

ENFANT TERRIBLE.

THE FORCE OF REASON VIVIFIES. THE FORCE OF ARMS KILLS.

VOL. I.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA, DECEMBER 20, 1891.

NO 6.

ENFANT TERRIBLE.

Published Fortnightly at Five Cents
a Year; Single Copies Five Cents.

H. C. B. COWELL
AND
CLARA DIXON DAVIDSON,
EDITORS AND PUBLISHERS.

Address ENFANT TERRIBLE, 101 Fif-
teenth St., San Francisco, Cal.

San Francisco, Dec. 20, 1891.

A wise selfishness is ever considerate, for to
be unkindful of others' happiness is excess
of folly. H. C. B. C.

Who dares not follow Truth where'er
Her footsteps lead.

But says: "Oh, I am not there, nor there,
I have not strength to follow where

My feet would bleed;
But show me worn ways, trodden fair
By feet more brave.

Who fears to stand in truth's broad glare,
What others dared not will not dare.
Is but a slave. C. D. D.

All matter written by the editors of this
paper will be signed by the initials of their
respective names, and they must not be
held responsible for each other's opinions
or those of contributors, unless expressly
endorsed.

The "Ploughshare and Pruning
Hook," which was formerly published
in San Francisco, has been moved to
Chicago and merged into two other
publications issued by the same society.
"The Flaming Sword" will be devoted
to the material interests and commer-
cial aspects of the Koreshan work, and
"The Guiding Star" will be occupied
more especially with discussions of
their principles. The new address is
3619 Cottage Grove Avenue, Chicago.

"The Cincinnati Herald" is the suc-
cessor of "Living Issue," and is edited
by M. W. Wilkins and published by the
Herald Publishing Company. It inter-
ests the ENFANT people more than the
regulation political-method reform jour-

nals usually do, and we hope yet to see
it free itself entirely from rulership
superstitions.

Christmas has come to be a general
holiday; not because of any special
feeling about the day, itself, but people
encounter so much care and anxiety
and misery during the rest of the year
that they like to make a supreme effort
to be happy just one day. Usually the
effort results in flat failure, but that
does not prevent a repetition of it the
following year: it is so natural to want
to be happy on the same day on which
other people seem to be happy.

Children are expected to be a little
happier than adults, on Christmas, and
Santa Claus, not Jesus, is most in their
minds.

The Santa Claus lie is one of the most
colossal of all lies. It requires more
credulity for its acceptance than would
suffice to swallow the bible and the
Arabian Nights Tales at one gulp.
This wonderful tale of the little old man
and his red coat, visiting millions of
homes in one night, crawling down a
chimney of each and depositing in each
child's stocking some token of his ap-
proval or disapproval of the year's do-
ings, is gravely rehearsed by mothers
who whip their children for lying, and
is made an additional band to empha-
size the power of the parents and the
helplessness of the children, who are
told:

"If you do not obey me Santa Claus
will bring you no gift."

The hard-working father who can
not afford to trifle for his children by do-
ing without necessities for himself,
cheerfully wears his ragged under-flan-
nels a year longer in order to give Santa
Claus the requisite financial stability in
the family: thus the little ones chant
the praises of their Christmas hero in
the same breath with reproaches of
their papa who didn't buy them any

candy!

Papa and the turkey may well hold a
back-yard, mutual-condolence, ante-
Christmas conference together, since
each is to be skinned on the morrow
for the glory of God and the happiness
of the children.

It has come to be almost compulsory
upon us to make gifts to our dearest
friends at Christmas time. This is
quite absurd. It robs us of the pleasure
we might otherwise feel in receiving
gifts to know that there was no spon-
taneity in the thought that prompted
the giving of them. To suspect that
the friend has been in some stress to
procure funds for the outlay, and that,
had the day been other than Christmas,
he would probably have bought himself
a pair of socks instead of buying you a
box of bon-bons; to feel that in accept-
ing presents we are placing ourselves
under obligations to bestow similar fa-
vors upon the givers, though we may
be altogether unable to spare the nec-
essary money; to feel the unfitness of
gifts to one who does not believe there
ever was such a person as Jesus, from
one who does not believe in the divinity
of Jesus, all because Jesus was said to
have been born on Christmas—such
considerations make some persons
laugh and some feel sad, according to
mental make-up.

Nowhere else are class distinctions
made so distressingly clear and plain as
in Sunday School Christmas festivals.
Here the children of the rich and the
children of the middle classes have
their presents dangled side by side on
the illuminated tree. Here the child
of the mechanic looks serious and asks
many hard questions, seeing that his
presents are less desirable than those
of his rich young neighbor whose par-
ents do nothing for a living, and here
the child of the very poor sobs in an
obscure corner, because, for him, the
tree has brought forth no fruit at all.

Int. Instituut
Soc. Geschiedenis
Amsterdam

ENFANT TERRIBLE.

Sometimes one wonders if Jesus is happier because of the shop windows decorated in his honor. The money spent in these beautiful, but quite useless, adornings, must ultimately be drawn from the pockets of consumers.

The time that is drawn from useful production by all unnecessary labors seems cruelty when we consider that there are people in the world who are badly sheltered, inadequately clothed and scarcely fed at all.

I say *seems* cruelty, because I have little doubt that there is plenty of food and cloth to feed and to cover everybody, but we have the strange spectacle of merchants with houses full of goods which they are unable to sell, surrounded by people who need their goods but cannot buy them.

Our civilization is very bungling in its methods of distribution. In fact it can scarcely be said to have any methods. Miners dig for \$.85 coal that sells for \$4.00 or \$5.00. A girl manufactures neckties at \$.50 a dozen that sell for \$.50 apiece, the cost of material being a few cents each. I might multiply examples, but it is unnecessary to do so. Every one knows that it is impossible for workers who get, on an average, less than half their real earnings, to buy back the products of their own toil. Therefore it must be that much that is produced can find no purchasers, however hungry or naked the populace may be.

If we were savages the man who took a fish would eat it and the man who slew a wild beast would wear himself with the skin of it, but, being civilized, we cannot be brought to believe that the man who builds houses might have a house to live in without feeling either the landlord or the State, that the woman who binds shoes all day might have shoes of her own to wear, nor that the person who does any useful labor is entitled to receive reward equal in purchasing power to the actual value of the goods produced.

"You say you do not believe in majority-rule," says my antagonist, "then you must believe in minority-rule."

"No," I say, "I do not believe in minority-rule."

"Then," he cries in triumph, "you are one of these Individualists! You believe in the rule of the millionaire

and the monopolist! You believe in the rule of the Czar! You believe in the rule of the Pope!"

As soon as I can make any sort of stand against this stormy enumeration of the things which he assures me I believe in, while my antagonist takes breath and applies his handkerchief to his forehead, I say, in a low voice, with the humility becoming a person burdened with such an accumulation of beliefs:

"I neither believe in majority-rule nor minority-rule nor one-person-rule; I do not believe in rule of any kind; I believe in freedom."

"To do just as every one pleases?"

"Yes," I reply.

"Some people may please to murder other people."

"But probably no one would choose to be murdered, and I do not believe in freedom for some, but for all."

"Impracticable, impossible, Utopian," ejaculates my antagonist, as he walks away.

The next Sunday we meet again, and the next, and the next, and every time we meet we say precisely the same things, and after the weekly battle each goes away with a self-satisfied feeling, certain that the other is vanquished.

A cow that had been trained to be milked while tied to a post by a rope which was fastened round her horns, afterward refused to be milked unless the rope was tied round her horns, but she would stand perfectly still while the rope was being adjusted, and was afterward quite indifferent as to whether or not it was fastened to the post.

Those people who admit the beauty of the Anarchistic philosophy, but still cry out in terror:

"We must have government! We must have law!" remind me of this cow. They are used to the rope and imagine that being tied with it is a necessary part of the regular business of life.

A nervous cock used to scream and cackle and call away his obedient following of hens when their friend came into the poultry-yard to give them food, but at night he slept soundly while a raccoon carried off a part of the flock.

Those quasi-reformers who make a great outcry against Anarchism without knowing what it is, while the real ene-

emies of social harmony go unrebuked, remind me of this cock.

A fair-faced little Nicodemus used to visit me after night-fall to enquire what she must do to be saved. She had joined the Methodist church because she was a dressmaker and nearly all the dresses in the village covered devout Methodists,—too devout to pay unsanctified fingers for fashioning their garments.

"I do not believe in the dogmas of the church," she said, "but I must say I do, or else I must starve."

Her partner in business joined the same church for the same reason.

Another member of the same church said:

"I—perhaps I do not believe quite all the religion as the church teaches it, but my dear old mother would break her heart if I should quit her church."

Another member of that church said:

"I don't believe in the bible-religion, at all. I am a spiritualist, but I have belonged to the church a long time, I know all the members and hate to break away from the old associations."

Another member of the same church admitted the foolishness of the Christian religion, but contended that it was necessary for women to believe in it in order to keep them virtuous.

I wonder, if I had been well enough acquainted with all the members of that church to receive their confessions, how many honest Christians I would have found in it.

And I wonder if the world would not have a stupendous surprise party if all the hypocrites should unmask at once.

The church represents not only colossal hypocrisy, but colossal stupidity. Think of thousands of people being idiotic enough to say they believe most absurd and foolish things which they do not believe and paying large sums of money every year to hire people to propagate these fashionable lies. Could children be more childish? Could "heathen" be more heathenish?

Recently I heard a "reformer," while discussing the color line, say: "Fred Douglas is a very intellectual and good man, but I would not want him for a personal friend, on account of his color."

This is very sad for Mr. Douglas.

C. D. D.

Rebuked.

I thought I saw a beggar, who had come
To crave some trifle, which, bestowed, would
bring
Tumultuous words of gratitude, mayhap
A kiss to burn and shine upon my hand,—
My hand outstretched in gracious gentleness
To meet this welcome opportunity
To prove itself a noble, helpful thing,
My mind ran forth in greeting. I was sure
She came to ask. Instead, she came to give.
No gift that I could urge upon her palms,
No kiss that I could lay upon her hair,
Was fit reward for that she brought; a thought
That seemed to fill, like sunlight, all the
room.
I stood afraid before its brilliancy;
Glad and afraid I stood; and then she said:
"Not what men think I am, but what I am
Makes me a joy or sorrow to myself."

C. D. D.

On the 25th day of this month the birth of one lamb will be celebrated by the deaths of innumerable turkeys, and the ideas associated with the manger of Bethlehem will not save the lives of stalled oxen. Veneration for days, times, flags and countries is the seal of imbecility.

Is it not more reasonable to inquire concerning a man's essentials than concerning his parents, country, or social position?

Many people feel indebted to those who are kind to them, as if their benefactors did not act so as to obtain for themselves the greatest amount of happiness.

I recognize no obligations save those which the consequences of actions impose. I obey no one because I think I owe obedience to him or her. I obey from motives of self-interest. I act in accordance with commands only when they are in accordance with my desires or when it seems reasonable to me to expect that I would suffer more by disobeying than by obeying.

The clergyman has no more right than the clown to marry people. The judge has no more right than the jail-bird to sentence people. The policeman has no more right than the pauper to arrest people. The tax-collector has no more right than any other thief to filch people's property. The legislator has no more right than the lackey to make laws.

I have no reverence for God, nor parents, nor sovereigns, nor presidents, nor popes, nor bishops, nor dead bodies, nor ancient institutions; in short, I have no reverence for any person or thing. To associate with some people is pleasurable to me, to associate with others is painful.

When a rich man dies and leaves his wealth conditionally to any person, the benefit is received with a alidity. When a rich man dies and leaves his wealth conditionally to the public, the benefit is received with reluctance, for then it is called charity. How many aristocrats know that they cannot give to the poor, only restore? The greatest of all debts is that of the exploiter to the proletariat. The greatest of all restorations will be when the working classes receive back their own. The trouble is that the idle rich think they can give charity to the working poor and the working poor think they can receive it. The producer alone can give.

In a notice of our paper in the November number of "The Ensign," some one, presumably the editor, referring to Anarchy and Free Love, writes as follows: We have no sympathy with the first and are decidedly opposed to the latter.

In the same paper in an article on "The Parnells and Other People," which I presume is editorial, I find the following:

The English law would not permit her to get a divorce. It commanded her to spend the rest of her days in misery, but carefully shielded all those who had been instrumental in her marrying Capt. O'Shea. What a blessed thing it is to live in an enlightened land with gospel privileges! If Mrs. and Mr. Parnell had defied this law and lived together they would have commanded our admiration, but, though she was probably willing, he could not think of it, for fear the Irish cause would suffer, and yet he could see his party break in fragments rather than to resign as leader. We hold the law is made for man, not man for the law, and we confess that law-breakers, like John Brown and others, who have justly, on their side, excited our admiration and we exalt them to the front rank of heroism. We long for a closer intimacy with such a side.

Anarchists are law-breakers with justice on their side. Free Lovers are defiers of marriage laws. Why does not the writer long for closer intimacy with Anarchists. Why do not Free Lovers commend his admiration? Or does he mean that he is so constituted that he desires and wishes to be intimate with

those with whom he has no sympathy and to whom he is entirely opposed?

Anarchists are opposed to those who break the laws forbidding theft and murder. But they are equally opposed to those who steal and murder without breaking any statute law; their opposition is to the invasive act without considering its legality or illegality. The essences of deeds, they say, are not changed by votes. Anarchists desire that individuals should have liberty to perform any actions, which they believe to be conducive to their happiness except such as are unmistakably aggressive. They would not use force except to resist invasion, and then only when no other means would be available.

They consider that offensive government, supported by plunder, is subversive of rational society. They admit that defensive associations, supported by voluntary contributions, may be necessary so long as some individuals are aggressive. And knowing that people invariably act so as to obtain happiness, they endeavor to show that the greatest good may be obtained under equal freedom, that persons living non-aggressive lives may be of the greatest service to each other. They appeal to reason and to selfishness.

I, as a Free Lover am, in the first place opposed to body-monopoly. In my opinion it is deplorable that any one should be willing to give to another a lien upon his or her person, or that any one should desire to possess such a lien. Between the husband who uses the force of public opinion to compel his wife to submit to his desire and the ravisher who uses the force of muscles to compel a stranger to submit to his desire, I see no difference in quality only in degree. I am convinced that much of the "social evil," much mental suffering and much bodily disease is caused by the constraining and restraining of sexual functions. The sex-embace may be beautiful as a gift but must be hideous as merchandise or a due.

When the economic dependence of woman upon man ceases, the relations of the sexes will be free.

H. C. B. C.

It is sad that so many people remember God and forget humanity, and feel more interest in a possible future than a certain present.

INFANT TERRIBLE

Phil. Kak in E. oism

Duty is that which is due. I ought is
 I owe or I owed. Some duties I assume
 for duties assumed by others toward me,
 this is reciprocity. Some alleged duties
 the Moralists tells me that I ought to
 acknowledge and perform from a sense
 of Duty. If I then say that it is a su-
 perstition he perhaps severs himself for
 the moment from the superstitious
 crowd and claims that it is only a gener-
 alization, meaning fitness, saving fire-
 some repetition of analysis; it is my in-
 terest after all. He is somewhat disin-
 genuous here, for if it is only my inter-
 est embodied in a thought-saving gener-
 alization, it will bear analysis and al-
 ways come out as my interest. But he
 has the "social organism" in mind, to
 the preservation of which my individual
 welfare is to be subordinated, according
 to his idea. The "social organism" idea
 captured him and he is using decoy
 to obtain from me a sacrifice
 self to his idol, his spiritual mon-

man is hired to do certain work.
 what is then called his duty; or ex-
 e of service grows into a mutual
 standing; the debt is first on one
 and then on the other, and what at
 time is expected, to balance the
 into to turn the scale as usual
 and create another claim so as to con-
 tinue the mutually advantageous ar-
 rangement or understanding, is also
 called one's duty. Where service is
 compulsory it is likewise called duty.

Moralism, when it has gained enlight-
 enment enough to reject slavery to a
 person, under the subjection of mind
 overawed by physical force, deems that
 the slave's duty is Duty. But if the
 slave has yielded his mind to his mas-
 ter the phenomenon is clearly that of
 Duty. When the Egoist is conscripted
 he does not argue that his assigned duty
 is not Duty. It is servitude contrary to
 his interest, and this consideration is
 enough. The fact that some slaves are
 governed by a sense of Duty furnishes
 the plainest evidence that Duty is
 mental slavery.

But the Moralists will claim for Duty
 that it is not always mental slavery. It
 is true that he can confuse the issue by
 using the word Duty to describe all
 those habitual actions in the doing of
 which no immediate benefit to self is
 thought of; but let us keep to the plain

sense. Duty is what is due. The
 domination of a fixed idea begins when
 one admits something due and yet not
 due to any person or something due
 without benefit coming to one in return;
 and of course when a benefit is calcu-
 lated upon the idea is interest.

When interest is sublimated so as to
 lose sight of self it assumes the form of
 love in the abstract of oppression.
 Evidently the presence of fear in the
 causative circumstances corrupts the
 sublimating process and results in the
 oppressive sense of Duty. It is possible
 for the Moralists finding a series of
 admirable actions in which are well-nigh
 perfect love or gratitude, to call these
 Duty, on an examination which will
 show that were the door to study his
 conduct he could find in it the elements
 which would serve to construct a wise
 scheme of reciprocal duties. If the
 Moralists talks of Duty when the facts
 spontaneity,—whether gratitude, love,
 overflowing pride and generosity ad-
 vancing to aid all that is seen to make
 our good, he talks of Duty. His
 system of thought has predicated that
 men need to be controlled by a sense of
 Duty. Let him stick to that or leave it.
 We deny it. The doctrine of hell fire
 was long upheld under the same idea
 that it was needed to control men.
 Moralistic Duty is the hardened dress of
 fear. Generosity is the overflowing
 fullness of a successful, satisfied and
 hopeful individuality.

"I ought" is no stumbling block to
 the intelligent Egoist. Two persons
 are playing at draughts and a bystander
 says of one: "He ought to have captured
 the man to the left, not the one to the
 right." There is no sense of moral ob-
 ligation conveyed in the remark. It is
 assumed that each player is trying to
 win, and the words "he ought" intro-
 duce a suggestion of what was wanting
 to produce the result. A pirate endeavor-
 ing to capture a merchantman and
 taking the wrong course would say: "I
 ought to have sailed on the other tack."
 To whom was the obligation? To him-
 self. So men speak of their duty to
 themselves, meaning the attending to
 supplying what is lacking to their wel-
 fare.

These words *duty* and *ought* are not
 words to be rejected. They are in con-
 stant correct use in every day life, and
 it is not the use of the Moralists, but it

can be observed that every humbug pol-
 itician has his "sacred duty" of
 the citizen. This or that,—some-
 thing that he and his party are inter-
 ested in,—and that he cannot readily
 prove to be to the interest of the citizens
 addressed, or he would do so instead of
 trying to get them with him on an ap-
 peal to "sacred duty."

I have been admonished to say noth-
 ing of the abuse of the lower animals
 so long as the human animal is injured
 and enslaved.

This does not seem logical to me. I
 wish to educate people toward a state
 of mind which will lead them to find
 their happiness in being free and un-
 aggressive. While they are learning
 the lesson that invasion gives ultimate
 pain to the invader, I see no reason
 why it should not be studied in its
 entirety. If I say:

You may properly kill a calf but
 not a baby, enslave a horse but not a
 man, kick a dog but not a boy, impale
 a fish but not a woman," any philo-
 sophic mind, though it be the mind of
 a child, must inevitably ask:

Why the exceptions? And can I
 give any good reasons for them? Can I
 say:

"God gave us the beasts for food and
 for slaves?"

For aught we know, the Bengal tigers
 may claim that the human animal was
 created on purpose to supply them
 with palatable food.

To assume a God and then cast the
 responsibility for our savagery into the
 clouds that surround him, is cowardice.
 I think it is wiser to learn as quickly
 as possible that we must bear the re-
 sponsibility of our own acts, and be
 done with vicarious crimes, glories and
 punishments. The decree of ever so
 big a god cannot render less cruel the
 hands that lay a knife to a throat that
 is pleading for me, I care not whether
 it pleads with the beat of a lamb or
 the wail of a human voice.

Competition with the U. S. in carry-
 ing mail is made criminal by the postal
 regulations, and yet one must have the
 brain of a Daniel Webster to learn and
 remember the 18,000 kinds of matter
 that one may be punished for attempt-
 ing to mail.

C. D. D.