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III.

The Sailor.

The Knave and the Fool and the Bright Man
Lived all by themselves on an island fair,
All the water and all the land.

And they formed a marauding plan
To own that same island and all the things there.

So he said to the Fool: "I'm a man divine,
And a friend of thine, and I wish to relate

And he then explained to the very dull fool
The thesis of government, good and strong,
'Thus Nature herself," he remarked, "goes by rule,
And, in order to peacefully glide along,
We must have a constitution, and we must have
With Justice and Honor in every clause."

So he drafted a code that would go thirteen ways,
And he read it aloud to the man and the fool.

Referred to committee, reported with praise,
And then on each section the young began.

A full referendum, a fair honest count.
With courteous discussion to any audience.

They voted on this, and they voted on that;
A two-thirds majority's certain to rule.
The other man's head-pace from under his hat
They voted that voted—both Knave and that Fool.
Thus ever. Whenever a freeman shall choose
To shake his balloting box, he will lose.

—[William Wainwright Girdal, in Liberty]

Liberty and Property.

The theory of equal time exchange was criticized severely in Melbourne by the advocates of the equivalent production system which I have commented on. They declared the newly-favored plan to be false in principle, and tending to State Socialism in practice. Brookhouse, the champion of the older idea, argued that under equivalent production workers of all capabilities could exchange their products indifferently; whereas under the equal time system the producers of high capability in their respective industries would confine their exchanges as far as possible to among the selves, leaving those of low capabilities to form a world of their own. Thus, the result would still be the exchange of productive equivalents, the time standard having done nothing but to confine the circulation of products and services within narrower limits and to divide society into sections having little or no economic intercourse with each other.

Later on, I pointed out from the side of Commmunism how the time-base labor note would exactly lend itself to fraud and enable fortunes to be accumulated by speculators under cover of measured equity. According to the "individualist" ideas, these notes would be issued by individuals or by co-operative associations according to one of two systems: they might be either simple promises to pay, or certificates upon goods, like the notes of the American "Labor Exchange" of today; but whilst the main purpose of these latter is to super-

The laborer, the Notes would be for the purpose of ensuring "equity" in transactions. I pointed out that this was precisely what they could not do. They might serve the purpose of facilitating exchange on the lines believed in as equity, but if the parties to a transaction departed from these lines, the Notes could do nothing but conceal the fact of the case. There was nothing more impossible about a thing being bought for so many hours and sold for so many more, than about its being bought for so many shillings, dollars, etc., and sold for so many more. I repeat here some of the illustrations which I then advanced.

Individuals issuing notes, these notes would be simply promises to pay; the character of security upon goods would arise when either the goods were deposited with a custodian having an interest in seeing that they were not sent into consumption except against notes to the value, or else the notes were issued by a producer who distributed his produce upon a sufficiently large scale to assure stability and average honesty. Consequently, the notes of individuals would not circulate, and would be passed chiefly through the large associations (or through special banks) in the immediate neighborhood, for clearances. This being so, the officials of these institutions would not be long in getting a knowledge of which among the unincorporated individuals were good or bad, quick or slow producers. Consequently, by always presenting the notes of the effective producers and receiving goods or services in satisfaction, and always paying to the ineffective producers in changes or for what they bought, these officials could realize a profit of considerable amount in products, while in appearance, according to the transfers of his products, the producer had realized none whatever. A bank or other institution handling the notes of different cooperative associations whose productive rates were unequal could do the same thing. The large handlers of notes would always be able to form a better idea of the products represented by an hour of any particular note issuer than could be formed by the public at large, so that the fraud would be particularly easy. The only preventative which I could imagine, and the only one which the "individualists" suggested, was to have but one issuer of notes—the collective community organised as a single cooperative association. But this would transform the "individualist" society into a liberal Social-Democracy.

Furthermore, the system presented a dilemma of its own, even more striking than that peculiar to the Equivalent Production scheme. I reproduce from the Australian Radical, Feb. 9th, 1895—

"The worker goes away. Some time afterwards, he reapplies, when Mr. Andrade offers to sell him a new slave, getting eight hours for that. But looking at it, the customer perceives a flaw, which reduces its utility to that of the second-hand one he purchased before. Again he offers four hours, but is met by the reply that it is the cost to the producer, and not the incident of value to the consumer, that is the measure of price. But as all customers object to pay eight hours for a bad slave when they can get double its value for the price. Mr. Andrade finds himself about to lose the whole of the labor he has expended in making it, unless he can invent a moral way out of the difficulty. To get at least four hours' return for his work instead of nothing at all, he consults the scriptures again, and after much thought arrives at the ingenious conclusion that he has lost a slave in making a slave. He cannot separate the flaw itself, and nobody would purchase it if he could, so he resolves to forfeit the flaw which he has produced at the cost of four hours' labor, and sell the slave for four hours.

"The next time, he studies up the art of slaves making, and produces a perfect slave, which he offers for sale at thirty-two hours. Another customer comes along, and inquires why it is fixed at so high a figure. He gets the reply, you worked two hours to make it, because I did not know how.

"'But,' says the customer, 'a slave maker can make slaves at the cost of eight hours, and I fail to see why you would charge me with twice the twenty-four in which you were learning... This knowledge will be distributed over all the slaves you make hereafter, and you with that in principle the real cost of a slave is only eight hours.'

"'No,' says Mr. Andrade, 'the cost is thirty-two hours, for I have discovered a more_congested_mode of employment, and do not intend to make any more slaves.

"In that case,' says the customer, 'supposing that, for the more curiously of the transaction, I can be prevailed upon to take the slave at your price, I must ask you for a guarantee to refund me a proportionate amount if you should ever find that it would be cheaper for me to make another slave. Or, if I pay for your knowledge, you will perhaps admit that I have a right to use that knowledge, and that I can command you to make perfect slaves for me (at the simple cost of your manual labor) for ever afterwards,'"

Well, already it can be seen that this measured economic sight is sighted so far afield that it might be called a sighted forays into killing things that have been praised as such not yet half through with the vagaries of "individual" property, though in mercy to the reader I shall only cite a few more.

IV.

All attempts at placing the property ideas on a working footing consist of systems of Exchange, this latter being the only means of distribution consistent with the present system of each individual's correct quantity of ownership. In Communism, the distribution is distribution, and exchange comes in only causally as an occasional incident of the adjustment of resources to needs.

On paper, exchange may seem to be effective as a social method, and capable of application in the degree of universality necessary for regulating possession strictly according to work done. It will be admitted, however, by the most enlightened supporter of exchange, that if some part of human affairs, wherein the work of one person goes to benefit another, etc., is not capable of being conducted in this principle of measure of change, the application of this principle to the remainder will not be sufficient to correctly indicate what each person has done and is entitled to. I shall content myself with citing a few facts of the very commonest kind, to show that the exchange idea is not applied other-
wise than to a very partial extols, whether on a profit basis or on any basis of equivalents; and with asking whether its rigid application throughout the man pays not reasonably preferable to them. It is in cases. I shall cite a contrasting fashion, and I contend that the parallels condemn the exchange system as a means for practically deciding possession according to mere greed; no matter who the parties for the "Individualist" basis of exchange be taken.

Two men scrape wood into axe handles. One goes his way, leaving the shavings for the first, who may or may not, or to blow away the chips on the face. The other, who equally has no use for the shavings himself, sees a gatherer of kindling wood coming along, and sells him the shavings as produce.

A man owns a child for perhaps a week in the aggregate throughout the year—a few minutes at a time—while her neighbor prepares dinner.

Another goes to the mother and obtains a price for the same amount of time and toll, as nurse or cook. Individual gives a word of information here and a moment's helping hand there, every day of his life, as a matter of course.

Another business as miscellaneous advertiser and doer of odd jobs, and adds the fees to the other income. He may pay heavily for saleable service, another would pay to have it carried away. It depends on the mere chance of events of who of the two pays and who is paid. It is only greed that results in either of them being paid for what he would have paid for.

You need a table, which it is not convenient for you to make. I have leisure time which I have nothing to do with. I offer to lend it to you, and you pay me for its use, and to dawdle about doing nothing is painfully tiresome to me. As a Communist, I make the table for you; I get pleasure instead of doing nothing. You pay me for the service instead of nothing, which is a property worshipper, I either cause you to pay for my pleasure, or, if you do not wish to pay and there is nobody else to do so, I suffer the pain of looking purposelessly about, when I might be getting enjoyment.

I exchange inCommunism, when I give up the use of something I need, and whom I need it on, on the arrangement of the terms (from whom of the third party) something else which I can make serve my purpose—doing this in view of the fact that the thing I give up serve your needs, while the thing I receive serve mine. But "exchange" in the commercial sense—capitalist or "individualist"—is parting with something I do not need, but which I monopolize, giving it up to receive from you something you do not need, but which you monopolize. Possibly I need this, but I do not, and only obtain it in the hope of finding somebody who does need it, and from whom I can keep it back till I give me something I need, for leave to use it. Commercial exchange is therefore easily defined—it is a compromise between the celebrated dog in the manger and the ox and the elephant.

J. A. ANDREWS.

TO BE CONTINUED.

The Kaddish.

COMRADES LOVERIDGE's last letter or the Bible leaves the impression of being emotional, but not being properly a part of the Lord's Prayer; see Biblical English version.

3. Jesus did, in advising his disciples "how to pray", make up his recommendations (commonly called the Lord's Prayer), mostly of the Hebrew and Aramaic versions, which are still the essential source for all the other available texts.

4. Conscience and arrangement (maters of no small importance) are their own, and apparently the words of a clause or two.

Comrades Loveridge and Radich are very positive that I am wrong about the date of the Talmud, and go on to inform me of such elementary facts as that there never was a Talmud. Why, not a single unimportant complication to my learning, they must think that I pitch into a discussion of this sort without looking up such a simple authority as an ordinary cyclical article. Probably they judged me for themselves, for if they had looked up "Talmud" in a cyclopedia they would not have said what they do about its date.

Radich adds that the Jerusalem and Babylonian Talmuds "must antedate the birth of Christ, as their names indicate"; evidently he does not know that the Jerusalem Talmud was compiled at Tiberias and the Babylonian Talmud at Sora.

It should be understood that the ancient Jewish prayers, are not a part of the Talmud, but are much older and only a few have been incorporated, that the others were in common use in Nazareth when Jesus was born.

I never meant to deny that in isolated cases the abstractions of the Talmud have been incorporated in our English. Unquestionably Radich has taken a very unlucky instance to prove it. He does not see that the words "their heel" in the Talmud "shall bruise the serpent's seed" originate from the Hebrew "shall bruise his heel", and that they are then used in the same sense in the Talmud.

Stephen B. Bingham.

Agrees with Mrs. Parsons.

I am a strong advocate for improving our sex relations. The freedom allowed man has simply compelled me to have a woman to whom I am open in our general reform, and rightly so, because it is one of nature's needs, as well as our own present happiness to propagate our kind. I do not know that I am quite an Anarchist, but I know we are far too much governed. I read in the issue of September 27, a letter from Lucy F. Parsons, which, as a woman and mother, I fully endorse. Our marriage and divorce law is disgraceful and barbarous, but in removing oppression we should guard against injurious excess. "Variety" does not exist in love. Young people allowed to choose the sex they love, instead of being made to try to love someone new merely because they have married one of the sex of house of Israel, before their fathers in heaven.

The next paragraph in Maimonides reads slightly different to this effect, there be great peace and help and redemption from heaven upon you and upon us and upon the congregation of Israel. Amen. Maker of peace be with us and upon all Israel. Amen.

The Kaddish, as given by your opponent (The Firebrand, June 7th), is a curious mixture. It contains phrases from other prayers in our Talmud (prayer book), and also some phrases which I do not at all recognize.

The Kaddish is old. Some of its phrases are mentioned in the Talmud (the oldest Midrash to Numbers and Deuteronomy), and many of its names or commands are to be found in the Kaddish of the Laden Talmudic treatises—Massachusetts.

The Lord's Prayer" can be paralleled not from scattered passages in the Talmud, but from numerous and common passages in the oldest portions of our liturgy; and some of parts of our liturgy go back to the service in the same way. There you have the full evidence. This is what it shows:

1. The Kaddish quoted by Loveridge is a forgery, originated (so far as is known) by Rev. John Greig, and ignorantly propagated by Loveridge's authority, of whom Loveridge says "I do not believe the conclusions you have arrived at, on any of his historical facts disproved, or his opinions scholarly denied." Yet any reader of ordinary sense ought to have seen that this alleged prayer contained sentiments that could not possibly have any reference to the Lord's Prayer.

2. In my first quotation from the Kaddish I quoted correctly all of it that is at parallel to the Lord's Prayer, except 'the Father who is in heaven.' (The recitation of praise by "ever and ever" doesn't count, not being properly a part of the Lord's Prayer; see Biblical English version.

Shay Mayflower.

Florida, October 9th.

I am convinced that the objections to variety, on the part of both Mayflower and Mrs. Parsons, arise from a misunderstanding of the term. The demand and the need of variety today is such that even the most conventional and unromantic will welcome a recognition of the law recognizes it. Those who oppose variety must, to be consistent, oppose remarriage after the death or divorce of a marital partner. Variety is sex related to the question of democracy, and needs to be appreciated and not condemned as an invention, which is synonymous with an idea of the present nature, which is not universally condemned as an idea of the present nature, which is not, when the principles of the parties to the association are deprived of choice in the
Communism Defined.

The real question is, how to arrive at the fullest possible satisfaction of our needs and nature; and the common idea that the satisfaction may be accomplished by diverting our attention from each other and from the things we want, is necessary to bring about a condition in which everyone shall possess material wealth in the exact measure of what he has produced; others, in the measure of what he is used to, in a way that is socially beneficial. And, above all, these are the Anarchists-Communists, consider that what requires to be done is for people to aim directly at the satisfaction of their needs and desires, and directly at the interests in such a way that each one shall satisfy each other and all others and nations where these are not such as are to constitute an essential hostility—no matter what particular divisions, distinctions, and differences may be divided, labor and consumption, may be effected as the outcome.

J. A. Andrews.

Note and Comment.

The TOWNSEND (Northern Queensland) Democrat, a local paper in the Socialist-interest, is publishing articles on Anarchy from the pen of E. Y. Lowrey, a believer in Anarchist-Communism.

The recent discussion in The Firebrand as to pleasurable and disagreeable occupations, shows that too many comrades have not yet realized that the division of persons into butchers, shoemakers, nighthawks and so on is a result of slavery. A free man’s occupation is the satisfaction of his needs. If it were different persons to take up more disagreeable occupations, it would be necessary for them to provide for the benefit of all other members of the community.

Another comrade contemplates to manufacture badges for the benefit Anarchists and to sell them at a price of ten cents, the proceeds of which will be for the benefit of anarchist and literary works. He offers a dollar for the best and most appropriate design. Send your designs to The Firebrand.

All comrades in New York and vicinity will be interested in the announcement that the International Anarchist-Labor-Liberation Convention will be held in Philadelphia on June 25th and 26th. The convention proposes to charge a ten-cent admission fee for the benefit of the Anarchist Rescue Fund.

The Chicago Tribune has issued a circular to its employees concerning a McKinley parade on Oct. 7th, and demands that all employees who take part in the parade will naturally go to those who like it, and what they pass by some one will prefer. At present, work is done for permission to consume the products of other people’s work, this being also the case of work set by the capitalists, but in Anarchy, the object of production, being not to place a master, but to satisfy knapsack needs of one another, is the worst population—tyranny. Thus, in liberty the man cannot go to excess without the consent of his sex partner, with whom he has no criminal association of the present he can, legally. Is it not plain to Mayhew that her necessary “caution” in guarding against men has its rise in the false idea of her own inferiority, whereby men are so much sex slavery? The man who believes in liberty in relation with any person who is not mutually agreeable; no woman is forced to be “caution” on his account.

The fact that the “vagabond” is the removal of restrictions upon the association of the sexes. To, by law the sex association to an act with one man for life is just as absurd as if the vairiste should demand a law to compel association in a series of three or four. The fact is not such a fool as to make such a demand. When the vagabond is free to practice his ideal, the monogamist will be free (not compelled as at present) to practice his. This is the real main question at present, but the question of sex liberty, which resolves itself into a question of economic freedom. When we are free to live our ideals in regard to sex association, this will be in a condition of the fullest form; but so long as we are born into a world full of prejudice and intolerant bigotry, and so long as our education consists in “Thee shalt not,” not every one is capable of unbiased judgment.

J. M. M.

The policy in this country displays more brutality than ever before. Lately a policeman of Chicago crippled a small boy for lifetime, and a little girl clubbed and dragged for several blocks in the same city. The following shows another instance.

"Visitors who were in Kansas City, on Friday night, of the Carnival confirm the reports of police outrages. About 7 o'clock in the evening the streets in the vicinity of the grand arch were packed with people bent on having a good time. Chief Irwin, in order to clear the streets so that the department might give its display ordered the police to charge the crowds. Payne wages were driven through the helpless throngs, mounted brutes in line uniforms crowded through and hundreds of men, women and children were ruthlessly and wastefully trampled, clubbed and cruelly molested. It was an uncalled for and brutal attack on a section of pure and pleasant seekers. By this act Kansas City’s arrogant chief of police has done an injury to his city that it will not be able to overcome. The people are now afraid and they will not soon forget the clubbing they got last Friday night. Future carnivals will suffer as few as possible to go to Kansas City to expose themselves to the brutality of their police. The highest statement and apology that Kansas City can make is the prompt imprisonment of the responsible parties and the dismissal.

Why do we want Government? Of others outside of ourselves? As long as the ballot is sustained and upheld by the sword and the bullet, what advantage to useful people is universal suffrage? We see none and we do not see why we should want to see any, in fifty years observation.

A. J. Porz.
The Letter Box.

C. P., Chicago.—Yes. Pamphlets will be sent.

A. C., Bingham, Wash.—You will receive the ordered books from Chicago.

J. D. B., Liberty, Pa.—We shall take pleasure in complying with your request.

J. S., Philadephia.—Books are sent as ordered, and we will also send the paper regularly to the same address. One copy is ordered from Chicago and will arrive a little later.

A. R. T., Dayton, Ohio.—We see you are getting interested in the questions discussed in The Firebrand, and if you keep on reading it, you soon will see that monopoly is not a means to an end, but a means to enslavement. We mean "civil" and "natural" liberty.

W. S., Los Angeles, Cal.—That is all right, brother; we know you will pay when you are able. As to the more-justification style of The Firebrand we haveno excuses to make, except that we saved about 29 per cent of our time and money, as we have not yet devote our whole time to the paper, it helps us a great deal.

G. F. Leaper, Tacoma, Wash.—You will find a point in each of these issues, printed for the special benefit of your kind. We are neither looking for "respectability" nor will we vote for anybody, even if we should "get you". You yourself will find out that it is you that "get left out." We might be persecuted, but that would not disgrace the principles we are advocating.

E. W., Jacksonville, Ill.—Contributions to our co-op. unions in this country are under the impression that in selecting matter for publication which is best suited for the purpose of the paper is always chosen. An editor cannot accept material from an unknown writer for publication without an opportunity to read it. Last week we received your article and accepted it with thanks. It might appear in the next issue, as it is a splendid article for new members of the co-op. unions.

W. H., Ephrata, Pa.—We were really glad to hear that you appreciate The Firebrand. You will find in the present issue an article similar to yours, and that is in your objection will not appear. We hold that freedom will regulate the sex question, and if we have not all the necessary knowledge. In a condition of freedom, a man who is "governed by passion and ignorance," could act for himself and he would have to take the consequences.

The Firebrand Library. In large or small, brown pamphlets furnished at three cents each.

Mrs. Wilsbrooker's Books.

My Country First. $1.00

The Council Pulp of sex. $1.00

A Sex Revolution. $1.00

Taxidermy. $1.00

The following named persons will receive for subscription to The Firebrand, one copy of the Firebrand, and one copy of "The Firebrand's Agents".

Chicago, III.—Charles L. Bedeckley, 1365 Milwaukee Avenue.

Ohio, Stk.—C. G. Skidmore, 412 South Seventh Street.


Boston, Mass.—D. W. L. Chain, 249 Boylston Street.

London, Eng.—J. E. Race, 1310 Fleet Street.

Sample Copies.

We will mail to each large number of sample copies, and if for any reason you are not satisfied, we will refund the price, and even return your subscription in the work. The subscription price is a very liberal one, and if you are interested in the work, give to your friends money more than the subscription price, and we will be more than pleased to take the renewal. A few are taking advantage of this offer. If you receive the paper without having or

Reprints.

The Friction Magazine.

The Friction Magazine.

The Firebrand Magazine.

The Firebrand Magazine.

The Firebrand Magazine.

The Firebrand Magazine.