Notes on Points.

Non-productive Labor under Communism.—I think the condition of labor under communism would be improved. As it is, I am not quite certain as to the precise meaning. I suppose the general idea, though, is sufficiently evident. In a condition of communism, people would group themselves together according to convenience and lay their needs—at least those which they did not propose to supply by their own unselfish efforts—before others, when each individual would say what he was prepared to do toward the satisfaction of those needs, or any of them. Similarly, any one who had any help to offer which was not so bespoken, would make the fact known, as a case of the occasion being found for it. In precisely the same way, if a man wanted to devote himself to literary work to an extent that would compel him to abstain from giving any help in the commonplace affairs of those about him, it would rest entirely with them as to how far they would choose to occupy themselves in commonplace affairs for his benefit; that would depend on their appreciation of his work in relation to the circumstances of the case. If to carry out this work he has to call upon others for his entire support, it would be at their option individually to assist him or not. As a matter of fact, the contingency would be exceedingly rare. A man cannot continuously do mental labor to the absorption of all his energies, without getting tired of it, and for the same reason that a laboring man cannot wheel barrowloads of stuff up a plank from the time he wakes to the time he goes to sleep without getting disgusted with molecular exertion. You find that the purely mental work, those whose mental labor does not require the constant active cooperation of the muscular system, always when it is in their power get a garden to dig in, or something of the kind, by way of recreation. And so far as my experience goes, a man not under compulsion to work continuously, forces speed, will do as much of each of two or three kinds of work, that is, two or three times as much work altogether, as he would do of any one kind of work under the same conditions. This in the long run; for during some days or weeks he may win himself better by applying himself closely to one kind of work while the mood is upon him. And he will do better work of each kind.

This is especially true of purely mental work, which must be varied by some that is less abstract, inasmuch as the mind being composed of the impressions, more or less complex, made upon the brain from without in the first instance, there is an absolute necessity for the largest possible contact with the outer world to renew, and to recombine the impressions. In default of this a man ceases to have ideas at command. The more specialist is the most unthinking being imaginable except an absolute idiot—just as truly if this specialty is botany or chemistry as if it is making the hundreds part of a pin, except inasmuch as the occupation itself contains more variety. A man may be a specialist and intellectual, but only on condition that the man includes the specialist, and that the specialist does not exclude the rest of him.

I speak as a mental worker by occupation, and feelingly. I have never been able to do so much or so good mental work as when I have had the greatest variety of it together with the greatest amount of the most diversified physical exertion.

Free Consumption.—It seems to me that a lot of people fail to discern the difference between freedom and privilege. The objectors to free consumption appear to be under the impression that it means the privilege of the ruler to master to consume just as he pleases, no matter what other people may think about it. This is just on a par with the idea that Anarchy or freedom of action means that if I want to hit you, you are bound to let me do it. Freedom of action that society has not pledged itself to take sides against me if I hit you, but that every one preserves the full right to form his own judgment and act upon it; and you are in exactly the same position toward society as that in respect to me. Freedom of consumption implies that people in general have not pledged themselves to allow any person to consume as much or so much as he pleases. The man who has not the slightest interest in the welfare of himself or others is not to be considered as a good citizen if he does not take his share of the public's good fortune.

Labor Exchange.—I have read the literature of this movement, forwarded by Carl Gossner, and consider it a move in advance and capable of affording some amelioration of conditions to those
Communism and Individualism.

In the last copy of "Liberty," an individualist-Anarchist organ published under the editorship of certain assertions concerning Communist Anarchism which appear to me should be refuted. He affirms, to begin with, that Communist Anarchism in France, and in England and in Prussia, is the expression of a revolutionary conspiracy. He says, "collectivism is the order of the day, and Communitists must choose between State socialism, for which they manifest so much aversion, and lead their unresisting countrymen who really desire liberty will have to seek it by acting in concert with the Individualists, and once attained can pursue their experiments in voluntary Communities without fear or hindrance." Mr. Tucker has been misinformed regarding the statute of the revolutionary movement in France. No doubt for some time past a sequencing evolution, to which Comrades Kropotkin has already drawn attention, has presented itself among the different factions, which will eventually be a great waste, clearly to the advantage of the oligarchic tendencies into what is termed a "double". On the one side the "authoritaires" who, drifting away from the old revolutionist traditions, have now only one aim in view: to wake up the State from its torpor and turn it back onto the road of autocracy and oligarchy. The second, which is the Communist Anarchist, and naturally the revolutionist Federal Communities otherwise "Alliance" and a great number of groups and labor corporations without special denominations. And among this last mass revolutionization communist direction toward Communist Anarchism is very marked.

Only lately the Federal of the Labor Exchanges published a manifest, formulating as a program the abolishment of the State and of individual property. This demand of Mr. Kropotkin consequently denounces Mr. Tucker's assertion that Communism is dead in France and Collectivism is the order of the day. But as a great many others, the State Socialists pretend that the State is the property includes being an ideal admirer in Common union, there is nothing surprising in his desire for the extinction of this conception. This however has no importance in the eyes of Mr. Kropotkin, and in fact individualism can be modified. One truth is that the idea of Communism has completed and purified itself in dropping the vague sentimentalism which permeated it in its原始 form, better and better understood. However contradictory may seem the link of the words, has resolved itself in a sense, to one more individualistic. The Communist socializing towards liberty have the advantage that the individual and he alone represents a concrete entity, and that is absurd to sacrifice the interests of the individual to society or to the community, abstract entities having a reality only through the individual that compose them. The only happiness that can be attained is the happiness of the individual, and this can only come through absolute liberty or Anarchy.

But this absolute liberty can only be obtained by removing the individual from every constraint and from every direction his personality, developing without obstacle all his aptitudes, and satisfying all his needs. This result could only be obtained on condition that the individual would dispose of his own property, and retain it, but so long as a tithe is levied on the individual just so long an obstacle will be in the way of his realization of happiness. That is the reason the Communist Anarchists are so liberal in maintaining that their obstacle must be removed, and so long as the obstacle of authority in order to reach the common end of all Anarchists, the abolishment of individual property, without the total abolishment of individual property. The happiness of the individual is the end, the only means of action. I propose at a future time to go deeper into this subject. We are only Communists for the sake of guaranteeing to the individual the greatest amount of liberty.

Mr. Tucker in the above mentioned copy of "Liberty", removes this opposition which he regards to base on the construction of G. W. Leibnitz and J. H. Morris style feeble objection and asks "Can these authous be partisans of liberty?" The argument is very shallow, and in turn I would ask this friend of "Liberty" whether he will remove from Mr. Tucker, necessary to his subsistence, what means would be sufficient to have him return them, persuasion. But I'm certain that would not be persuaded, I would say, would not be excluded from us as he considers some for having interfered with the liberty of his thief.

The means of production, this is to say the means of producing goods, capable of being to all by natural rights have been since time immemorial controlled by a privileged class. Robbery of ancient times is still robbery to-day. And it is certain that criminals in law sometimes favorable to the criminal do not constitute a state of justice. This privileged class then compares exactly with the thief spoken of. This recognition means have been exhausted with such recognition. What is left to do? Just what Mr. Tucker would do with the thief: use force. And this would not be encouraging the liberties of the thieves, but would only be taking possession of objects illegitimately acquired.

At the bottom of the quarrel instituted against us by the Individualists there is only a misunderstanding. The Individualists have the fallacy of which the Communists, the real "libertarians" understand Communism and its establishment. The word Communist awakens in our opponents the ideas of barricades, of sabotage, of the destruction of property, of murder. They see in it the negation of the opportunity for the individual to isolate himself, if he desires, to have a distinct home and family. They imagine that Communism implies as a forced consequence the communization in common of the goods produced, and I must admit that such a state of affairs is not calculated to be very seductive. They also hear of expropriation, as if the government takes nothing from the producers, and, forcing them to the point of the sword to relinquish their wealth to the common fund. Such pictures may appear advantage in a romantic utopianism, but the truth is that none who knows how slow economical transformations take place. A property transformation cannot take place in a day, by a forcible way. Alone the State Socialist pretend that the State can make a possess of the property, and not one who knows how slow economical transformations take place. The "libertarians" Communists simply say this: "At all times property has attained a degree of perfection in accord with the means of production only undergone variations. The property of a long time has filled the requirements necessary to the means of production, the conditions are today altered. The actual production disposes of too few, and the formation of the property form be the one to realize the greatest economy of forces. It can only produce a concentration of the capital and its steady absorption to the profit of a minority. As for the corresponding form to the present improved means of production. Its transformation is implied only. And the economic..."
forms which today responds to the economic forces is Communism, which leaves to each, according to his needs, the productive forces, assuring a maximum of production, proportionate to these needs.

How establish Communism? None are prophets, and he who would attempt by force to establish the principles of the revolution, would be disappointed. However no economic transformation has ever taken place without leaving certain trails, and occupying a stubborn resistance by the beneficiaries of the dying regime. To pursue the same class resistance to exist is the safeguard of property and the maintenance of the present economic forms, opposite itself directly or indirectly in the interest of the classes benefited by the present regime, to the effort of the few interested in the necessary transformation. It will therefore require force to remove this obstacle. Education toward liberty on the change of conditions, the balance of power, to be possible. The desire to share the immediate and absolute access to the small farmers, is in other things, whatever he could if he had his way, the primitive and rudimentary existence, some would prevent him, some enjoy him. But in the other case, the agricultural society to be considered as a large farm, where the different groups would resemble the horses of animals rather than groups of intelligent beings. The individuation or the primitive and rudimentary character of this thing, which is the thing itself, with the method simple method left to each, to use or not to use, according to his demands. The different elements of action to his disposition.

We consider Communism is not that promiscuity due to life and the free enjoyment of the products and the free use of the means of production, absolute freedom for all to partake, but where the same will be divided by the need and the necessities of the commodities of civilization.

With these things, and because of these things, none will be obliged because living in a communist society to live in barracks, to sleep in commonatories, nor to the consequences of indentured.

Let us be Philosophers.

If the Anarchists would promptly denounce bomb-throwing they would win our respect, but it seems, unfortunately that they do not seem to know that it is a crime against humanity. The idea that the explosion of a bomb would help any cause is ridiculous.

We believe, at least, that the destruction of the present society which we call the State, is not a solution, but an Anarchist-Communist, it is a destructive of innocence.

Why don’t I denounce voting? It perpetuates government, the most destructive of institutions, of which the method of the best, of which the progeny of the most, 89 people of the 90 die, with diocese and liberty and piety of slavery.

We do not want to expose the methods, however, I believe that only in a few instances people can make a mistake because the simple, simple, simple of the definition and the killing of the innocents.

So, we cannot and with the attitude of any class of reformers who know the little that is knowable, countenance any such insane methods. We cannot make no excuse: it is better to die, to die freely, to die in simple. We can only try to bring it to the consciousness of the people.

We believe that with the destruction of the present society, which we call State, Anarchists and Communists, is not a solution, is too, and its necessity, which is the cause of the destruction of the innocent.

The State is the enemy of peace, and the enemy of liberty, and of the innocence of man.
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Brigton must admit that it was not so near easily sixteen centuries ago when the Old Testament was first translated from the original Hebrew, and most assuredly gross errors and misinterpretations resulted from the Vulgate. Unless he accept with christian meekness the long expounded doctrine of the "Holy Spirit" guiding and directing both writers and translators of the Bible.

As a sample of the slovenliness and unpunctuated Hebrew, I will refer Comrade Byington to Gen. 8, 15, in a Roman Catholic Bible to compare with the Hebrew version; he will find that instead of (and) "He saw...he read..." the Latin reads (and) "He shall...shall," etc. The mistake is obvious.

Not because Hieronymus was not a good scholar, but because of the ignorance of the Vulgate and unpunctuated Hebrew of his day, that he could not help himself to transcribe the word for the Hebrew letters comprising the words he or she are identically with the exception that the former has a modern period in the second letter.

Now, Comrade Byington must admit that the above translation of the above passage is virtually so different from the Protestant, and that the latter is exactly like the Hebrew, he replied that they (the Catholics) have the original translation and that Protestants or Jews must have tampered with that passage.

Of course, it is impossible to us if the Scriptures are older than the Talmud or vice-versa; the same also if a "be" or "shall" shall crush the serpent's head.

We cannot leave that to the "upholders of the faith" who are sore in need of defending the same, but for the sake of clearness and of truth I penned the above criticism.

F.M. R. Cooper
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