all degrees of intelligence, from the sound money democrat and fetish worshiper up to the flatist and philosopher, saying this is right and that is wrong; and yet how few can tell you in a satisfactory manner just what they mean. In the minds of the most of men the just is the expedient. They have no conception of the good as the eternal and unchangeable, but rather consider it as one thing to-day and another to-morrow. Such confused notions of right, however, are as much the result of selfishness as of ignorance. Let's illustrate the question by a single example. The man who advocates the putting of on hundred cents' worth of metal into a dollar does so in obedience to the notion that a dollar should have intrinsic value equal to that of the thing for which it is to be exchanged. His chief argument is that it is robbery, or unjust, to receive a dollar's worth of the world's goods without giving a dollar's worth of metal in return. Hence he deems it just that the weight of



the dollar should be permanently determined, and he seeks to establish 25 and 8-10 grains of gold as the standard of honest dollars.

Honesty is invariable, therefore an honest dollar must be an invariable dollar. A dollar varies when it buys more or less at one time than at another. Hence if a dollar buys ten pounds of cotton to-day and more or less than ten pounds to-morrow, it is a variable and consequently a dishonest dollar. Supply and demand, production and consumption, govern prices, so says the sound moneyite. Granted. Hence if the production of cotton was always equal to its consumption, its price would be uniform; if the production of all commodities was always equal to their consumption all prices would be uniform. If, however, the production of a commodity is not equal to its consumption, its price is variable. The sound moneyite says that the government can do nothing but recognize the price fixed by supply and demand, hence it cannot coin "fifty-cent dollars". From all of this it follows that 25 and 8-10 grains of gold is a dollar whether the government says so or not. The supply of gold therefore must be equal to the demand. This we know is not true, because the more people there are the greater the demand. Now there are more people than there was in 1871. Nearly twice as many. The people make the demand. In 1871 the United States produced \$43,500,000 of gold. Now if the gold dollar is honest it should be the same in 1894 as it was in 1871. But in 1894 the supply of gold was \$39,500,000, and the population, the demand, was more than sixty millions. Hence, the supply and demand of gold have been variable, and if the stamp of the government has nothing to do with the value of the gold dollar, it must have fluctuated in value during 23 years. If it did not supply and demand do not govern its price, and if it did fluctuate it is not an honest dollar because honesty is invariable. But if the gold dollar has not varied supply and demand had nothing to do with its price, consequently the government is responsible for its honesty.

Now if the government can fix the price of gold in spite of supply and demand, it can fix the price of any commodity. But the government cannot fix the price of all commodities, hence it should not fix the price of any, since to fix the price of my gold and not to fix the price of your cotton would be class legislation for my benefit. And if my gold commands a fixed price regardless of the government, I do not need its favors.

Why then should the people pay for the running of mints if they are not necessary? Certainly an honest moneyite would not palm off less than 25 and 8-10 grains of gold upon the gulleible if he did business with it in the shape of bullion!!!

To sum up: an honest dollar is invariable; for an honest gold dollar to be invariable the supply and demand must be equal; the demand for gold was twice as great in 1894 as in 1871; there was less produced in 1894 than in 1871, hence the gold dollar has not been honest if it has been governed by supply and demand. Again: the government cannot fix the price of anything, the government therefore could not depreciate gold by demonetizing it; the government's stamp upon the gold dollar then is merely a pledge to the people.

In 1871 there were \$23,000,000 of silver produced in this country. In 1894 there were \$64,000,000. In the former year the population, the demand, was 40,000,000; in 1894 the population was 60,000,000. Now how does it happen that the supply and demand have depreciated silver and not affected gold, if the government's stamp has nothing to do with it? And if the stamp did fix the price of gold, why is it powerless to fix the price of silver.

But I have proven that it is class legislation to fix the price of any commodity by law. Therefore the coinage of gold and silver is class legislation. But we must have money. Granted. Let us return to first principles. Supply and demand fix prices, and not the stamp of the government. The price of paper is fixed by supply and demand. Paper is an artificial product, hence its supply can be controlled by man. If the coinage of paper would increase the demand, the evil could be overcome by increasing the supply. Therefore since man can maintain the supply and demand of paper in perfect equality, its price can be made invariable; consequently the only possible honest or invariable dollar is the paper dollar. Or to be exact, the only possible honest dollar is the dollar the supply and demand of the material of which can be maintained in perfect equality.

The gold standard advocate therefore has an imperfect conception of honesty, or if he has a perfect conception of honesty he does not seek to realize it. He

has confused notions of right and wrong. He is expedient rather than just, and whether he knows it or not is the beneficiary of a dollar which may never depreciate but always appreciate. It is expedient for him that his commodity, gold, should never depreciate; but it is unjust that the farmers' and miners' commodities should not enjoy the same privileges; and since all commodities cannot enjoy such advantage, the spirit of equality, honesty, is violated if any commodity enjoys it.

The coinage of paper would not affect its price; its supply and demand can be maintained in perfect equality; consequently paper, or man-made money, is the only possible honest money. Nature is neither honest nor dishonest. Hence it is absurd to talk of honest nature-made dollars. There can be no such dollars. Nature is variable, honesty is invariable. Nature produces without regard to its effect upon the human race; man produces with regard to nothing but its effect upon himself. If he is wise he need never hurt himself, if honest he can never hurt himself. Financially the American people have hurt themselves seriously. The cause is attributable both to ignorance and dishonesty—the ignorance of the masses and the dishonesty of the classes.

JAS. ARMSTRONG, JR.

In the foregoing Mr. Armstrong shows that the use of gold and silver as money is dishonest because in so doing the government fixes their price as commodities, thus giving them an advantage that is denied all other commodities. He then advocates, by implication, paper money, stating as his reason that its production can be controlled so as to make its price always stable regardless of the price fixed by the government in its use as money.

If paper money is issued by the government the money value which attaches to it must be arbitrary, the fiat of the government. If it is to circulate at its commercial value, the proposition is ridiculous.

Fiat money, legal tender, is a form of compulsion and as unjust and despotic as the special privilege which Mr. Armstrong objects to when the price of gold and silver is fixed by the government by its use of them as money.

The advocate of legal tender money demands a dollar that shall be receivable for all debts both public and private. In so doing he commits himself to a policy of compulsion on the part of the government. If the government issues any kind of money and says I must take it when offered me in payment for what may be owing me, it legislates in favor of the man who owes me, and against the right of agreement. Is that honest money?

It follows, then, that legal money is dishonest.

The use of money is one of the means used to rob the toilers of their products. In a truly civilized society money will not be used because production being free there will be an abundance of everything for all, and consumption will be as free as production. There being free consumption, there can be no price, consequently no need of money.

H. A.

### Carelessness and Dishonesty.

I DISLIKE very much to burden the columns of The Firebrand with a matter of this kind, but owing to the very peculiar methods of E. H. Fulton, in the "Age of Thought", I am constrained to ask the use of your limited space for the publication of the following statement:

The issue of Mr. Fulton's paper dated August 8 contains about one and a half columns of stuff, one-third of which consists of extracts from an article written by me, which Mr. Fulton carelessly and dishonestly presents to his readers as a defense of single tax, and his answer thereto. He is apparently so elated over what he terms the corroboration of a wholly unimportant opinion which Mr. Henry Cohen delivered himself of that he does not hesitate to stoop to an utterly contemptible method, a method which an honest controversialist would scorn to employ, to let Mr. Cohen know about it. As long ago as 1884 I found myself defending the single tax against the arguments of much abler men than Mr. Fulton, and for the benefit of The Firebrand readers who also read the "Age of Thought" and who may be misled by the reckless manner in which Mr. Fulton jumps at conclusions, I will state that, so far from having jumped into single taxism from Anarchist-Communism, I have but lately accepted Anarchist-Communism, as a result of much study and thought, and after having progressed from single taxism, through so-called Individualist-Anarchism, to the

point where I now find myself.

The article which I sent to Mr. Fulton was not a defense of the single tax, and if he had published it his readers would have seen that it was not. The article contains the following statement: "I have no present intention to enter into a defense of the single tax theory, either here or elsewhere, but when I see objections made to it from the advanced standpoint of Anarchism I like to see those objections well grounded." This was the standpoint from which I criticized Mr. Fulton's objections. Mr. Fulton's objections displayed a lamentable lack of the commonest sort of economic knowledge, and Anarchists only make themselves ridiculous when they make use of such objections; when they oppose the single tax they should do so on ground which cannot be assailed.

Now, the article which Mr. Fulton mutilated for the purpose of misrepresenting me to his readers was written with a full knowledge that was hardly suitable for the columns of the Age of Thought, and I really did not believe that it would be published,—indeed, I so stated to Comrade Holmes in a private letter, and he will bear me out in this—but I placed it in such shape that Fulton could publish it if he saw fit. I am perfectly willing and able to defend the article in its entirety, but had I really desired its publication I would have written it in a form more condensed and more suitable for the columns of the Age of Thought, and had Fulton entirely ignored the matter, or passed it with mere acknowledgement of receipt and refusal to publish, I would have been perfectly satisfied, and he would have retained my respect and consideration as an honorable man. However, when he takes the course with regard to it that he has taken, he stamps himself as an intellectual parasite, deserving only of contempt, because demonstrating that he is concerned only to bolster up a particular theory by any and all means that fall to his hand, instead of earnestly and honestly searching out truth and fearlessly proclaiming it wherever found, which latter should be the aim of all who call themselves Anarchists.

W. P. BORLAND.

### Sex Ethics.

A SUBSCRIBER in San Francisco expresses a desire to see more concerning sex ethics in The Firebrand. Very well, sister, we all have the same desire, here at the office, and would be ever so pleased if the sisters would contribute their thoughts on that question to our columns.

That much false modesty exists there can be no question, and it is largely due to a lack of knowledge concerning sex. Ignorance of the physiology of the sex organs and of their functions, leaves the mind open to all manner of false notions, superstitions and non-sensical beliefs. The notions and beliefs concerning sex relations, in a word, the present sex ethics are false, unscientific and detrimental to the individual and society. It is quite important, then, to pry into this question and see if we can assist in establishing new sex ethics, founded on correct knowledge of the mechanism and functions of the sex organs. In order that this may be accomplished I would suggest that those of our readers who have scientific knowledge of the sex organs and functions, or who have opinions on the question of sex relations, contribute what ever they may desire to our columns.

For one, I consider present sex ethics as unjust and detrimental, as are our business ethics. The double moral standard, against which our moralists have so long inveighed, is a monstrosity, but no more so than is the rigid moral code which the moralists would substitute. They would abolish the double moral standard by requiring the same "purity" of men that is required of women. In other words, they would establish one standard to be lived up to by all alike, by still greater restrictions on individual liberty, and an intolerable censorship of "public morals," by ostracising, jailing or otherwise punishing all who did not live up to their moral standard. And be it remembered that their standard would be one of denial, restraint and self abnegation. Such an ethical standard would be more despicable than the present one which allows more freedom to men than to women, although the present one is so illogical, ridiculous and unbearable that it is dying out because of its own inherent weakness.

But why should men have more privileges than women? asks our moralist friend. There is no good



reason why, but why should men and women starve themselves sexually, and attempt to live up to a standard of chastity which requires, according to the assertion of its own advocates, the grace of God to enable them to live up to, especially in these days when the grace of God faileth to save even the elect, his own ministers, from falling a prey to the allurements of sexual felicity? No! Our moralist friends are as far off as our hypocritical upholders of the present sex ethics.

It is not greater restriction that is needed in sex relations, but greater freedom.

What right has madam Grundy to hold the lash of scorn and ostracism over the heads of all to prevent them from satisfying a craving that is the result of life, and as inseparable from it as the desire for bodily exercise, for food or for drink? This is in the interest of public morals, and of purity, they tell us. But are "public morals" of more value than human happiness, health and physical improvement? Can an act be pure at one time that is impure at another? If copulation is pure and legitimate after the county clerk has been feed, and a rigmarole has been gone through with by the minister, how can it be impure before? Does the performance of a ceremony work some organic or chemical change in the sex organs? Hardly. Then, if it does not, the act is as legitimate and pure before the ceremony as after it.

The purity of any article is determined by its chemical composition, but just what determines the purity of an act I cannot tell, so will not consider the purity of the sex act, but simply consider the expediency of the act, and its effect upon the happiness of the individuals personally concerned therein.

Sex organs are a development in the human anatomy, performing as necessary a function in the perpetuity of the race as any other organ of the body. They are not as essential to the life of the individuals as some other organs, but without them the individual would be powerless to reproduce and its life would terminate with the death of its body. The desire to reproduce is as spontaneous as the desire to breathe, and why an individual, well equipped with all the necessary organs, and prompted by a desire to reproduce, having found another individual of the opposite sex who is stirred by the same desire at the same time, should be prohibited from so doing, or compelled to conform to certain formalities before they are allowed to exercise these functions, is beyond my comprehension.

In the development of the race the function of sex has become complex, and is no longer simply a means of reproduction, and I hope some of our correspondents will try and bring out some of the other functions of sex and their influence upon our social intercourse, and show us a good and sufficient reason—if one exists—why every one should have absolute freedom in sex relations.

H. A.

#### Note and Comment.

The employees of the Jones and McLaughlin iron works, Pittsburg, Pa., three thousand in number, were assessed one dollar each for the McKinley campaign fund, but refused, in a body, to pay it. It is to be hoped that the workers everywhere will refuse to contribute to either the McKinley or Bryan campaign fund.

H. A.

The Communist is somewhat mixed in his ideas to our way of thinking. He has discerned that the tendency of mankind is to form themselves into groups. Therefore he jumps to the conclusion that industry must be grouped, and only those who think alike should work together. Let us look at the actual condition. Men are employed in factories and stores whose tastes and desires are diametrically opposite. Yet the work goes on because they are gathered for work. But when the work is done they divide into groups for social purposes only. When men are gathered for a definite object all other objects disappear until the definite object has been attained.—[The White Slave.]

"The White Slave" may or may not be "mixed" itself, but I suspect that it has mixed the popular conception of Communism (that it simply means a series of co-operative groups) with a proposition of mine (that groups should be composed of compatible individuals) and drawn from the mixture an unwise conclusion. The fact, is those who insist on the group as an essential of Communism have nothing to say of compatibility—they are of the "Slave's"

opinion, that compatibility cuts no figure; and those who see in Communism an opportunity to consider individual choice in the matter of association for productive purposes, see that such choice includes a yea or nay as to the act of grouping. That is to say, equality of opportunity is Communism, and not the mere presence of the group. Personally, I do not find that the personality of my associates in my work is a matter of no consequence; on the contrary, I find that agreeable associates greatly lighten labor.

\* \* \*

In noticing what I had to say concerning the difference between "The White Slave" and the New York "People" concerning the former's favorable mention of comrade Turner, that paper says:

The Firebrand, commenting on the attitude of the New York People towards the White Slave in regard to John Turner, calls the White Slave a state socialist paper. The Slave is a Socialist and a social democrat, but the Slave will not be driven by the New York faction of the Socialist Labor Party. Neither will it be ridiculed out of Socialism into anarchy. However, we will say that we have heard Mr. Turner, and we are glad that we have heard him, for we find that we agree with him in most of his conclusions, though not all.

From the above it appears that the "Slave" intends to deny being a "state" socialist. I am willing to withdraw the accusation. And I certainly had no intention of ridicule in anything said at that time or since concerning "The White Slave." I am too seriously interested in it for levity. J. H. M.

\* \* \*

The following was sent to the Berlin trades union congress, last May, by the French federation of labor exchanges:

The federation of labor exchanges of France, being revolutionary, Communist and anti-Statist, fights against patriotism, and proclaims the organization of trades unions for two purposes: To prepare the way for a general strike in the most essential branches of production. To make it possible for the workers, after the overthrow of the present system, to reorganize production without a central power which would, under cover of purely administrative control, reestablish authority already vanquished.

Will the labor exchanges of this country assume this attitude? They are certainly in a position to do so, and if logical must. H. A.

\* \* \*

COMRADE PETER KROPOTKIN has sent us a copy of his latest pamphlet, "L'Anarchie," with fraternal greetings. It deals with the philosophy and the ideal of Anarchy. We hope to see it translated into English.

\* \* \*

COMRADES who have taken an interest in The Firebrand receipts have noticed that they nearly all appear under the printing-press fund. It costs \$7.50 per week to get out the paper, even if the composers could manage to exist on air, and for the past eight weeks the receipts have averaged a little over \$6. The result is that we are seriously in debt to the press fund. All eastern comrades can now tell by the dates on the wrappers on their papers when their subscriptions expire. A large number have already expired, and if those who are able to pay would remit promptly it would no doubt be sufficient to keep affairs straight. We desire to say in this connection that we are not beggars who stand on the street corners and wait for the pennies to come in. We never miss an opportunity to earn money or contribute in any way to the bread-and-butter fund. We are not the "soft snap" kind.

#### The Letter Box.

J. P., Finleyville, Pa.—We received \$5.00 for pamphlets. The rest of the money you will find accounted for in the receipts. Thanks.

H. P., Chicago—We don't think "Der Arme Teufel" would have "changed its opinion about the contents of The Firebrand," if we had given him "a hit" as you say. We are very well aware of the fact that the discussions are sometimes "somewhat tiresome," but it cannot be avoided in a paper like The Firebrand, whose object is to introduce Anarchist-Communism or to define a condition of freedom to the American people, especially when space is so very limited. One of the best writers on Anarchist-Communism has a different opinion, who among other things in a private letter says: "I agree with you that the time has come for the development of the scientific and positive philosophy of Communism, and for propagandism along scientific lines; and I am pleased to note the able manner in which The Firebrand fulfills my conceptions of what a proper agent of propaganda should be. The paper is a jewel, and I trust The Firebrand will receive the support it is entitled to from the comrades throughout the country. Anarchist propaganda has been too much

taken up in the past with discussion and elaboration of petty and inconsequential matters of detail, concerning which, from the very nature of things, conclusions must be unexact and indeterminate. Coupled with this, there has been altogether too much mere raving to induce sober and quiet investigation of the scientific bases of Anarchism. I am pleased to note there has latterly been an emergence from this chaotic state, and I count The Firebrand as the mainstay of a clear and definite scientific propaganda." You see the opinions about The Firebrand differ. But should we be able to issue eight pages, the paper may be more entertaining.

#### Propagandists Attention.

HAVING an opportunity to obtain a lot of splendid Anarchist-Communist pamphlets at about three-fifths cents each, we decided to use a part of the press fund for that purpose. We now have on hand 1200 copies of "The Paris Commune" and "An Anarchist on Anarchy" (in one), 1200 "The True Aim of Anarchism," by E. Steine, and 500 "Scientific Principles of the Theory of Anarchy," by the same author, which we offer at two cents each in lots of ten, the entire proceeds to go to the press fund. We have taken this action because we believe it will hasten the time when we can put in a press and enlarge THE FIREBRAND. We will make every effort to do this with the beginning of volume three, at the very latest. Let all the comrades push the sale of the pamphlets. Everybody order ten and distribute them among friends. They are among the best and certainly the very cheapest literature to be had, and their sale means the addition of \$40.00 to the press fund.

#### Receipts.

Meyer, Hogan, Young, each 50c. Uffner, Mende, Koch, Wiegand, each 25c. Loveridge, 10c

#### Printing-Press Fund.

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

Previously acknowledged	\$77.05
M. Diamond, New York	1.00
A. Morton, New York	1.00
C. Puetzner, Chicago Ill.	.50
M. Maisel, New York	.50
Keller Heist, Sheridan, Wyo.	.52
G. A. Brooks, Chicago Ill.	.25

#### FIREBRAND LIBRARY.

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

An Anarchist Manifesto. By London Anarchist Communist Alliance.	\$ .02
Common Sense Country. By L. S. Bevington.	.03
A Plea for Anarchist Communism. By W. H. Duncan.	.03
Bases of Anarchism: Historical, Philosophical and Economic. By William Holmes.	.05
God and Anarchy. By Peter Kropotkin.	.05
The Commune of Paris, by Peter Kropotkin, and An Anarchist on Anarchy, by Elise Reclus (one volume)	.05
The True Aim of Anarchism. By E. Steine.	.05
Governmental Government. By Peter Kropotkin.	.05
Anarchist Communism. By Peter Kropotkin.	.05
The Wage System. By Peter Kropotkin.	.05
Expropriation. By Peter Kropotkin.	.05
A Talk About Anarchist Communism. By Malatesta.	.05
Anarchy. By Malatesta.	.05
Revolutionary Studies Translated from La Revolt.	.05
Anarchy on Trial. Speeches by Paris Anarchists.	.05
Anything More My Lord? By Lois Waisebrooker.	.05
Revolution. By S. H. Gordon.	.05
Wants and their Gratification. By Henry Addis.	.10
A Plea for the New Woman. By May L. Collins.	.05
Secret and Confidential Addresses of Anarchists.	.15
A Sex Revolution. By Lois Waisebrooker.	.25
Albert R. Parsons' Book on Anarchism, Its Philosophy and Scientific Basis. German and English Editions; handsomely bound in cloth and gilt, 76 cents, paper cover.	.35
Life of Albert R. Parsons, with a Brief History of the Labor Movement in America. Beautifully illustrated and nicely bound; 290 octavo pages.	1.50

#### Sample Copies.

We send out each week large numbers of sample copies, and for that purpose we ask friends to send names of persons likely to be interested. The receipt of a sample copy has no other significance than the hope of interesting you and securing your assistance in the work. The subscription price is nominally five cents a year, though in reality it is voluntary, for many friends pay more than the subscription price, and we send it to all who desire it, even if they feel able to pay only a few cents or nothing at all. If you receive the paper without having ordered it, do not hesitate to accept and read it, as no bills are ever sent out.

#### Taxidermy.

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 twenty-five cents to The Firebrand and a self-addressed, stamped envelope to me.

P. S.—After receiving it, if your conscience troubles you for receiving so much for so little you can remit something to sender. Address, ED GORE, Warren, Minn.

#### THE FIREBRAND'S AGENTS.

The following named persons will receive and receipt for subscriptions for The Firebrand.  
Chicago, Ill.—Charles L. Bodendyke, 1140 Milwaukee Avenue.  
C. Taylor Street.  
Omaha, Neb.—C. C. Schmidt, 412 South Thirteenth Street.  
New York City.—I. Rudash, 60 Livingston Street.  
Buffalo, N. Y.—G. Lang, 29 Grape Street.  
Philadelphia, Pa.—L. E. Shultz, 721 Plover Street.  
Baltimore, Md.—B. Morwitz, 1141 East Lombard Street.

#### ADVERTISEMENTS.

Omaha Progressive Club meets Wednesdays at 7 p. m., at 615 south Tenth Street, Omaha, Neb.

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

The Age of Thought, published by E. H. Fulton, Columbus, is an advocate of the rights of individuals; of the free use of land and other natural resources; of free banking and is an unalloyed opponent of arbitrary authority and special privileges. It is eight 32x pages in size and printed on fine book paper. Send 5 cents for sample with terms and premium offer.