Influencing the Capitalists.

Comrade Morris appears to think this is hopeless. I think that fear is a conventional fear. The greatest number of capitalists do not enjoy the true amount of comfort and convenience, besides necessity, produced by the average exertions of one man; they are surely as well capable of understanding that they have no chance worth considering of becoming able to spend large fortunes on personal gratifications, as the workers of understanding how much chance they have of doing the same, and the difference is not much in this respect; they are not secure in the positions they occupy, and whatever reduces the aggregate purchasing power of the workers cuts off profits from them or destroys their capital; the same condition which threatens the workers with starvations threatens them with ruin and starvation afterwards in the capacity of unemployment; except a handful of criminal lunatics whose peculiarities the system has favored, they are ordinary persons who are in the position they occupy by the mere chance of events. Certainly, it is hardly to be expected that they will give up capitalism in order to become wage-servants and outcasts; but the unemployed might argue that so long as the opportunities of subsistence are locked up in the way they are, justice among the workers demands that those opportunities which are available should not be monopolized by some members of the working class to the exclusion of others; and because those who have billets do not throw them up, they might contend with equal validity that it was useless to try and agitate among employed persons, who might become in earnest over the solidarity of the working people, only after becoming unemployed. On the contrary, the interests of the employed themselves would lead them to welcome a change of system if they saw clearly that the new principles were correct, and how the new methods would operate and be operated. In the same way, the majority of capitalists when they realize, as they are doing, that the present system is to their detriment, will be eager to bring about any change which recommends itself to their understanding, even if they will not let go the means of support that they possess right up to the moment when they can see their way to set about changing—and in this they are no worse than the workers, who are supporting capitalism for their own immediate convenience even when they work for a capitalist or buy capitalist-owned goods, and who are not likely to voluntarily cease doing so until the moment they see the way to support themselves under a different system. The point I take is, that the average capitalist is not benefiting at the expense of the worker, but is really suffering at the expense of the worker; that he does not get the materials for enjoyment, but alone the social means of enjoyment, under the present system by robbing the workers, which he would get as an honest worker in Anarchy; that for what he does get, he has to pay his workers, who are as rich as the absolute poverty from which they are often undermining his constitution during the greater part of his waking hours; and that he has no greater security for his position than has the worker, the same disastrous causes influencing him in the same way, with the only difference that he has resources which prevent him for awhile from feeling the pinch quite so acutely; and that if he understands this well, and also understands Anarchy, then if an easy opportunity for peaceful evolution presents itself he will take advantage of it, and if warlike revolution breaks out, he will at the critical moment be found on the right side. It is to be remembered that few men are heroes, but nearly all will face the greatest difficulties and dangers when moving as a mass. There are also many people who will help to make up the mass if they know why they should, but not otherwise. I contend that the capitalist needs the social transformation about as much, taking things all around, as the worker does; the worker is often fool enough not to see his real interests, and, he finds that the only difficulty I see about it. If the capitalist really benefited himself by the present system it would be another matter; but he don’t and can’t, and I put him on the same footing towards the worker as the employed worker towards the unemployed—simply a slave to the system, who has in some respects, by the accident of circumstances, a little less rugged suffering. Anyhow, I would consider it better work to convert one capitalist than a dozen of the unemployed, for the simple reason that one man logically convinced against his immediate interests based on the System, is certainly convinced, whilst a man who is open to conviction under the necessaries of the moment may simply be driven by exasperation to acquiesce in express doctrines which as soon as the exceptional provocations is withdrawn, he regards as mere extravagances. It must also be confessed that, as capitalism has been considered by the public generally up till recently as perfectly moral, it has really been superior energy and ability, and not merely greedy cunning, that has enabled many people who are capitalists to become and remain so; and on the other hand that whilst the system produces degradation as well as poverty for which the degraded and the poor are not personally responsible, there are a great many people at the bottom of society whose own defects have thrust them down or kept them down; consequently with all due allowance for criminal lunatics, etc., among the capitalists, there is every reason to suppose that they should be good material for converts and quite as well worth trying to influence as the unemployed, etc., to whom it is the fashion of agitation to appeal. That is considering them as men, but there is also the very powerful argument in favor of doing all that is possible to enlighten them and make them sympathize with us behind their immediate interests, if they won’t sympathize in front of them—that when the critical moment arrives and is recognized, and the immediate interest of everyone is above everything else one or other of the possible issuers of a power of resources who has been prepared to range himself on our side means so much of resources which we have possession of from the commencement—a very considerable item whether for actual war or for war preparations. If on this ground alone, I think that without neglecting efforts in other directions—every possible endeavor should be made continually to impress upon capitalists the truth and desirability of Anarchy, and the fact that the choice between it and the present system is not at all indifferent for them; that for us as for us Anarchy is an escape from evils to benefits.

J. A. Andrews.

Warren Replies to Me

In The Firebrand of August 16th, a copy of which one has kindly furnished me, is an article by J. H. M., entitled "Judgment without trial," to which I beg leave to offer a brief reply.

To begin with the title to the article, I remark that it exhibits more of discrepancy than does the article itself, and does not truly indicate either the character of my reminiscences, or of the writer’s criticism of them; for on the whole, the criticism shows too little real disagreement between Mr. Morris and myself to justify controversy. Some of his quotations, however, are inaccurate, and like his title, misleading, and the reader is likely to infer that, in Mr. Morris’s conclusions as to the lessons to be drawn from the Berlin Heights experiments are quite unworthy of consideration.

To be as brief as possible, I will mention only one of these misquotations. I did not say that: "The conclusion from the experiments at Berlin Heights, and all the experiments everywhere, is that Communism is impracticable; for this would have been contradicted by the experience of the Shakers, and by numerous other examples. It is true that I assumed, that all such experiments had failed; but I did not mean that they had ceased to exist, nor that they had been invariably condemned as impracticable. I only meant that they had failed to satisfy the aspirations of freedom loving men and women. What I did say, which Mr. M. should in fairness have quoted in full, was that conventional Communism, as a system of organized industry, can never succeed, except at the sacrifice of individual freedom and aspiration. This is the lesson to be drawn from the experiments at Berlin Heights — from all the experiments everywhere.

The insinuations of my article as to the ignorance of the Berlin people, concerning the principles of Communism, will cause a smile on the countenance of Frank Barry and the veterans of that celebrated movement. If, in all justice in attributing to ignorance whatever seems to antagonize his own theories; and the reader is partially for those in subsequent remarks, criticizing what he is pleased to term the old Communism, as distinguished from real Communism.

But what he calls Communism, I called Communism in my reminiscences, and the world has all along
agreed with me. And so, before pitching into me, he should read his own works. He is, he said, not an advocate of the attack on Communism at all, but only an advocate of Communism, and so far as that was concerned, he had no fault to find with the author, he said, he would agree with them, and then goes on and devotes the bulk of his article to the support of his position. Communism, he agrees with me, is a failure. I did not say so, he said. For the little consolation I suppose that Alexander Lonsdale and Frank Barry and I will still be allowed to call it Communism. Of course, they have more reason to be the Anarchists putting new definitions to words if they prefer to do so. But in this instance, I am no more a Communist than I was before. In both articles, written by myself and M., I have defined, what the new definition is. Anarchist Communism means simply "free consumption." Unrestricted production will make commodities free. All commercial value will disappear, and each individual will be free to help himself to whatever he needs, or think he needs, as we now take a pin or a match, without regard to ownership. Of this kind of communism I have two remarks to make. One is, that it is not original with Anarchists, unless Jovisal Warren is to be so designated; and he did not claim the name, nor did he name the theory Communism. The other is, that both Jovisal Warren and the Anarchists are, I think, mistaken as to the effects which will follow the removal of the economic system. They are all too sanguine. Of course there can be no objection to free consumption, under the conditions predicted; but it cannot be assumed that the destruction of the state would not mean that every individual would produce more than enough to supply his own wants; because in such a case products would only be accumulated uselessly and allowed to perish wantfully. Communism does not contemplate any such imbecility. It is expected, however, that the individual will be restricted in supplying his wants, and that in doing so he will necessarily exercise his powers of production. If the main principle of these is that the production of the power is necessary to the satisfaction of other needs and wants, but because the exercise of every faculty and power is a natural want. Whether under such circumstances the individual would exceed that of the present is an entirely irrelevant question. The point is that people shall be free to produce as much or as little as their wants dictate.

As to the individual wants, I agree with Mr. Warren [see Firebrand No. 29]. Anarchists do not mean "equal freedom"; or if it does agree with Mr. Warren, it is understandable [see Firebrand No. 39]. My demand for absolute freedom does not mean that I want greater freedom than my neighbor or that I want to control his action—that is another principle altogether. Absolute liberty is in order that I may freely act for the satisfaction of my own wants; controlling the actions of another would be directing his actions to the satisfaction of my own wants. and far from being the principle of liberty, it is the opposing principle of government. To assume that the logical conclusion of absolute liberty is the principle of government, as Mr. Warren does, is an absurdity unrealized by no notice. Those who talk about "equal freedom" appear to have the same notion, and Mr. Warren's equity proposition is their own in different language. The idea is that beyond a certain level of consumption (the principle of government) and to remedy this liberty, it is to be regulated, limited, "equalized." That Mr. Warren's principle of absolute liberty is apparent. It is very evident that we can regulate the amount (say "how much") and determine the quality (whether of "equity" or "equity") of government, we can abolish it completely desired; and the fact that some of us do desire it would seem to make the first proposition as much a question as the other. Besides, if absolute liberty is the principle of government, limiting the government, i.e., saying how much, would be limiting liberty: and liberty limited is not liberty, according to Mr. Warren. There never has been and never can be any question of equity in this country. Mr. Warren recognizes in a former sentence, rules. Equity is the absence of compulsion—absolute individual liberty.

W. A. W. A. Ames.

If my friend Warren said things that he did not mean to say in his "Berlin Heights," article, he should not blame me for it. But he did pronounce "all" communistic efforts failures. I am quite ready to agree that what he calls communistic experiments always do fail, but it will fail, because the men are always failures. I trust there is no reason that they are not communistic. Like "limited freedom," "limited" Communism is not Communism. Even if I grant his correction of my question, it would be a presumption to say I must agree with him. As for reasons that they are not communistic, and so on, Mr. Warren's conclusions as to Communistic are unworthy of consideration. This principally because (and also tried to make this fact plain) he has no economic system. His failure is because of lack of understanding. Mr. Warren attempted to judge a system without trial called out my criticism. Had he carried the experiments by their proper names I could only have said that he was wrong or that he was wrong or that he was wrong.

If my friend Warren said things that he did not mean to say in his article, he should not blame me for it. But he did pronounce "all" communistic efforts failures. I am quite ready to agree that what he calls communistic experiments always do fail, but it will fail, because the men are always failures. I trust there is no reason that they are not communistic. Like "limited freedom," "limited" Communism is not Communism. Even if I grant his correction of my question, it would be a presumption to say I must agree with him. As for reasons that they are not communistic, and so on, Mr. Warren's conclusions as to Communistic are unworthy of consideration. This principally because (and also tried to make this fact plain) he has no economic system. His failure is because of lack of understanding. Mr. Warren attempted to judge a system without trial called out my criticism. Had he carried the experiments by their proper names I could only have said that he was wrong or that he was wrong or that he was wrong.

The Iron Law of Wages.

By "the iron law of wages" is meant a natural law, but I am speaking of the economic system. This law of wages is claimed to have been discovered by Ferdinand La Salle, but Engels delta it by announcing himself and Marx as the true discoverer. It is not a law at all. Engels or La Salle was the discoverer of this law does not alter its grave significance. Hence, this law of wages, meaning simply that wages to decrease just in proportion as the cost of reproduction of the laborer decreases, loses nothing of its value to the student of economics by the fact that (1) it is "History of Philosophy," by Marx, Russian edition.

all or neither of them were its discoverers. This law is no economic fiction; it is a stern reality, substantiated by facts too numerous to be specified in this short article. When there are millions of women and children and the sick and the old and the young starving to death; when there are hundreds and thousands of those who work early and late and cannot earn enough to keep a roof over their heads; when the rays upon which the laborer is forced to live and are forced to live, and sufficient food in their stomachs to sustain themselves in good health; who can doubt this cruel law of wages? Let other critics try to say what they will, but in the eye of every honest man the law of wages does exist and result most cruelly to the laboring masses. They who work in the factory and in the mine, they who labor under the hardest and most degrading conditions; those who are the most useful members of the community, go about without clothing or shelter. Is it because they do not deserve comfort that they suffer in poverty? In the eyes of these laborers, who have no business system, who have no business, but because the law of wages does not permit them to have it.

Now the question likely to occur to every intelligent reader is: Whence comes this iron law of wages? Why do wages tend to fall so low that hundreds and thousands are driven to the most despicable crime? Why do women and children work under the most cruel conditions of toil? The honest laborers are proud of putting it to find to that point at which it is much the same to the laborer whether he works or not, starvation or his portion in life.

These questions are easily answered as soon as we understand that all this talk of men being free and independent is not true. Wage earners are not free and independent. When land and the instruments of production are monopolized, and those who have all the wants of a human being having nothing save their labor power to gratify them, it is absurd to think otherwise. The capitalist is the one who is free who has no access to the soil upon which he chooses to make his livelihood. No man is free whose livelihood depends upon another, as a worker. The capitalist does not own the laborer, but he owes that which he cannot live. And this, as we shall point out later, is the laborer comes under the "iron law of wages." Had the laborer been free and independent, as the prevailing notion is, that is to say, had the laborer, on his own property, to the same extent, throw his labor into the market that might have been established by the fruits of his labor. The iron law of wages could not hurt him, because if his wages were not so high as he could earn for himself, he would make them. All would work for himself and dispose of his commodities by selling or exchanging them with those who were in need of them. But, under the present system the laborer cannot afford to refuse wages no matter how low they may be. He must accept the wages offered to him or commit suicide, because the laborer of today has no land, no tools, and cannot employ his laborer of yesterday, better to perform the same function.

The laborer of today, I repeat, has no tools, and has no land. He sleeps in another man's house; he eats in another man's shop; he uses another man's tools. He can exercise no will of his own with reference to the compensation for his toil; the present industrial system has rendered his helpless, and under the domination of monopoly in land begun, monopoly in machinery has finished. This comes the laborer of today under the biting pressure of the iron law of wages. But, as we grow accustomed, the hardest drudgery of life becomes so familiar and so habitual that a thing is inevitable he ceases to complain, even though it may be an evil of the most painful character. Hence the necessity to labor for a bare living, just to the necessity to do it as a very ordinary thing. Work seems to the toiler the greatest boon in life. The meanest and the hardest drudgery is always welcome to those whose lot has
been made miserable by our existing capitalist sys-
tem. And with multitudes of men falling over each
other in the struggle for an opportunity to work,
what becomes of those who refuse to work for low
wages? When there is no pressure there is no
demand — limit to which wages may not be pushed,
except that beyond which the laborer cannot reproduce
himself.

I hold it will be clearly understood why all
but the most skillful laborers are forced on the
law of wages without regard to their personal merits
or demerits, without regard to the multiplication of
the differences of price and labor powers. And when
industrial training schools are done away with to
make labor skillful, then what we call skilled workmen
will be just as poorly paid as the rest. The only point,
in fact, is that in a capitalist system there is

in the strength of life still live.

KATE AUSTIN.

Misconceptions.

In your definition of Communism, in your last
issue, you say, "For supposing the community to be governed
by the representative system, it is evident that some
will have more voting power than others, and that
the land or capital or property will accumulate in
the hands of the rich." This is the basis of the
management and disposal of the "common property." Thus we see
the "common" principle has been violated," etc.

The objection is not that the "enfranchise the government
appears quite natural, so it seems to me, it is not the
provided absolute liberty be the great desideratum, in fact, it is
difficult to imagine any sort of society whatsoever, with¬
out a surrender of liberty to some degree. But, the
question is, absolute liberty the real ideal which
activates or, and if so, to what extent are we propelled
by it. On I confess, I want to make sure what
liberties, to what extent is it desirable to do so?
You seem to place a good deal of emphasis on the word liberty,
and yet, from your concluding remarks in the same
article, I judge you recognize there is a mistake of curtailing individual
 liberty to some extent, still is it not true that
much importance has been given that word,
allotment.

It seems to me that the true object in life, the end
to which all we arise, is to live and enjoy life with
the least possible friction and in putting it that way I am
not forgetful of the fact that we may enjoy a certain
amount of friction and be improved by it, indeed it
seems a part of the object of the struggle itself, involv¬
ing, as it does, education, morals, health, life, etc. But in
term of duty, does not the surrender of a certain degree of
profit be necessary, not only logical, but a matter of
necessity. I do not for a moment think so. I see
things, the only question which remains is upon
what terms shall the surrender take place, and therein
lies the mystery of the situation.

Now if one makes a surrender to society it must
be evident that unless society renders a full equivalent in
shape of a compensation, it may not cease of the
freedom, liberty, society or portions of it becomes the master
of the situation, as at present. On the contrary, if
an equivalent is rendered a balance is maintained and for
reason that I believe in our con¬
tentions regarding property and government.
The ideal liberty is at fault, I am persuaded.

To those who recognize not only the desirability but
the absolute necessity of certain social habits, such as
instincts as 'a justice of recreation, instruction,
property is the product of production and distribution, but property,
are property essential. The term government being
used in a larger sense, of course. But, with equiva-

lents rendered, the question of objection arises to either? Is it not precisely because equivalents
are not rendered that both are so obnoxious to day? (2)
Now, I can or I can not, but the law of society is,
the useful, by employing the natural laws of
and that involves organization — of groups
if you please. But, our inability to organize, combined
with the name which has not been robbed, marks us as
and as the great body of us, as the "incompe-
teit"; precisely as charged. I can see no special object in
either property or government, except as they
be can be used as a means to exploit, and by competition
exploitation can be eliminated. No object, one way or
another, proceeds.

The country is full of communists and co-operative
colonies but the object of each and every one of them is
to exploit, hence they are all certain to meet with ulti-
mate failure, for unless you have a law of union, you
cannot have a law of liberty. The worst of it is,
such failures set up themselves, if we may judge by
history, the only way out of it, will it, is safe to
tell, as long as selfishness is confined to the
individual.

With all our boasted progress we stand in need of
equity as far as the world is concerned.

Again, I ask, is there anything but competition on
a proper basis, not for profit — which will furnish
a remedy for this state of affairs? You will admit,
I believe, that we must have such things as railways, for
example, and yet railways must have both property
and government. Such institutions can scarcely be
operated byexpectation of the corporation, for
reclamation, or community, without endless confusion and dis-
ruption. But, let competition appear, and profit dis-
appear, and where can either be used as a means to
exploit.

Again you say, "Restriction of opportunity is a neces-

sary adjunct of markets and commerce". This is far
from the truth. What have markets or commerce to do
with monopoly? I may be wrong of course, but I do not think it

says considerable confusion here, and I believe that
improvement at all will. Of standard and hope, death hath no power to bind.

Immortal in the strength of life still live.

KATE AUSTIN.

Kind Words for Borkman and Elieh.

Mr. FULTON in "Ages of Thought" goes the length of
calling Borkman a "great jurist" and Frick a "man
deserving of the highest commendation." For my part I think Fulton
right there. Borkman is certainly not a coward, he had reached
that stage where he was willing to seal his
destiny with his heart's blood, and it seems
that if he succeeded his life would pay the forfeit,
and he walked boldly where his star led him. We will have
nothing to say about Borkman, as Borkman, says Lingle
and Engel and Fischer, ere the "iron jawed" of
monopoly are broken, and I am glad to see that The
Firebrand comedies are not afraid to face the issues, is
either with the banner of peace or the banner of war.

I have just received the last No. of The Firebrand,
talking of the brutal murder of Herman Elieh. And
so another true soul has passed into the "great Un-
known", one of the immortal few, who refused to be a
Prostitute. I have read with interest the notice of his
passing which I had intended to say but had no
better text to you, that if you were in communication
with him, to inform him that we would be glad to see him
if he come down. But Elieh was a friend's friend,
but I was too late with my offer of friendship,
and he will never know that away in Missouri
he had friends who mourn his sad late and
unjust death.

Do you know who buried the poor fellow? (1) It is
hard to think of him lying in an unknown grave, far
from the one he knew. These few lines to Phineas may apply to all:

Immortal are the life lives on forever,
For they are preserved in his works forever.

The thoughts that welled up from thy loving heart,
Determined that thy soul might see forever.

The burning words that made thy life a fire.
Unto the lesser soul, hope to inherit.

Until we meet again, to warmer climes.

(1) The body was buried at Sault Lake City, by a friend there.
forth direction for action. This is only possible through
widespread and active participation of all. For in-
stance, the factory hand produces an article of
general use, receiving a certain sum therefor. He
cannot take the article produced for his pay, but
must give up the surplus of his labor to the
employer and pay, perhaps, one and a
half times what he received for producing it. It is
as if he had taken the article direct from his
employer, agreeing to produce it for him one and a
half times the value he received for it. Thus we find the producers
in perpetual bondage for the use of the articles of
their own production. Commerce can rest upon no
other basis. With opportunity to produce and sell, and pay more than the cost
of production, and the employer and the merchant
cannot exist.

M. J. M.

Massmeeting, Entertainment, and "Access"

In order to make our voices heard here in the public
debates on the national issues, some of us thought it
appropriate to arrange a massmeeting, where we will be able to explain our position, and our attitude toward
different political parties.

We feel the necessity of explaining ourselves to the
people at large what Anarchy really is, and what it is not.
One main effort is to be clear and concise in
stating our aims and desires.

It would be very gratifying for us to see also comrades
come from Seattle and smaller places throughout the
Firebrand territory and ignorance and ignorance, to
shake hands and have a good time with us.

We want to show to the people at large our concep-
tions of education, politics, and economics.

We need arrangements for Germania Hall, where
most of the stump-speaking is going on. The program
is very elaborate and will be a surprise to our enemies
which are supposing that we "won't figure" in the
locality. We are going to have Prof. Jenson's full
orchestra which is a first class one. An address
delivered by A. Klemmedon on National election and the
Social problem.

The Tacoma Zither Club assisted by Mr. Rotachek, Miss Hotepeke, Messrs Karanek and Jeske, in song by
Mr. Harry Hart and Miss Loraine; and a violin solo by Mr. J. T. Davis.

In connection with the concert is going to be introduced the
"Grape picking" entertainment where it will be
allowed to steal, but will be fined if caught. In this
Messrs Thrall, Gregorson, Burh and Bishop will act as
Guardians, Mr. Hardy as Burgemeister and V. Klem-
medon (the chief trial will get the premi-

A. K.

Note and Comment.
The New York Times (for the eulogistic diction-
ary) has again been postponed—the date being set for
November 7.

To demand the right of self-government is not demand-
ing the privilege of inflicting injury on others: to grant
the right of self-government is not granting another
the privilege of injuring you. The right of self-government
and of self-protection against invasion are equally inal-

lelable.

Without exception anything Conrade Andrews has 30 say concerning converting captives to
Anarchy I believe the market for authors is being advertised.

My experience is that there is no essential difference
between the average capitalist and the average work-
man; but not one as far as I can see that the other.
It is difficult, as conrade Andrews says, to
induce the employed workingman to see beyond his job
at so much per day. How much more difficult, then, to
reach that workingman who has worked thirty years
and who thinks he has so much farther to look. So
difficult does it appear that I think it will require some
thing more than words to awaken the.

Anarchism knows no class, however, and I certainly
should not object to the means with which the capitalist
would be able to enforce the movement.

A. M. R.

This 8. H. P. leaders are working for principles only,
but it is a little funny how they have so much money

for the campaign against the populists and Bryan-

ites, while constantly complaining of the smallness of
their pay and being somewhat skeptical of their funds.

Only one thing to be done about the Anarchists, calling them police spies, etc. But that reminds me
of the legend of the man who ran, crying stop theft,
with the plunder in pos

Not only are there tons of literature being distrib-
uted gratuitously, but all papers who will use them
are supplying supplies gratis. No ready prints for
campaign purposes. Everything that can be thought of is being done to "educate the voter" on
"sound money" and on "free coinage", but there is
not a single one of these papers that makes any edu-
cational literature but what is calculated to mislead
the reader and befoul the voter. But it serves its
purpose just the same. It keeps the deluded wealth
producers quarrelling amongst themselves and perpetu-
ates the power of the robbins.

Proposal

It has been the custom in the past few years for the
Jewish Anarchists of New York City to be canvassed
in New Haven, Jersey City, Philadelphia and a few other
neighboring towns, perhaps to send one a year, delegates into
New York City for the purpose of meeting and discussing
the Anarchist movement in the United States.

This has been termed an "annual convention". At the
last meeting a committee has been appointed to arrange
and call the next convention. The present date is
January 1897, and we thus take the opportunity to propose
a general and real convention of all the Anarchists in
the United States, to be held in New York in the English language.

It cannot be that the Jewish section will object to this
at all, on the contrary, we think that they will feel
gratified when this is accomplished because they know it
of the usefulness and real necessity of it. And it is
hardly necessary for us to emphasize on the importance
of such a convention. Everybody will admit the
need of this convention; it is important. It is time
start now men working and will stimulate and en-
courage the old ones. It is evident that the Anarchist
movement in this country has become stagnant, some are
losing hope, and many are becoming indifferent.

This is because we come together but little, we rarely consider matters conjointly;
we divide things. As a consequence we have yet to
arrive at a common understanding, we need to find
good means for agitation, we need yet to perfect the
ideas and principles of Anarchism, it remains yet for us
to put our efforts and work in union. All this can be
accomplished only through conventions.

At present the political aspect of the United States
is rather extraordinary, and we are sure a discussion on
how we should coordinate our means will suffice to
indicate the position Anarchists are to occupy in
diverse political movements.

Moreover now that Mr. Turner is in this country,
and we hear on good authority that Commodore Louise
Michel and Kronpatkin are to arrive shortly here; it
would be a fine introduction and a most profitable
of much accomplishment.

We feel assured that the people will oppose this op-
portunity, we yet do not why to be presumptive in the way
of deceiving a community that is in a state of agitation and unrest, and we ask the opinion of all on the matter, to be expressed
through The Firebrand, and from that the committee
will determine whether it will agree that a general convention is of the utmost importance, indeed, an open and generous
hand that much good would result therefrom, and that the move-
munity as well as the public in general, would thereby
be benefitted.

And almost every group can get together a few dollars
to send a delegate. So that any one who opposes this
propo-

tion will kindly list the reasons for doing so.

Many comrads in New York and Boston have given
their admiration to the idea of canvassing for a convention of this sort,
and it is hoped to carry it out of a year's agitation, and that it is worth spending
more money for than many other things. They have
mentioned several subjects that need to be dis-
cussed, which in itself would necessitate a convention.

We therefore hope that all comrades will take an
active interest in the matter and will not only consent to
express their opinions in The Firebrand in due time
so as to give us ample time for making arrangements.

All those interested in co-operating are invited to
inform Mr. Huse, our Secretary, M. E. Smit, 266 West St., New
Haven, Conn. Anarchist papers will please be sent to
The Committee.

Theodore Rose.

Entertainment (Firebrand band) by Philadelphia comrades,
E. M. Smit, Albert Gross, M. E. Smit, etc. Group Human-
itarian, 122 3d street. Miss M. Smit, 266 West St., New
Haven, Conn.

SHANNON'S
IN TOM'S BAR

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

An Anarchard Manifesto. By La Cour, Anarchist Commun-
ism. By G. E. Peabody.

Social Democracy in Germany. By W. Landauer.

A Plan for Anarchist Communities. By V. I. Bronze.

The Case for Anarchist Communism. By W. H. Duncan.

A Plan for Anarchist Communities. By A. W. T. Duncan.

The Anarchist and the State. By A. W. T. Duncan.


The Case of the State. By A. W. T. Duncan.

The Communist of Paris. By Peter Kropotkin. And An
An-
archist in the State. By W. H. Duncan.

The Anarchist and the Revolution. By V. I. Bronze.

Anarchist Revolution. By Peter Kropotkin.

Anarchist Questions. By Peter Kropotkin. And An An-
archist in the State. By W. H. Duncan.

A Talk About Anarchist Communism. By Malatesta.

Anarchism. By Peter Kropotkin.

Anarchism. By Emma Goldman.

Anarchy on Trial. Speeches by Paris Anarchists.

Anarchism. By Peter Kropotkin.

Anarchism. By John M. Clark.

Anarchism. By Em. Goldman.

Anarchism. By Peter Kropotkin.

Anarchist Communism in the Relations to State Socialism.

A Plan for the New Woman. By May L. Collins.

Anarchism. By Peter Kropotkin.

An Appeal to the Young. By Peter Kropotkin.


A Letter to a Friend. By Peter Kropotkin.

A Secret and Confidential Address. By Caracciolo, Italy.


Short stories in the English Editions: Sand-

Theodore Rose.

Life of Albert H. Parsons, with a brief History of the Labor
Movement in America. Beaufort illustrated and now
bound. 150 octavo pages.

Mrs. Walsbrooker's Books.

My Country Plant. $1.00

The Cornell Parson of New

3.00

The Fate of Mr. Potter. 3.00

Those who desire to study the Pax Question will find ample food for

The United States. 3.00

Grandmother's Lessons to Men. Young and Old, on the

The Ancient History of the World. 2.50

On how to read the above and then be told that the prom-

The Modern Bible. 2.50

The Constitution of the United States stands in the way of human happiness.

A book for The Firebrand, Box C77, Portland, Or.

ADVERTISEMENTS.

Omaha Progressive Club meets Wednesdays at 7 p.m., at the

International Group Free Initiative meets at 64 Wash-

The Age of Thought, published by E. H. Pallot, Columbus

Chopstix. "Do you know that people each year are

The Firebrand is published weekly.

The Firebrand is published weekly.

The Firebrand is published weekly.

The Firebrand is published weekly.

The Firebrand is published weekly.

The Firebrand is published weekly.

The Firebrand is published weekly.

The Firebrand is published weekly.