Love—True and False.

I never was attached to that great sect whose doctrine is that each one should select out of the crowd a mistress or a friend.

And all the rest, though fair and wise, commend to cold oblivion, though it is in the law of modern morals, and the beaten road of true love in this differs from dirt and clay.

That to divide is not to take away.

Love is like understanding, that grows brightening on many a flower, its like the light, imagination! which from earth and sky, and from the depths of human passion.

As from a shining prism and mirrors still, the universe with glorious beam, and kill each other, with every sable arrow of its reverberated lightning. Narrow the heart that loves, the brain that contemplates, the life that bears, the spirit that creates.

One object, one form, and build thereon.

A sepulcher, for one soul.

Mind from its object differs most in this: how happy one is to see happiness from happiness; the base from the nobler; the impure

And frail, from what is clear and must endure.

If you divide pleasures and woes, you may diminish till it is consumed away.

If you divide pleasures and woes, you may.

This truth is that deep well, whence sages draw courage when despairing; the eternal law

By which those live to whom this world of life is a safe asylum, and whose strike

Tills for the promises of a later birth

The wideness of this elysian earth.

—Perce Bysshe Shelley.

Individualism vs. Communism.

While Mr. John Turner of England was in Denver, in the month of September, 1900, a debate was arranged between that gentleman and Mr. Henry Cohen of Denver. The discussion took place at the residence of Mrs. Edgerton, the spacious parlors being quite filled with interested listeners, most of whom were students either as beginners or scholars, and all of liberal views. Though the debate lasted until after midnight, the deepest attention was paid by every word by the present.

It was admitted to be a remarkable presentation of the two schools of thought—Communism and Individualism—each side putting forth arguments in favor of a clearness, strength and a close adherence to the subject matter in hand, seldom seen in a debate of this kind.

Mr. L. W. Rogers acted as chairman. Mr. William Holmes reported the speeches stenographically.

His notes were afterward written out and submitted to the President for endorsement, with a few minor changes the following is the transcript:

The question for debate was: Is Anarchist-Communism a better and quicker solution of the economic question than Anarchist-Individualism?

In order to clear away the ground, each speaker gave his view of the position of the other.

Then a short reply from each followed to make corrections. After each speaker gave an analysis of the present industrial system to show exactly how they understood the process of exploitation was going on. The discussion proper then followed.

Henry Cohen, opened with his definition of Anarchist-Communism in a few minutes talk, as follows:

“The Anarchist-Communist believes that products of labor are not produced by the individual but by society in general. All existing wealth has been produced by all and belongs to all. It should therefore be seized by the community and enjoyed in common.

“Production should be conducted by the commune the members of which would consume in proportion to their needs and desires. The elements entering into the production of an article are so numerous and so complex that to attempt to separate them and apportion to each individual his share is impossible. Take the lead pencil that I hold in my hand, according to their theory the labor of every one has entered into it. It should therefore belong to the community.

“If, however, we say competition is a form of welfare and is detrimental to society, it will be replaced by a mutual helping of each other in industrial relations. By helping one another everyone is benefited. The present competitive struggle is worse than war because it is incessant and by generations of minds and children actively into the conflict. For this they would substitute communal production and model society after the plan of the family. To look after one’s self is anti-social and only in so far as we are altruistic will society improve.”

Turner’s definition of Anarchist-Individualism, given in ten minutes, was as follows:

“The Individualist attribute the exploitation of labor to the desire of one of the land—which they would remedy by a system of occupancy and use in the hands of all. They hold that that the problem. They think it necessary to bring the whole back to the people. They see the property should remain in the hands of the present owners, but they do not tell us what shall be done with it when there are no heirs—or what amount there would be to hold the property or house if rent, interest and profit had disappeared.

“The evolution of production and the great increase in productive power are almost ignored, though these have completely changed the economic outlook. If they attempted to resist the payment of rent they would put themselves in the position of revolutionists at once, while the question of economic rent would have to be dealt with in every society. The system developed from Froudon’s fifty years ago as applied fairly well to the prosperity of France at that time, but it is out of date now. It must be shown how the laborer who has no property is to be benefited by the mutual bank.”

Turner, continuing, criticised Cohen’s definition of Anarchist-Communism, as follows:

“There is not much to be taken exception to in Friend Cohen’s definition of Anarchist Communism. He is mistaken when he says all have to be educated for the labor force. Commodity are produced by using labor of each of the parties or the past, and it is therefore necessary to have those interest have to be kept going some form of exchange. When we say the competitive system is bad, we mean it relatively, because we think something better will take its place. Cohen says, “for in so far as we are altruistic, society will improve,” but it is to intelligent self-interest that we look, believing that this will lead society to adopt Communism because of its inherent economic benefits.”

Cohen then criticized Turner as follows:

“Friend Turner has correctly stated our position regarding land tenure. We do not ignore economic rent; we recognize its existence, but to us it is a boodoke. If economic rent is to be considered, and opportunities to be equalized, the same must be carried to its logical conclusion. If all land is held in an equal right to all land, the bananas in Central America grow for the Equinox as well as for the Central American and the foreigner. One man may spend a whole day in catching a fish, while the latter has gathered many bunches of bananas, must be made to share. In other words nearly one-half the bananas must be taken from the Central American and must go to the Equinox. The Individualist not being bothered with this problem need find no solution. To him the equality that comes from liberty is enough, and no more is necessary.”

Cohen gave the following analysis of present conditions:

“When a man wants to go into business of any kind, the first thing he does is to convert whatever form of wealth he possesses, (if it is not already in that form) into money. With this money he buys the plant, the raw material, and pays the laborers he employs.

“When the product is finished it is sold for money, and it enters on its way to the consumer passing it may be through hundreds of hands at each time that it changes hands it is for money. It is a motion of products in one direction and money coming to meet them constantly and continuously pass each other. Which has more power in the market? Which is it that robs labor? If I take this pencil and try to sell it, some time may elapse before I can do so, but if I take five cents I can buy one as soon as I reach a store. Can Friend Turner explain to us why this process is so slow in one direction and so rapid in the other? Were the process equally rapid both ways would not the problem be solved? When I say money does the robbing I do mean that holders of other kinds of capital do not. They exploit labor far more than the money lender does, but their power to do this is based and rests entirely on the fact that money bears interest.

“Profit, the profit system, of which we hear so much, and which is supposed to rest on the private ownership of the tools of production, is a taking phase, but it has no meaning. The return to the business man is a manufacturer in the general run of business, that is in the absence of some particular privilege like a patent or a tariff, after he has paid for the work is interest and insurance. The rate of interest depends upon the restrictions on credit and note-lending.

“Going into business at present is risky. There is the constant danger of failure. The money must be paid for in addition to the current rate of interest, and this payment I call insurance. Business is uncertain and products cannot be sold, because labor only receives a fraction of the product it produces as wages. Were interest and rent abolished the wages of labor would be the full product. There would be no uncertainty in business, consequently no payment for risk necessary. Profit is therefore only a vagary of the imagination.”
Turner then replied:

"Cohen's proposition is that a man generally obtains money to start business. In reality he generally has a bank account, or credit, which is legal value, and has to start business. If a man makes 5 per cent. in business, he will go into business, and if he can make more in banking, he will go into banking.

I should say generally, he goes into what he understands. I do not think it is the same as the banking business; the man who understands it, is either that of the landlords who hold land out of use by the aid of the law till someone will pay them for the privilege of using it, or — the capitalists who, monopolizing money. Two questions and provision (as necessary for modern methods of production as land itself) can entail or inflate the output to gain profit — guided by the clumsy competitive methods of today — compels the farmer to turn to this value created by labor but sold back by the capitalist after having paid the competitive wage to the worker — he is willing to pay interest for the use of that money capital, rent to the landlord for permission to use the land upon which his industry is carried on, and taxes to the government to secure him in the balance of his plunder. All that he is entitled to as an organizer of labor (according to the competitive theory) is what he got in the open labor market as a wage for men — all over that is sheer robbery through the power of monopoly of land and capital. As a banker of capital business, by a rapid turnover of his capital, the distributive business man frequently averages a gross profit of 20 per cent. a week. There is a certain amount of wealth required for the purpose of assuring future production. It is this that we think should be held in common. We do not desire to abolish competition by competition in capitalist conditions, but believe it will be abandoned by the workmen as soon as they have destroyed monopoly and are free to associate together for production and distribution. We do not think it is a good thing in itself, and while we protest to state law as a means of settling economic disputes, regard it as a free man to physical warfare — something to be resisted to only as a last resource. We think that the principle of competition ought to be replaced by that guided by equity. We do not think the workers will want to renew competitive conditions under freedom. By mutual agreement they can and will establish a society wherein the capitalist is not in his own so much money, but in his legal right to rob the workman of the people of the result of their labor. This claim we wish the workers to repudiate and realize, and be ready to work.

Cohen made a ten-minute rejoinder as follows:

"It makes no difference whether a manufacturer has a bank account or credit. Capital must pass through the money form, and this makes the money question important. The 20 per cent. gross profit of a week the resulting of the operation of this 20 per cent. of the year, shrinks to a very small sum. The characteristic feature of society is not the large sum that any one has, but the general poverty of all. The average wage is now about $1,000 per capita. With the tools and the methods of the present day, it should be an easy matter for a man to produce one dollar of value in one hour. In thinking of producing one per cent, and yet it has taken a thousand generations to accumulate this mile. Why is there so little? The payments for interest, rent and insurance are so much waste, not on the production of real wealth, but on the destruction of it. The money capital is only a speculative asset as a positive check to production, and limit it. The accumulation through interest has already been described. How insurance has increased by the adoption of the sinking fund. Conditions in the United States during a certain period of time — say twenty-five years — 100 men have gone into the drug business; a few have become rich; a number of pharmacies have been established. How much money have lost money and either retired or were forced into bankruptcy. After deducting the current rate of interest and rent paid, the balance is insurance. The man who has a one hundred dollar note, receives it, so to speak, what those who became bankrupt lost. I challenge Turner to show any factor in the sum robbed from labor outside of rent, interest and taxes. The sum is the easiest of attainment: the one which would prostrate all the holders of wealth, or the one which only opposes the money owner of which are only one hundredth part of the total wealth owners? And from this we do not accuse even the one-thousandth.

Even this small fraction, but only to take away its power of increase — not by doing anything to it, except to bring it under the influence of competition. Why is it necessary that the man who wants to use money capital will be forced to give the use of his capital at zero per annum? Creditors are simply wasting time when they talk of expropriation. It is not the question of any difference in the competition that they complain of it that between laborers. Let that same competition be applied to the holders of capital and the price of labor will be driven down to the cost of replacing it. This bids up the price of labor to its natural wage — its full product."

Turner then said:

"If, as Mr. Cohen says, the profit of the retail business man after paying rent and taxes is compensation for the use of his capital, we have here a very heavy element in some cases and covers a multitude of sins, 'while in others the risk is that all is got as compensation for a lifetime of skill and energy, with bankruptcy as a bonus.' How is it that from the mutualist we hear so much in favor of the small capitalist and so little about the propertyless worker? All business, we know, is based on estimation: is business estimates worth today, based as they must be on competitive values fluctuating from day to day like the odds on a horse race? Still, some make fortunes and others lose them in a moment and lose their work. This, however, can hardly be considered a condition of equity. Cohen said if a man can borrow money at 6 per cent. the profit of business would fall to that amount in the way of compensation. The fact is he cannot borrow money unless he has security — even from the mutual bank. He must have some property before he can borrow, and he will have to give that property as security for credit. Besides, Cohen must show how the mutual bank, ever, would reduce interest to zero. We do not believe it would to those with poor security, and it is just those who require the money who are in need of it. The mutual bank is free to use, and capital free to all through the mutual bank — no advantage coming to landlord or capitalist as such for owning either — where is the necessity or benefit of private property in the institution as it is now working out on the owning? Property only has value as property — where it enables its owner to exploit labor. If this goes, then the existence of private property will go. The mutual banks can and should return it. Free use is common use — Communism. We welcome mutualism because it leads to Communism, but by an inverted method. A rose by another name will serve. If a bank has no one com- pletes but the laborer, which is not correct. The cap- tialists also complete, especially the smaller ones com- plete on one another, since, in the one per cent. is the bank rate of interest in London today. The Liber- ator Building Society went to smash for millions in attempting to pay 6 per cent. Economic rent is not so much the laborer's property. It is the only ones who can deal with that problem without the aid of State government — it is, however, a bugbear to the private property people. We do not say that the mutual banks will do the work of the American capitalist, but we do say that the Central American has no right to bar out the Equinox."

Cohen speaks as follows:

"The mutual bank will not lend money at a higher rate of interest to those who offer poor security; it will only lend to those who can offer good security — actual property. It is too bad everybody has to borrow money and engage in business. When enough money has been borrowed to employ those who are now idle, all laborers being employed and having one to do and doing work can make their own terms. There is enough capital today to employ all laborers. The different tools and machines needed are not money, but can be mobilized, and that can only be done through the organization of credit on a sound basis and furnished gratuitously. But when the use of credit and capital come down so small that the normal earning is less than the exchange value. That depends on the competition to labor, and while that may be reduced under better conditions, there will always be a wage to pay. The question is not what will allow or not allow him to be made an equitable partner. The capitalist will have to work himself; his capital will no longer being him an increase.

"The 2 per cent. bank rate in London is not to the point: if Turner wanted to borrow money in London today, no matter how good his security might be, it would be nearer 3 times. Interest is always low after a period of hard times; confidence having dis- solved. The particular rate of interest, whether it is 4, 6, or 8 per cent., is little in the comparison. It is a little longer, that is all — the power of interest to absorb, even at a low rate, is quicker than that of a mutual bank to absorb until bank- ruptcy steps in as a leveller, and at a high rate the levelling process takes place a little oftener—that's all."

Mr. Turner:

"Cohen says all owners of property should organize credit and mutual banks. This is well enough for those who have property, but the question is what are people who have no property to do? Those with property are well protected today and the facilities for converting property into money are fairly easy. It is quite true the different sections of the capitalist class rob one another in almost every process of pro- duction and distribution as well as in banking and the issue of money. But it is not in the interesse robbery of this class that we are interested but it is about the people without property. It is those who own nothing but their ability and skill and no property to live, that we are most concerned. People get rich (properly) today through private ownership of land and capital and the capitalist processes of production and distribution which are necessary to care of themselves. Cohen says that the products can be bought when people are employed and that the mutual bank will make conditions of employment possible. Assuming that the mutual bank will make conditions better for those who join it and receive its benefits — its for the properly classed and not the propertyless that the benefits will go. Cohen knows that credit or property will be improved. Instead of running the mutual bank for 4 per cent, as you say the cost of property holders of running the bank would often be more than the difference between 4 and 6 per cent. to borrow money from the bank of to-day say between 5 per cent. and 3 per cent. which is 2 per cent. The distributive co-operators have been a failure in London and those co-operators can live in the town. Cohen talks of shopkeepers with large capital while in country towns they have been a success and have no doubt been a benefit to the members. I expect it would be the same in the banking business even if the tax on the lending of money was removed. Besides, in the mutu- alist going to wait until he can convert the government into Communism.

Cohen said that this is to be remembered too! If as friend Cohen says, competition between property owners will compel them to give its use to the laborers free its value as security would have disappeared. Take this as an excuse for nothing why will I trouble myself to produce it? I contend if mutual banking will do what the mutual- ist claims, it will only result in bringing products to market cheaper. There will be no incentive for the capitalist to own the table in the absence of interest, and he cannot make profit by sales as people will not buy if they can get the same thing for nothing. The tax will not disappear or its use value, but its exchange value will. With respect to the question of the Equinox and the Central American, the latter will invite the former to come and settle down. The production of commodities and will share with him in the natural opportunities presented, together with the results of their joint labor. Competition between their mutual banks will not be an obstacle."

Cohen was accorded 15 minutes; he began by reading a few pages from Greene's "Mutual Banking." He then said:

"It will illustrate how the plan would work in Den- ver. The wealth of this city is, according to the assessor, $37,000,000. The credit here is $5,000,000. If a mutual bank were formed by people owning two of the one hundred and twenty millions, it would put a million dollars into circulation. This one million would be assigned to thirty thousand men to work. The new industries formed could only get customers by selling cheaper than the others. This they could easily do because the rate of interest they pay is zero. The others who paid 7 per cent. would have to meet the cut in prices and would have to start other mutual banks. The first bank to
Turner then replied:

"Cohen's proposition is that a man generally obtains money to start business. In reality he generally has a bank account, or credit, which is legal value, and has not in 20 or 30 years in business, he will go into business, and if he can make more in banking, he will go into banking. I say generally, because he goes into what he understands. The advantage or exploit to him is that either of the landlords who hold land out of the use of the sale of the land, or someone will pay them for the privilege of using it, or the capitalists, who are the masters of the means of production and distribution (as necessary in modern methods of production as land itself) can accrue or inflate the output to gain profit—guided by the clumsy competitive methods of today. Out of the money of this value created by labor but held back by the capitalist after having paid the competitive wage to the worker—he is willing to pay interest to the banker for the use of borrowed capital; rent to the landlord for permission to use the land upon which his industry is carried on; and taxes to the government to secure him in the balance of his plunder. All that he is entitled to as an organizer of labor (according to this competitive theory) is what he gets in the open labor market as managers for someone—al one that is sheer robbery through the power of monopoly of the means of production. Turning over capital, turning over of his capital, the distributive business man frequently averages a gross profit of 20 per cent. A week. There must always be a certain amount of wealth that is allowed to waste! I do not believe all the trouble in the world is due to failures, the institution of the profit motive is the root cause of the trouble. We are not saying that the workmen are as soon as they have destroyed monopoly and are free to associate together for production and distribution. We do not think it is a good thing in itself, and while we prefer it to be done as a means of settling economic disputes, regard it as free men to physical warfare—something to be resorted to only as a last resource. We therefore regard the principle of employment as a means to replace it by reason guided by equity. We do not think the workers will want to renew competitive conditions under freedom. By mutual agreement they can and should control the power. The capitalist is not in his own power, but in his legal right to rob the workpeople of the result of their labor. This claim we wish the workers to repudiate and think it is a wrong principle, to gain but be done.

Cohen made a ten-minute rejoinder as follows:

"It makes no difference whether a manufacturer has a bank or credit. Capital must pass through the money form, and this makes the money question important. The 20 per cent gross profit a week of the retail dealers, as I have mentioned before, shrinks to a very small sum. The characteristic feature of society is not the large sum that any one has, but the general poverty of all. The average wage is about United States $1,000 per capita. With the tools and the methods of the present day, it should be an easy matter for a man to produce one dollar of value in one hour. In one thousand of those methods, he might produce his per capita, and yet it has a thousand generations to accumulate this sum. Why is there so little? The payments for interest, rent, and insurance are so much waste, not only in the present but in the past. Distributive capitalization as a positive check to production and limit it. The accumulation through interest has already been described. How insurance has been collected can best be shown by an illustration. Suppose there is a period of time—say twenty-five years—100 men have gone into the drug business; a few have become rich; a number have made a fair return on their investment, others have lost money, and some have been forced into bankruptcy. After deducting the current rate of interest and rent paid, the balance is insurance. Those who lose the most, lose in the most catastrophic way. The interest rate is high, so to speak, what those who became bankrupt lost. I challenge Turner to show any factor in the sum robbed from labor outside of rent, interest, and insurance, which does not contribute to the least of the least of the accumulations. The accumulated capital is in the least of people's minds. I say why are there so few? It is not simply that the existing laws of distribution are not as men wish to exist.

Even this small fraction, but only to take away its power of increase—not by doing anything to it, except to bring it under the influence of competition. Why is it necessary for the man to be mutual, that the man who is the most successful is the one who has the capital at zero per annum. Commune are simply wasting time when they talk of expropriation. It is nothing but a return to the competition of the old, or the process of competition. They complain of is that between laborers. Let that same competition be applied to the holders of capital; and the price of capital will fall, as labor has, to the cost of reproduction, but the price of labor to its natural wage—its full product."

Turner then said:

"If, as Mr. Cohen says, the proof of the retail business man after paying rent and taxes is compensation today, in many cases, to the very heavy cost of labor, in some cases and 'cover a multitude of sins,' while in others the risk is all that is got as compensation for a lifetime of skill and energy, with bankruptcy as a bonus. How is it that from the mutualists we hear so much in favor of the small capitalist and so little about the propertyless worker? All business, we know, is based on estimates; but what are business estimates worth today, based as they must be on competitive values fluctuating from day to day like the odds on a horserace? Still, some make fortunes and others lose all, even with equal ability and skill at a trade. How can such enterprise be considered a condition of equity. Cohen said if a man can borrow money at 6 per cent, the profits of business would fail to that amount, it is just compensation for risk. The hazard is the same, and if one had any security— even from the mutual bank. He must have some property before he can borrow, and he will have liberty to give that property as security. Cohen must also add how the mutual bank, even, would reduce interest to zero. We dont believe it with those poor security, and it is just those who require the most money. So the bank is free to use, and cash free to all through mutual bank—no advantage coming to landlord or capitalist as such for owning either—where is the necessity or benefit of private ownership? Property is that which is to maintain the life of it. Free use is common use—Communism. We welcome mutualism because it leads to Communism, but by an inverted method. A rose by another name will smell as sweetly as a rose. The real one as well as the peon, but the laborer, which is not correct. The capitalistic also compete, especially the smaller ones compete one another out of existence. Two per cent, is the rate of interest on the bank. The Liberator Building Society went to smash for millions in attempting to pay 6 per cent. Economic rent is no bogus to the Communista—they are the only ones that can maintain the city by the aid of State government—it is, Evermore, a bogus to the private property people. We do not say that the Equinmeaux should share with the Central American, her capital will no longer bar us to the Equeimeaux."

Cohen speaks as follows:

"The mutual bank will not lend money at a higher rate of interest to those who offer poor security; it will only lend to those who can offer good security—this is the only reason for the performance of property owners to compel them to give its use to the laborers free of its value as security would have disappeared. Take this table, if I can have its use for a moment. I will read it to you. I contend that if mutual banking will do what the mutualists claim, it will only result in bringing products to the same place that Communists want them. There will be more work and less profit in the table in the absence of interest, and he cannot make profit by sales as people will not buy if they can get them for nothing. True, the interest will not disappear, or its use value, but its exchange value will. With respect to the question of the Equeimeaux and the Central American, the latter will invite the former with his mutual bank to partake of the production of commodities and will share with him in the natural opportunities presented, together with the results of their joint labor. Competition between them will be healthy."

Cohen was accorded 15 minutes; he began by reading several pages from Greenw's "Mutual Banking." He then said:

"I will illustrate how the plan would work in Denver. The wealth of this city is, according to the assessment, $600,000,000. There are 1,000 men here. If a mutual bank were formed, every one of these men would have two thousand men to work. The new industries formed could only get customers by selling cheaper than the others. This city could easily do because the rate of interest is zero. The other who paid 6 per cent would have to meet the cut in prices, and would have to start other mutual banks. The first bank took
all the idle laborers out of the market and thus shut off all further competition between the workers, and in putting products on the market cheaper than they would otherwise be, they would do so to that extent, and thus raise the wages of every workman in the city, since a decrease in the price of goods is a raise in wages. If the competition of this million dollars has only one per cent—another bank would soon come into the field with another million dollars. After they would get the capital they would look for environments for labor, but they could not get them by offering their higher wages, they would have to cut prices, which is a raise again in wages. This process would continue until the entire capital would be withdrawn for the great increase in the wealth which the better conditions would make possible, and which would be left in the possession of those who produced it. There is no such thing as interest at the mutual bank; the one-half of one per cent, is the cost of running the bank; it is for the payment of wages to clerks, the expense of printing the notes, etc. The present methods of facilitating exchange among bankers, have done much to check this item of expense, and it will be reduced much further. The restrictions will be removed when people understand the beneficial results of it. I am glad that my friend Turner realizes how revolutionary our plans are—it is a compliment we seldom get from Communists. We hope to abolish restrictions by free competition. Our program is one of free competition carried out by those means. Whether active or passive we can achieve results much more quickly and easily than the Communists can.

Turner assigned 15 minutes:

"I must still insist that in the elucidation of mutual banking the proletariat is omitted. Cohen has not shown how the laborers' own interests are involved. He has not shown how wages are to be raised more than the laborer is to get a real increase of his labor. He is assuming and asserting, nothing less than that all the money one knows who work for the mutual bank in the production of commodities will not displace those who are not property owners. The capitalist and those that are all owned and are able to maintain and even raise wages. I must equally assume that they are not all organized and that they must out wage. The fact is to be comprehended that the property which has centered in the hands of the few and big masses of workpeople are under their control. The intelligent organized workpeople, and generally speak, those that are interested in maintaining those that are not, are looking to the time when they will control the capital they use in common, in the same way as they control the funds of their organizations. Of course, I wish to have a fair amount of property. It is the only small owners property of those who are likely to desire the mutual bank, in the vain hope that it may preserve their present position. The large farmers who employ labor, is well to do, and has a balance at his bank upon which he receives interest in not likely to become very active in trying to start a mutual bank—he has no use for it. It is the men who have pushing over, and who are most dependent, who are connected with their families upon their premonition, who have borrowed money upon this security and have to pay interest, who are most likely to be interested in having mutual banks started. But of them all, they always are hoping for the time when they will be in the position of the well-to-do man and be receiving instead of paying interest. This is why most small proprietors are so conservative and on the contrary why the proletariat is always more or less revolutionary. The great factor in exploitation is profit. The capitalist will make the most of his capital, keep the paying wages to the producers of it, out of which he pays rent, interest, insurance and taxes. By the way we think we ought to have a definition of insurance from the standpoint of the working man. The industrial evolution is likely to come by small capitalists working on economic lines in a spirit of philanthropy. It is more likely to be the absolute repudiation of the claims of the exploiters by the workpeople and that is what we call the revolution. We Communists want the workpeople to repudiate.

Cohen, then said:

"To the Communists it is always a question of the large capitalists against the small one, but can they not see that when the rate of increase is zero it will make no difference whether one is a small one or a one small? A million times zero is no more than a hundred times zero. The colossal fortune, of which so much is said, is often mere talk. Col. North said, "the best-placed man in the world to be the richest man in the world," and his fortune was estimated at one hundred million dollars. When his financial affairs were looked into, the fortune was something like that of ten or twenty of the small capitalist, if the occurrence is the closing up of Stewart's store in New York a few weeks ago. It is just twenty years since A. T. Stewart died; his fortune was also estimated by this trouble to be a large one and the event has shown it was not more than twenty millions. One thing, however, is certain—he was the richest and most powerful merchant in New York at that time. This fortune, according to the theory of Communism, was produced by the rich man and the people, according to the Communist's theory, make the possessors thereof all powerful. Five years after Stewart's death, the nominal price of the other owners. Why did they fail, and why did not an additional million? Because Stewart's business talent was lacking. That is precisely what would happen under Communism—the incentive and the means under which wealth is produced will be gone and changed and the whole scheme will fall to pieces. I have every reason to believe that it will fall. I hate about Individualism? It is impossible to give a value of change of goods as far as ownership, buying or selling are concerned. Private property would be left in the hands of those who now have it. That men will produce for the public good that is a matter of pure coincidence, and not a matter of invariable fact. That they will do so under Communism is not so clear: in fact, every approach to common property made in the past has been a dismal failure, except between people who practiced it as a religious faith, and as a part of a deep religious conviction that it was right. This feeling, American-Communists cannot expect to appeal to, and the complicated system of modern production, which Communists must have, would make it a failure even among the religions."

Turner finished as follows:

"Even if interest should disappear in the sense now understood profit might still be in existence even greater than at present. If rent too vast it does not mean that the capitalist who owns a railroad company may own the freedom of the land belonging to it and pay no rent, it may pay off the debentures given for before the railroad was any expense. The rent may not be a cost better for it. The shareholder will receive more profit as dividend upon his share now that the plunder is not shared with the laborer. In one of London, he may own the freedom of his stable and yard, besides the horses and cattle and may have a large balance at his bank instead of having to borrow money, any capital he possesses is not exploited because he does not pay interest, rent or even insurance. Not a bit. If people can have the free use of railways and rail, will the shareholders of railways frame their conditions for picture, or the proprietors of cabs yard his their titles-deeds just having to the fun of seeing them—some may, but I fancy most of them when they realize what it really means will light the fire with which to clean all along the free use of property will do away with the incentive to own it. It is impossible for unfruit to become the permanent principle of production without it drifting into the hands of a few. The property holder will, with the principles of mutualism by all means, we will look after the propertyless workpeople. The masses of capital now used in production are so enormous—the real legal to plunder is so great that it only 1 per cent of its possible earnings to pay the interest of it. The type of a small capitalist is not capable of making the holder of capital want to maintain existing institutions. An interest may exist, but as the larger and larger it would be. Like the free use of property will look after the propertyless workpeople. A large community will be at the same time that it is less than the real estate. It is a question of the relationship of the small capitalist harder than ever. It has not been shown clearly however that the whole of his labor is not only employed at work. To set half of them at work will not materially better conditions. If however it should succeed in doing what its advocates claim, it would destroy itself in the process of the small community is the same, but whether our or their theory constitutes the question that is real question at issue."

A. M. Allis, the young. 'ommunist to which the one big dollar and that we have no capital and no money now, but we wish and had workers and still like.

R. a. Los Angeles, Cal. The address is Robert Baron, 3630 N. A. Deau, Detroit. It is taken over the subject of the The Anarchist. Price $1.00 per year.

C. F. New York City. Yes, as we shall make money for all men. It is the first issue. It is in its commencement to issue pamphlets. The first issue will be the first chapter of Eco. M. Brooklyn, N. Y.—I don't think it was a joke when the writer of that article advised Mr. Hylton to print his own books. Do we not intend to make money? No, we shall have no such thing. I don't think it was a "way of living," with all the speak of the subject about the value of public and under freedom. This is, indeed, a very great advantage, and under the proceeds will be abundantly profited. A very capable of me told me the other week that he would be best assured if he could make fine instruments such as astronomers and other men of science could be. Apparently the movement here is in the money growing considerably, as the crime Spanish government does not use such means without cause. The movement will grow still more dangerous in line of it. I—Socialist, Berlin.

The Letter-Box:

A. M. Elia, New York: Don't worry that you can't read your letters or write them as you would like to, because I would try to write them in a way that you would be best assured if he could make instruments such as astronomers and other men of science could be. Apparently the movement here is in the money growing considerably, as the crime Spanish government does not use such means without cause. The movement will grow still more dangerous in line of it. I—Socialist, Berlin.

The Police a Bomb-Thrower.

In Madrid, the capitol of Spain, in January 1894 a trial took place against two so-called Anarchists; one of them, H. D. Minors, was sentenced to death, the other, Antonio Picaro, a Portuguese. They were accused of having made preparations to throw a bomb in the parliament. The trial brought out the fact that these two foreigners were arrested on suspicion or bribing a police agent, Mr. Minor. It happened according to the principle: the little criminals are hanged and the great ones are allowed to escape with the dignity—that the police agent had to appear before the jury. He admitted to having instilled these men, because his superiors had promised him that he would not be accused of any crime.

Minors, himself, had laid out the plans for the bomb-throwing for these men and then delivered his duped victims to the police. He, too, along with his victims was sentenced to seven years imprisonment. It can be seen that the Spanish government, which has some very talented officers, has made some progress. At that time only one attempt was made, and now it comes to a deed. Apparently the movement here is in the money growing considerably, as the crime Spanish government does not use such means without cause. The movement will grow still more dangerous in line of it. I—Socialist, Berlin.

Comrades,

We, the Anarchists of Philadelphia, have organized a club, under the name "New Generation," for the purpose of educating him in the first place, and secondly appeal to all comrades, and to all those who are friends of Progress to send us a share of their money, money, as much Literature as possible, and also books. Hoping that our appeal will not be a voice in the desert we remain, Yours for Liberty.

NEW GENERATION.
N O T I C E

Urru. further notice we will get our mail at Selle-
wood, Oregon, instead of Box 94, Portland, and we
request all friends to take notice of this change.
Exchanges will please change our address on their
mailing galleys and lists.

When Eight Prevails.

Was this land of slavery awake
And, unchained, Liberty takes
Into herself the cause of Right;
When no longer was gone by might
The cause of Justice and of Truth;
And courts of law—now without ruth—
Cease their selling for yellow gold
Freedom of young and life of old?
When the children of life have rule,
Not deem his fellow as all fools;
When work has come round
And Justice is then revered.

Monarch of the stately brow
Almost regal glory and power,
Then our land shall indeed be free—
Our salted galleys, fair prosperity—
[Adnuk the Dreamer.

Caserio, Why He Killed Cartoon.

We have received several letters from new
subscribers, asking why Caserio killed the president
of France, and we think that his speech, made
before the jury, will satisfy our readers more than
any answer we could give:

"Gentlemen of the Jury,—I do not propose to
defence, but only an explanation of my acts."

"Since my early youth I began to learn that the
present society is badly organized, so badly that
every day many wretched men commit suicide,
leaving wife and children in the most terrible dis-
tress.

"Workers, by thousands, seek for work and cannot
find it. Poor families beg for food, and shiver with
cold: they suffer the greatest misery: the little
ones ask their miserable mothers for food and the
mothers cannot give them, because they have
nothing to give. The children who the home-sal,
tained have already been sold or pawned. All they
can do is to beg alms, and often they are arrested
as vagabonds.

"I went away from my native place because I was
frequently moved to tears at seeing little girls of
eight or ten years old obliged to Work fifteen hours a
day for the paltry pay of 20 centimes [not quite
four cents]. Young women of eighteen or twenty
years old also work fifteen hours a day for a mock-
ery of remuneration. And that happens not only to
my fellow-countrymen, but to all the workers,
who sweat the whole day long for a crust of bread,
while their labor produces wealth in abundance.
The workers are obliged to live under the most
wretched conditions, and their food consists of a
little bread, a little water, and sometimes no bread
or water; so that by the time they are thirty or forty
years old they are exhausted, and go to die in the hospitals.
Besides, in consequence of bad food and overwork,
these unhappy creatures are, by hundreds, devoured
by pestilence and groaning with hunger and country,
attacks, as the physicians say, those who are badly fed
lead a life of toil and privation.

"I observed that there are a great many people
who are hungry, and many children who suffer,
whilst bread and clothes abound in the towns.
I saw many and large shops full of clothing and
woollen stuffs, and I saw also warehouses full
of wheat and Indian cora, suitable for those who are
in want. And, on the other hand, I saw thousands
of people who do not work, who produce nothing
and live on the labor of others; who spend every
day thousands of francs for their amusement; who
debauch the daughters of the workers; who own
dwellings of forty or fifty rooms, twenty or thirty
horses, many servants; in a word, all the pleasures
and luxuries of life.

"How sad it is to see this vile society
so badly organized!

"Many times I said to myself: Those who
assumed the first fortune are the cause of the pres-
cent social inequalities.

"When I was a child, I was taught to love
my native land; but when I saw thousands of workers
obliged to quit their country and leave their
children and their parents in utter destitution
I said to myself: The fatherland does not exist for the
poor workers; our country is the whole world!
Those who preach the love of country do so because
they have in that country their personal interest,
their well-being; as the bird defends its nest
because it feels comfortable in it.

"I believed in God; but when I saw so great an
inequality between men, I acknowledged that it
was not God who created man; but man
who created God. And I discovered that those who
have their property to be respected have an inter-
est in preventing the existence of paradise and hell,
and in keeping it from being discovered.

"On account of all this I became an Anarchist.

"On the 1st of May, 1891, when the workers
of the whole world demanded a holiday, the govern-
ments, republican as well as monarchical, answered
with rifles and prisons; many workers were killed
or wounded, and many more of them were sent to
prison.

"Since that year I have been an Anarchist,
because I have ascertained that the Anarchist-Ideal
is consistent with my own feeling. Amongst
Anarchists alone have I seen great men among
men, who know how to fight for the sake of
the workers.

"I also began to do Anarchist propaganda, and
did not delay in passing on to action. I have not
been long in France, but in this short time I have
seen that all governments are alike. I have seen
the poor miners of the North, who struck because
they did not earn enough to support their families,
and after more than three months of struggle they
were forced by hunger to return to work on the old
terms: but the employers did not care at all for all
those thousands of workers, because it was engaged
in preparing festivals for the Franco-Russian
alliance in Paris, Toulon and Marseille.

"It was said that millions of francs must be
obtained by new taxes for these festivities; and the
bourgeois—that is to say, the journalists—wrote many
articles in order to demonstrate that the alliance
between France and Russia would be very profitable
for the workers. And yet we poor workers are
always in the same condition, and have to pay the
expenses of the festivities governments.

"Still, when we ask work and bread, we are
shot down, as were the miners of the North, the
peasants of Sicily, and many others.

"Not long ago, Vaillant threw a bomb in the
Chamber of Deputies to protest against the present
system, which has not only killed no one, only wounded
some persons; yet the bourgeois justice sentenced
him to death. And not satisfied with the con-
demnation of the guilty man, they began to pursue
the Anarchists and arrest not only those who had
joined Vaillant, but even my close friends and
merely been present at any Anarchist lecture.

"The Government did not think of their wives
and children. It did not consider that the men
killed in prison were not the only ones who suffered,
and that their little ones cried for bread. Bouri-
geois justice did not trouble itself about these inno-
cent ones, who do not yet know what society is.
It is no fault of theirs that their fathers are in
prison: they only want to eat.

"The Government went on searching private
houses, opening private letters, forbidding lectures
and meetings, and practising the most infamous
oppressions against us.

"Even now, hundreds of Anarchists are
inhabiting a newspaper or for having expressed an opinion in public.

"Why, if the governments use against us guns,
chains and prisons, should we Anarchists, who
have to defend our lives, remain skulking at home?
Should we renounce our idea, which is the truth?
No, the enemy of the world will answer those govern-
ments with dynamite, bombs, and daggers.

"In one word, we must do all we can to destroy
the bourgeois and the governments.

"Emile Henry threw a bomb in a restaurant; I
avenged myself with a pistol.

"Judgment of the Jury is the representative
of bourgeois society; if you want my head take it;
but do not believe that in so doing you will
stop the Anarchist propaganda. Take care, for
men reap what they have sown.

"The governments have begun to make martyrs;
they have garrotted in Xeres, hanged in Chicago,
shot in Barcelona, guillotined in Paris. The last
words of the victims pronounced in the moment of
their execution were: Death to the bourgeois!

"When the revolution comes, the bourgeoisie
will be thrown into the seas and the
mountains; they have penetrated into the towns,
into the villages, into the homes of millions of
workers.

"The workers, until now, have suffered them-
sewed by ambitious men, who try to rule
them by means of associations, trade unions, syn-
dicates and other impostures, in order to be elected
as Deputies or Councillors and to live without
working.

"But now, at last, it is recognized that only the
violent Revolution against the bourgeois system
will help the workers.

"When the Revolution has taken place, the work-
ers will no longer commit suicide through misery;
they will suffer no more by years and years of im-
prisonment; they will have crossed the seas
and the mountains; they have penetrated into the towns,
into the villages, into the homes of millions of
workers.

"The workers, until now, have suffered them-
sewed by ambitious men, who try to rule
them by means of associations, trade unions, syn-
dicates and other impostures, in order to be elected
as Deputies or Councillors and to live without
working.

"The workers, until now, have suffered them-
sewed by ambitious men, who try to rule
them by means of associations, trade unions, syn-
dicates and other impostures, in order to be elected
as Deputies or Councillors and to live without
working.

"Law and Marriage.

"Thomas Rowe, just sent to the penitentiary from
Sherman, Texas, is said to have sixteen living wives,
all of whom were married to him of seven years.
He said that he had no special objections to any
of them only that he became tired of them. Most of
the women have children by him, there being three
sets of twins among them. He claims that no
woman has ever refused to marry him.

"If love be taught sexual coition then Mr.
Rowe has had all the freedom that he could ever
possess, whether under the present form of govern-
ment, or no government to interfere with his move-
ments.

"If marriage means only to secure a license and
pay a fee to the officiating officer then, again, Mr.
Rowe has had perfect freedom from any restraining
influence in preventing him from marrying sixteen
times. What more freedom could Anarchy give,
than this Mr. Rowe has exercised?

"A man who has ever refused to marry him:—
a charmed man, or a power to fascinate all women
called by his way! What a danger to society by
Mr. Rowe which, when exercised, brings to his
arms any woman? Is not this the occult forces from
which springs the conduct of sex relations? Is it
not the occult to discover that coalition is not love
nor the cause of love, but an effect and can not be
a cause? Have not all who favor this freedom of
promiscuity anywhere, basing their arguments on
the premise that coalition is love, gone astray from
this.

Love is a magnetic attraction between the sexes
and when misused by mercenary or lustful ends,
which later influenced Mr. R. in his sex career, it pulls all men and women together who go together at all in a natural way.  

"He became tired of them." Any amount of men that way today; doubtless there are many women who feel this way also. Is it because they do not attract any more? Why this non-atraction? The sex relation is a magnetic relation and is governed by the same principles which govern what is called magnetism.  

All the women were repugnant to Mr. R. consequently it became an easy matter to get their consent to a marriage. A species of hypostism is always operated in sex relationships. If Mr. R. had not "tired" of his first sex partner, the other fifteen, well, he might have tried them all of them. What is the scientific rationale of this phenomenon? The magnetic flow is from the positive to the negative, so long as this flow is in equilibrium satisfaction is sex relation is sure to be had; but when this balance is destroyed then begins distress and discord, or discontent, and longing for something felt to be wanted. Mr. R. constantly discharged his positive magnetism and in time, the negative magnetism of the women, instead of being received by Mr. R. was appropriated by sexual life; hence Mr. R. felt his loss and had no love as some would say, hence sought more of this kind of love by seeking more with whom the women would have the desired effect and have the men have the desired result. This has done likewise and none objected—unless discovered!  

Now why is not this love an enduring element? Easily solved. Magnetic attractions, or want of them, are governed by the same magnetic principles governing electricity or magnetism. To assume that these ever varying states of human magnetism is love is to build on sand; for freedom or no freedom from government is what the man wants; it will not be obtained by cooperation or left to the women.  

In my little town there is a little creek—that is, it is small—little which got its back up on the other streams and became a rushing river, booming along at 12 or 15 miles an hour. That little creek was more powerful than the United States government and set aside all possible regularity on its way to join the Mississippi or a branch of the star route to the sea. Our worthy postmaster—a student of Kropotkin, and one who has often listened to this teacher's views—would be willing to admit that "only science can lift Nature." How so?  

I read in a recent issue of a Cleveland (Ohio) paper I found these two statements:  

"We have no patience with apologists or conservatives who pottor around, Force, violence, etc., and would pot patches on a rotten system."  

"Where all workers a unit in not working more than eight hours a day, would not the unemployed find rest temporarily?"

Enl!—Which of them goes? They don't harmonize a little bit, Bro. Hayes. They resemble the platform of the S. L. P., and the sweeping declarations of the party fugitives. Since I have written, I want to say, I doubt it very much. Organized labor takes eight hours when it knows that with the present advanced stage of machine production—even under the present shameful lack of organization and—see!—an usual day of eight hours would not employ all the willing hands, and until all are employed, labor will have little voice in the matter of wages. The trouble with the laborer is in regard to the day work day is that it lacks more than members—it lacks the courage to demand its rights, and even in the way of a palliative the eight hour day would not do. A six hour day would be much better. A thing that organized labor may secure a general eight hour day, it will not do so until to secure the result it aims at, a six hour day will be absolutely imperative, and its palliative will be inadequate. Then the laborer will have to be willing to secure eight hours to work (or vegetables) for a six or seven hour day while the sufferings of the people would be even greater or at times they now are.  

In another part of the same issue of the same paper appears this, which shows signs of evolution:  

"It is more sensible to band together and smash a few things than to continue attention than to retire to some obscure corner to starve."  

So far, very well; but our friend has not yet struck the final solution. That is only an expedient, a last resort—it is all right; it does not make a truth; the truth is there to be discovered and applied—it is equity, which covers Liberty, Equality, Fraternity—three words which compose the complete code and statute book of the universal laws of nature, the great creator and controller of life.

A recent letter from "Mr. Foggart" may help our comrades out some. He says: "It's the empty stomach works the brain—when there is any brain to work—falling brains have an explosion of physical force and a continuance of despotism. Right to the point and well put, alas..."  

"The great antagonist of intolerance is not humanity but knowledge. There is no instance on record of a race or individual man who could be subjected to a state of supreme power to enforce them, has not done far more evil than good." (Buckley's History of Civilization.)  

Now, Buckley, in writing that history had a habit of selecting situations which were in the present or near the future of the event. In the assertion given above, then I ask, wherein will permanent good result from an explosion that is purely physical? No, there must be a mental explosion that will redound to the glory of the race and to the loss of the brotherhood of man can be an actuality. It may be that physical force must accompany it; if so, the people necessary to do the work will be on hand—and I would express my sentiments as to any of these slave show any attitude for the work, so why prod them? You "can't make a silk purse out of a pig's ear."  

ZACHARY TAYLOR DREAMER.  

The Revolutionist And His Pretended Followers.  

There was once a man (so we read in an ancient book) who neither he nor any other person or a fictitious character is a question which does not concern us)—there was once a man who was not a slave to conventionalism and conservatism. He thought for himself. He expressed his thoughts in a language. He denounced the hypocrisies and the heartlessness of his contemporaries. He had very little respect for the conventional religion of his time. He convinced very severely those whose religious creeds insisted in observing meaningless forms and ceremonies. He wanted men to be not "professors" of religion, but doers of good deeds. He wanted to humanize the individual; he wanted to kill the spirit of selfishness and to make men think of the sufferings and sorrows of their fellow-men. He wanted men to be charitable, but he wanted them to be quiet about it and not boast of their charities. He did not like the talk of Simon Ben Halavi hospitals or Abraham ben Eleazer colleges. He said: "When thou doest thine alms, do not sound a trumpet before the eyes of men, as the hypocrites do in the synagogues and in the streets, that they may have the glory of men."  

He believed in man more than in customs and institutions. He did not emphasize the Sabbath Sabbath breakers. On the contrary, he was a Sabbath breaker himself. He said that the Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath. He declared in the existence to be the law; and he expressed the opinion that man's duties and obligations to his fellow men are of more importance than his duties to God. He said: "If thou bring thy gift to the altar and there rememberest that thy brother hath a need of the same, leave there thy gift before the altar and go thy way: first reconcile to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift."  

He was not a preacher in a rich and fashionable church. He instructed the multitudes, he preached sermons, but he never said: "Now, dearly beloved brethren, let us take up a collection." He was poor and lived with the poor; he sympathized with the poor. He did not quote texts in justification of their robberies. He drove the money-changers out of the temple and, on another occasion, he said that it was as natural to go through the pond as the fish than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of heaven.  

He was a believer in progress; he was a reformist. He did not believe in crying "Peace!" He did not tell his hearers that their country and their institutions were the best on the face of the earth; he did not believe in to love and to take the sword to support their government. On the contrary, he said that his mission was to bring the sword. He evidently understood that without a struggle progress does not exist and that in the struggle men must fight for their ideas. He did not tell children that they must obey their parents and ask no questions. He believed that when children have opinions which may benefit mankind, they need not stop to consider the opinions of their parents. He did not look upon a war of ideas as an evil to be shunned. He did not advise any one to acquiesce for the sake of peace.  

THE REDLANDS.
He was absolutely honest and untrivial. When the spirit of evil offered him the kingdoms of the world as a bribe, he said: "Get thee hence, Satan; for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve."

And what becomes of that extraordinary man? He was put to death. And why? Because it is customary to execute their prophets when they are crucified, but his name became immortal. His adherents have increased very rapidly, and today his followers are counted by the millions. They are very strict in all that they do, and believe that the name of their master, and they preach his gospel all over the world. But outside of this what are they doing? Are they practicing the precepts of their master? As followers of Christ, they must have done it if it is succeeded in establishing just conditions, they surely must be aggressive revolutionists, still fighting for right and justice, for the sake of a matter of fact, not for anything of the kind. The majority of them are very "respective" people and the opposite of what their master was. They hate poverty, they love comfort and they strive to get as much of the good things of the world as they possibly can. Their master told them not to judge, not to resist evil, and to love their enemies, but let anyone try to take anything which they consider their own, and he is arrested, judged and sent to prison. As to loving their enemies, not very many of them love even their friends.—(Cyrus W. Colodridge, in Free Thought Magazine).

The Theory of Heredity.

No branch of the evolution philosophy has received more attention than heredity, and no scientific theory has been oftener used than this one for the purpose of explaining social phenomena, and yet, as Professor John Dewey says, "a great deal of the prevalent opinion about heredity seems to be only mythology or fiction masquerading as science."

It is this doctrine of heredity which forms the basis for the stock arguments of the sex reformers of the Harvard school. While not denying the influence of environment on morals and the formation of character, they seem inclined to consider such influence of very secondary importance, and boldly advance the theory that our social and economic evil are practically irremediable except when we begin at the "creatory," to use Harman's phrase, and secure well born human material to work with. Harman is more concerned about the "quality" of the people than the form of the community, or the quantity or the circumstances with which they may have to contend after they are born. I have no quarrel with sex reformers of this school, so long as they are looking toward the abolition of the conventional marriage tie and claiming full freedom for the sexes in their love relations is entirely acceptable to me; but I cannot help thinking that they say a tribe too much stress on their argument and to push things further than the science of heredity will warrant. Much of their talk, in short, is only mythology or fiction masquerading as science.

Degeneration enters into the evolutionist theory as well as progress; and this negative factor demands our attention quite as much as does any positive factor of evolution. In his excellent little introduction to Life, E. L. James says: The stock farmer and the nursery gardener select for breeding those animals and plants best suited to their purposes, thus making a 2-to-4 trotter out of a common horse, or a passy out of a Johnny-jump-up. But, as we venture to his First Corinthians, he is pulling a boat upstream—if an oat break or slip out of the row lock the current sweeps all down again immediately. The posterity of the blooded horses and the selected strains and crosses have no certain secure will be very well acting individuals after all, unless they are placed under proper conditions to cultivate the qualities we desire them to exhibit. A well born child, if placed in an improper environment and forced to grow up amid improper associations, cannot help but become tainted, and he is likely to find his birth of but little use to him in the end; but one who is poorly born may entirely overcome the disadvantages of his birth if placed under proper conditions of development after birth. This would seem to indicate that the "creatory" is not the only logical place to begin the reform business. Indeed, I am inclined to think that a great deal of this talk about the "creatory" is purely nonsense; we know a mighty sight less about the "creatory" than we assume to know, and much is left for granted on the part of those who are appreciative of proof. On the question of heredity I am inclined to accept Ritchie's view: "It seems very doubtful whether, accept in fairy tales or comedy, one can be brought away for its parents and in complete ignorance of them (for this also is essential to a fair experiment) would present any of their moral characteristics in a definite form.

We may say that a certain amount of psychological energy is inherited, but the direction it takes is mostly determined by circumstances—the environments they must admit that it may be of a kind that more readily takes to certain occupations than others. Individuals start with inherited tendencies or capacities, not with fully formed habits. An energetic or an aspergetic temperament, a cool or a nervous temperament is transmitted; but it seems very doubtful whether one can adopt it, that apart from the external influences in early life, which generally act along with it.

No positive statement regarding social phenomena can be founded on the mere doctrine of heredity unless the conditions into which they are introduced may happen to impel them. Here, as in the physical realm, motion follows the lines of least resistance, and it invariably carries the individual along with it. — W. T. BORLAND.

Note and Comment.

If we find in any of our readers a copy of Vol. II, of the date September 27, 1896, which we can spare, we would much value it, and should send it to us, if we need it to complete a volume for a library.

A COMRADE writes us that he can furnish us with a portrait, or pictures, ready to be used in The Firebrand, or other publications, if we can have them engraved. If any of our readers are able and willing to engrave a picture for us occasionally, we can make The Firebrand illustrated—occasionally at least—and add much to its attractiveness.

Die Freie Gesellschaft, an Anarchist journal in the Hebrew language, has started publication again. All contributions are expected to address Harris Mintdtd, 202 E. Broadway, New York City. Subscription price $1.00 per year, single copies 10 cents.

We request our comrades in Europe to send pamphlets and other literature to us by mail. We recently received a consignment of three dollars worth of pamphlets, and the expense on them was as follows: pre-paid from London $7.00, postage, etc. $1.40, duty at time of delivery to us 30 cents; in all $8.44. From this it can be seen that it does pay to send literature by freight. We have received lots of pamphlets by mail in small bundles, and there was no expense after they started.

A COMRADE in New York writes us that a young man told her, quite bitterly, that he had been paid for The Firebrand, but had never received it. On further inquiry it was found that he had paid $1.00 to H. M. Kelly, formerly of Boston, and neither this nor the money has been heard of since. H. M. Kelly has never been authorised to collect for The Firebrand, nor has he ever sent in any payment for subscriptions.

How dealing in religion affects mens honesty can be judged by the following:—

The editor of The New Orleans Newspaper Directory further says that the circulation statements furnished by the publishers of the religious papers are, as a whole, less honest, less truthful and more calculated to deceive than are those that come from the average legal periodicals.

But why should they not lie? They are working for "God"! he can surely overlook so slight an offence when they work so hard for him.

The sense and justice of the postal department, the "model socialistic institution," can be seen from the following, taken from the Fourth Estate:—

"Two days ago the Arkansas Gazette offered a $6 gold piece to the scholar in any public school in the State who, before the end of the month, should send in the shortest and best answer to the question: "What is news?"

The announcement of this offer, the Gazette is now indicating, has caused the lottery law, and papers containing it cannot pass through the mails. An appeal to the Postmaster-General was made, while publication of the announcement has been suspended."

What might we expect if the State Socialists had not undertaken to put their "regulation" theories into practice?

A FRIEND of The Firebrand lately made a little propaganda tour through the coal regions in Pennsylvania, hoping to get some subscribers. He says among other things:

"People were very anxious to read The Firebrand, but poverty prevented them from subscribing. The prevailing want and distress among the coal miners is hardly describable. They only work two or three months in the year and receive from one to five dollars a day. From this amount they have to pay from four to six dollars house rent (hog pens) a month. Besides, they have to buy everything from the company store and pay from one and one-half to three times as much as in other stores. If they don't buy in these stores they are discharged." We are sorry our friend did not send in the names of those that are anxious to read Anarchist literature. The only way out for these miners is to take possession of the mines and work for themselves instead of a lot of parasites.

Some of the business men and other citizens of Spokane have recently received letters from parties in other states saying that glowing reports are abroad in those sections which give the impression that Spokanes is building too many factories and attracting enough men here to do the work. Some of those letters have been shown to members of organised labor, who concluded their duty to bring the matter before their fellow workers of other localities, and hence passed the following resolutions:—

"Whereas, It has come to the notice of the trade committee's reports are broadcast all throughout the country of a scarcity of laborers and mechanics of all kinds in this city, and that extraordinary high wages are being offered for their services; and, "Whereas, It is known to the trade council that the real state or affairs is largely exaggerated by these reports, and that they are circulated to flood the local labor market, and thereby depress a rate of wages, now only sufficient to furnish the indispensable necessities of life; therefore, be it Resolved, That the trade council of Spokane deems it its duty to inform the workers elsewhere of the following facts: That while this section of the country enjoys for the present a period of prosperity, and while there is considerable demand for help of various kinds, yet the wages are not equal to those paid in some of the cities, and that demands that may be made upon it at present or in the near future; and that the workingmen of Spokane are connected through the trade council, hereby learn their fellow workers in other places against all stirring advertisements in order to spare them inevitable loss and disappointment."

Freeman's Labor Journal. April 11, 1897—Labor papers please copy.

Correspondence.

FORMING A GROUP.

I send a note to help along. Will be able to send more shortly. I want to see you succeed, for you are doing an excellent work, and will do as much as possible to aid you here. I hope to get easier shortly and be less occupied with my own affairs, then I shall be able to do more for the cause. I will make an effort to collect some money for you, and hope to form a group here; if you wish to do so you may publish my
name among your agents. I deplore the attitude of those so-called Anarchists who seek to place fetters on free discussion in the Firebrand.

Bay City Mich.

W. P. FORLAND.

Agrees with Zadnik.

Majority rule by Henry Addin splended. Zadnik the great whistleblower with his unanswerable right, because I think the Dreamer comprehends Coxe's good roads bill as being an awful danger to property holders, under majority rule. Also his Swiss reference is a wild one and a bolt on the end to an endowed idea might answer. But in the vast and diversified interests in climatic and sectional localities, more or less antagonistical to each other, it would be impractical in the United States.

Coxey undoubtedly, like many others, means well, but in my opinion he cannot comprehend what he is talking about farther than his desire for money, with no regard to how he can get it. Only so long as he has his little goat, his insignificance seems to be his protection. Well, many a fool thinks he is a statesman. "Let me rip!" the higher up the pile he gets the more he can be seen.

Dayton Ohio.

To Free Lovers.

In an article in The Firebrand an "Open Letter to E. F. Roodbeck," the writer says: "The majority of women are discussed and not able to work hard after they have borne from three to four children." If that be so the women in self-defense should refuse to bear children. We believe that it is in the interests of women in which their sexual life is lived rather than childbirth that causes disease.

Now, as to the support of children, it is a superstition to think that it must be taught as a duty, it is a decided pleasure and the man who will hold sexual relationship with the intention of leaving the responsibility entirely on the woman is as much an unacquainted man as a man with a cup of music in his hand in an impregnation. That man who can be truly proud of his manhood is the man who can show his capability and pride in the appropriation, appreciation and respectability of love; and the consciousness of the husband of Mrs. B. should be known among free-loving women and he would find his variety very much curtailed. He tells his wife she has the same freedom; will he please tell us why she has any more right to support the children than he? Personally I would not desire as a sexual partner anyone who had ever neglected a child. There is something definite in the expression of love and we must have the best of it.

This man seems to think that "love is only in the sex act." Confusing love to these limits I blame no one for opposing "free love" altogether but from close observation of the manhood of men avowed "free lovers" I may say they bear their responsibilities better than the average married man, where the wife often takes in work, or is helped by her mother, sister or worse still, often, you very well tells her favors to other men, the husband pretending he knows nothing of it.

This so-called "free lover" tells his wife she ought to be as free as he was: what the matter with him that he could not be smart and protect her from pregnancy? He has a great abundance of impudence to write to her he loves her yet. His love is of such poor quality, I do not see how he could exercise her right of choice and find a pern. robber lover. If she is so good as to fight the battles for the children, I think she should be a very desirable lover, one to be proud of, one to be loved, one to be loved with the sacrifices he made for his children.

I am sure the right one is somewhere, and I wish you would meet him soon.

You may say you are together, but soon you were compelled to get married- Why? How did it help you? Don't you see that it was getting married that gave him the right to your body? Otherwise he would have had to have got along without you. He says he practices "free love" when he has money. He therefore pays other women for sexual favors; why don't you do the same? The man who is not a husband by you and so help to support the burden. Of course I believe you would not sell yourself for money, but he really under the pretense of "love" has had much cheaper women and has paid as much for them and has no claim to be a free lover, when he has spt such letters upon you or, when he pays money to some unfortunate woman who is driven to sell herself. No woman could
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had not been as congenial as desired. But in their ignorance of this subject, the belief that as long as they live they need not worry about love any body else, they live a miserable life.

It is not only the "invasion of seduction" by men that is at fault, but society as a whole. On the other hand, it is not the mother, the woman, that is being sought for, but the lovely and girlishly beautiful, all those suggestions ideas into them that we complain of? Neither woman nor men desire and leave each other for the sake of hurting the other; both of them are seeking happiness and pleasure, but an account of our ignorance and the present moral code and prevailing conditions, the outcome is misery and suffering.

A. I.

We are in receipt of No. 83 of the Twentieth Century Library—National Ownership of Railways by Chaas. H. Vail. It contains 47 pages, is printed on medium paper, in clear type: price 15 cents. It is published by the Humboldt Library, 94 Fifth Ave., New York City.

The author tries to prove the necessity and advantages of national ownership of railroads, but he lacks the essentials to found his proof. He merely makes a vague argument for the necessity for government. A justification of the national government is necessary before any argument for its ownership can be valid.

Propaganda Fund.

Arbeiterbildungs Verein, Flushing, N. Y., $25.00. Pictorial, $5.00.

Caros, 40.00. Roodbeck, $10.00; Elko, 7.50; Hirsch, $7.50.

Peis, 100.00; News, 50 cents; Elkhorn, 25 cents.

Hulman, Neuwirth, Frank, Pratub, Moyer, Goldsch, each No. Farman, Edelheit, each No. Margue, James, Ariakis, Thebom, Gates, Meissmer, Schneider, Rossw, each No. Jannay, No. Dodge, 50

Wellenbrook's Relief Fund.

Headquarters New London, Wis. The name of the Contra is present in The House of The Firebrand and is in a critical condition, but there is hope of its recovery.

P. A. S.

There is in the above a sentiment expressed that we so often find in the contributions of Lucifer, i.e. that the woman are nearly all angels, although with out wings, and that the men are brutes and rascals—at least the greatest number of them.

That is in "jumping to conclusions" which are neither based on facts nor experiences, but on simple prejudiced and partial statements.

If the confronde would have used the word "society" instead of "man" or "men" for condemnations I would have nothing to say, but when the man alone is held up to ridicule and is made to keep in sex relations, without taking conditions into consideration, then I must protest.

Woman are not any more sublime in love affairs than men. We see just as many men committing suicide on account of rejected, etc., by their sweethearts as woman who commit suicide for the same reason. Only when they have "gone to for" is the woman the suffering party. Not because her love affection was not as fully known because she is aware that society will ostracize and condemn her alone. Many women have told me that they never would have married the man "if I had not gone too far already." And no the men but the women in the end to their "fallen" sisters.

Furthermore how do we know that Mrs. B.'s husband married her simply for the sake of having a child? It is not to be presumed that she has been just as sincere a lover as his co-partner, but government—society—compelled them to marry and the result was misery and unhappiness. Even if they had not been legal, the marriage might have been different? No: Under existing conditions she would have been just as much a slave on account of her little children. But both of them had had correct ideas on sex and in their marriage they had in to marry, they probably would still live together and mutually support each other, even if their relation

* * *

* How do you know the man referred to is doing it? Both imaginary accusations should never be made in a stupid discussion.

A. I.

To find the HOME OF THE FIREBRAND take the Oregon City car at cor. First & Alder Sts., and ride out to Sellwood. Get off at Spokane Ave. Walk two blocks, cross the river, then turn to the right and walk one block.

The Old and the New Meal. A topic of of that subject: The Bold Question which pertains to Love, Marriage and Sexual Immorality. By Emil F. Roodbeck. Paper cover 50c. Published by The Humboldt Library, 94 Fifth Ave., New York City.

Notice.

* * *
THE FIRE BRAND

THE GOD IDEA OF THE ANCIENTS.

JUST OUT. OCTOBER, 336 PAGES.

Beautifully printed, clothed.

PRICES, 12.50.

A WORK FOR EVERY FREEDOMIST AND RADICAL.

CONTENTS:


ORDER OF THE FIREBRAND.

FIREBRAND LIBRARY.

A selection of ten or more, five-cent pamphlets furnished at three cents each.

Let us be Just. By W. Thetford. [An open letter to "Anarchism." S] 0.05

Anarchism. By Carlo Malatesta. 0.10

Anarchist: The Philosophy and Ideal. By P.K. Kropotkin. 0.15

Anarchist Communism in its Relation to State Socialism. By A. Guyau. 0.15

Anarchist Communism in France. By K. Durruti. 0.25

A Talk About Anarchist Communism. By Malatesta. 0.10

Anarchism on Trial. Speeches and Addresses. By K. Kropotkin. 0.25

Colonial Sense Country. By L. B. Huxley. 0.15

A Fine Anarchist Communism. By W. H. Duncan. 0.15

Anarchist Communism. By A. Guyau. 0.15

Social Democracy in Germany. By G. F. Lenser. 0.15

Other Thoughts. By S. R. Bunting. 0.10

Anarchist Morality. By Peter Kropotkin. 0.15

Revolution and Revolution. By Eillee Redfern. 0.15

Revolutionary Roads. By K. Kropotkin. 0.15

Explanations of Anarchists. By P. Kropotkin. 0.10

Books of Anarchy: Historical, Philosophical and Economic. By P. Kropotkin. 0.25

God and the State. By Michael Bakunin. 0.10

The Commune of Paris. By Peter Kropotkin, and An Anarchist Revolution. By E. Zamyatin. 0.25

The True Aim of Anarchism. By E. F. Boulanger. 0.10

Revolutionary ربوع. By E. F. Boulanger. 0.10

Wants and their Gratification. By Henry Addis. 0.10

Parsons vs. My Life. By H. A. L. Shaw. 0.10

Alberto P. Book on Anarchism, in Philosophy and Scientific Basis, German and English Editions; hard and soft cover. 0.50

Life of Albert P. Barnes, with a brief History of the Labor Movement in America. Beautifully illustrated and nicely bound; 200 pages perfect binding. 0.25

The two books last named are slightly damaged, but readable.


The Triumph of Death. By Gabriel P'Amateur. Cloth 1.10

The Wherefore Investigating Company.

By LOY WAISBROOKER.

A Thrilling and Deeply interesting story, intending to show the wrong, and the inevitable bad results of monopoly in land. It is one of Mrs. Walshbrooker's best and most powerful works.

A Splendid Missionary Book of 313 Pages. Don't Fail to read it.

SEND A COPY TO YOUR CONVENTIONAL NEIGHBOR.

This Book is Printed and Bound in Good Paper and Bound in Heavy Paper.

Our Price, 25 Cents.

WANTED—FAITHFUL MEN AND WOMEN to travel in responsible established houses.


FLOWERS & SHRUBS.

Anyone who will send a donation of ten cents to The Firebrand, or a 25 cent subscription and a 2 cent stamp to pay postage, I will send a page of soil, selected from my out singles, which I send out free on request. Among them are roses, bulbs, house plants, and handy outdoor flowers. This is a splendid opportunity to get some nice flowering plants. Don't miss the time.

Order of E. W. Hoffmann.

786 E. 8th St., Portland, Oregon.

The Places will be sent all over the United States.

BR. FOOT'S PLAIN TALK TREATISE ON MEDICAL CONSIDERATIONS.

For the information of those who may be interested, I would call attention to the popular and useful book, "Plain Talk Treatise on Medical Considerations," which is replete with valuable information, and a source of knowledge to tens of thousands of readers for many years to come. The present edition has been brought out to meet the ability of the poor to buy, and is sold at the remarkably low price of $1.00.

Order from The Firebrand.

KURIOUS KURTREES.

Red Balsam, Mounted on card............ 1.00

Pansy, Mounted............. 1.00

Orchids, Mounted........... 1.00

Tulip, Mounted............. 1.00

Ranunculus, Mounted............. 1.00

Tulip, Mounted............. 1.00

Horned Tusk, Mounted............ 1.00

Alligator, 1 1/2 long............. 2.00

Alligator, 2 long............. 2.00

Snowy Owl. Large size specimen............. 10.00

Order of E. W. Hoffmann, Portland, Oregon.

The German Gymn, Chicago, Ill., meets every Friday, 6 o'clock P.M., at 355 Lake St. Arm.

Anarchist Headquarters in New York City, 12th and 13th Flats, 406 Bowery St., Room 2.

The Independent Educational Club meets every Sunday evening, at 7:00 p.m. at 1938 E. St., Tacoma, Wash.

The Firebrand, on Thursday and Saturday nights, every Sunday day at 8:00 Westminister St., Providence, R.I.

International Group Free Iniative meets at 66 West 42nd Street, New York, every Thursday night, at 8:00 p.m.

The Free Press, on Thursday and Saturday nights, every Sunday day at 8:00 Westminister St., Providence, R.I.

The New Era, an advocate of the principles of Anarchy, or absolute freedom of the individual in all things. A four page monthly, 2 cents per year. Address: Lake Bay, Wash.

The Group Proletarian Socialism and Socialists in America, 351 3rd Avenue, New York, N. Y.

The Pamphlets in English, Hebrew and German languages can be had by any of town hand-books and comrades, by addressing, Leslie, 541 Cherry St., New York City.

The San Francisco Anarchist Club. Headquarters at 1125 G. Polson St. will hold regular weekly agitation meetings every Saturday evening at Apollo Hall, 824 Pacific St. Discussion will be held at 9 and 11 o'clock, followed by socials—music and dancing, 10 and 12 o'clock.

The Little Free Thinker, the only magazine published for the young that is free from superstition. Semi-monthly. Fifty cents a year. Subscription for ten cents, post paid. Address: 931 W. Washington, Chicago, Ill.

The Albatross is a monthly paper issued by the friendliness and munificence of St. Louis, whose members hold all their property in common. In both men and women we believe the time has come to consider all their business affairs by majority rule. Twenty-five cents a year; sample copy free. Address: A. Longley, 229 Olive St., St. Louis, Mo.

Labor and the Lighthouse, published at 1264 W. Congress St., Chicago, Ill. E. M. Harman, makes a specialty of sociology and biological science, believing this to be the most important of all sciences, because the most intimately connected with the origin or inception of life, when character, for good or ill, for strength or weakness, for happiness or misfortune, for success or failure, is formed upon each individual, 50 to 110 years.

SPECIAL OFFER FOR PROSPECTIVE TIMES: "Women in Liberty and Nature Law," 12c: "Women in Freedom," 10c; "Allied" Reasons for Defending Fields, Heeds, and Schubs," 5c; "The Proletarian Daughter," or, the Price of Virtue," 10c. Send 5c subscription to participative total twenty-five cents; or send 10 cents, 3 months subscription and we will send you your choice of 10 cent worth of these pamphlets free. Listor is weekly, eight pages, the only paper of its kind in the world. This is a rare specimen securing a large supply of excellent literature for missionary work. Address M. Harman, 1209 W. Congress St., Chicago, Ill.