The Post Office in Anarchy.

We are often asked how certain standing organizations, of which the Post is a typical instance, could exist in a society where the people are effectively filled in a condition of Anarchy. And perhaps a precise answer showing, not only generalities which the questioner's mind fails to see the working application of, but this working application itself, in the direction and on the scale inquired about,—may be the means of helping to a true conception of the nature of Anarchist society and enabling the Anarchist theory to be comprehended.

For this reason, and also because the study is not without interest to those who are Anarchists already, I have attempted to work out the idea of a possible postal system in Anarchy; naturally, it is that which I think would be put in operation, but it is as well to warn the reader who may not be an Anarchist as yet, that the realization of Anarchy does not necessarily imply that this will be the working postal system. There may be one worse, or better, be there may be several side by side or in different regions. It does imply, however, that the same principle—not of the mechanical working but of the relation between the persons concerned—will appear in whatever arrangements may be adopted. It needs also to keep in mind that we are considering the arrangements with reference to an Anarchist condition of society, that is to say where people in general think, and as a natural consequence act, in an Anarchist way and thereby make it easy and natural for each other to do so also; and that this means a society very different from the present. It is a condition of society where nobody is bound to do, or yet not to do anything; where nobody is bound to submit to or tolerate anything, nor yet the contrary: where consequently there is no rule of so-called "right", which anyone can assert himself to be in order to hamper, frustrate or oppose another, or which creates a temptation to do so, and therefore nobody can be forced on the other hand to disregard his neighbour's welfare in order to preserve his own and the rule at the same time; where there is therefore no privilege of any kind whatever "exclusive" or "intrinsic"—no property, whether private, or collective, or common, but simple free people in a world unowned, having to concern themselves with nothing but to provide for their welfare as harmoniously as possible, to satisfy their human sympathies, and to associate their efforts at their own will and pleasure for the purpose of accomplishing things needed by their living actions—the only end and way to accomplish them and helping each other to do so.

As to the Post Office in Anarchy, it is worked on even in connection with this very matter, and I should scarcely hesitate to affirm that a complete postal system on Anarchist-Communist line could exist and work successfully even in the midst of a present society. Let us begin with the post in its most elementary form. This is simply a place of call, for the exchange of correspondence, etc., between residents of the same general locality. A person who writes a letter, or sends a book or a paper, takes it there or gets some one else to do so, in the expectation that either the addressee will at some sufficiently near time call there and find it, or some other person coming there and learning of its existence will take it along to its destination.

This we have already, on purely Anarchist lines, and in spite of the hateful isolation in which most persons are from each other through existing social conditions (and which in turn constitutes those conditions), I believe it affects about half of all purely "local" correspondence. The members of trades unions and friendly societies who leave communications for each other at the society room operate post offices in this sense. Every newspaper office is a post office where readers correspond with casual or regular contributors, these with each other and some times the public with advertisers. Every Anarchist or Socialist reading room, or book-stall, etc., is a "post-office," and indeed there is hardly a prominent place of any sort which people frequent that is not so for those who are aware of each others' visits. And indeed, so far as the receipt and delivery of postal matter is concerned, and not seldom the immediate stage of transportation also, are not large numbers of official post offices in the small country settlements on exactly the same footing, all the local work being voluntary and free of commercial considerations?

In these cases, there is a person who takes charge of the letters, or on the contrary they are confided to the visiting public by being deposited in a box or on a rack, to which everyone has access. This last is perhaps more naturally adopted at some uninhabited places where ship letters are posted; and generally for convenience wherever more than a few people and (these few mutually acquainted) make use of premises where many are coming and going—being precisely the reverse order of fact to what authoritarian and commercial suspicion would prompt to. Yet it is very rare for any abuse of this confidence to take place. Often, with all the supposed inviolability of the safety boxes, letters and other personal papers are destroyed by the basest to get rid of them, and correspondence is tampered with or withheld for political and class reasons, whilst hundreds of letters and societies are appropriated for private reasons of the officials, not withstanding that (or perhaps because) in the principal offices they work under the constant supervision of detectives. On the voluntary system everyone who is willing to carry a letter further being free to do so, and the doing so not being a task imposed, the first of these evils is secured against; the third loses its impelling motive with the disappearance of the property system, as, even if the book or article sent might be desirable to some one other than the addressee, that person could easily be supplied without his inconvenience using the one for whom it was meant, in a social condition of freedom and mutual helpfulness where the sole aim of both production and distribution would be the satisfaction of the needs that existed for the particular things produced. As to the second evil, it is sufficiently evident that in the absence of authoritarian control over the correspondence it could only be interfered with privately, whether for party or personal reasons, and it would be a very simple matter to take precautions if risk were suspected, because anyone who did not want his letters brought away by anyone but himself would only have to set up a private box, or ask the person who took charge of letters—if there was one doing that business—to keep them for personal delivery, or give notice asking his own correspondents to refrain from leaving letters for him where he thought they were unsafe, and informing them of any other arrangement he had made.

This public confidence principle would enable a great development to be made at once on these primitive lines. Thus, without any yet considering the cases in which it might be desirable to arrange specially for some persons to make rounds of collection and delivery at regular periods, we could have a large outwork of letter boxes all around the centre, with collections and deliveries at all times.
through the day. It would only be necessary that these boxes should be unlocked, and that the contents should be visible, but to make the best of the idea let us say each box should contain three compartments, one for each pound, and if there be another for those going to the centre, and the third for those to go in the opposite direction; and that each compartment should be fitted with a semaphore or flag, to be raised by the first person putting mail into it, and the second and third lowered by whoever takes the last letter out. The people in the neighborhood being thus apprized of the moment a letter is brought, and those passing in with ease will unstop the semaphore and inveigle back the outgoing mail from the moment there is a letter to go—the like arrangement being maintained on as multiplied a scale as necessary at branch roads and at the common centre. This system, if applied to the country parts with daily or more than daily mail collections and deliveries where now they have to put up with a mail each way once or twice a week and only one place to send from or receive at—which is only due to their falling to thus communically associate, as there are always travelers in all directions. Evidently what applies between centre and outposts applies also between neighboring centres. There would be another post office here, as well as the collection, transport, and delivery all over the connected district would be effected by the same journeys which would be made in any case for other purposes, and with scarcely perceptible increased cost to the customer. We may consider the whole problem settled, as ninety-nine hundredths of the transport from post office to post office, large or small, is already effected by journeys undertaken for other purposes, so that in adding collection and delivery we are actually only breaking down the bounds set by commercialism and social isolation to the essential arrangements already and always relied on. In the cases where special journeys were necessary or desirable, they would be no more, in the London arrangements between the parties most affected, or between them and other comrades, in the same way as any other matter of social habit founded on friendly solidarity.

In what way is it arranged now that someone or other in the house goes to the post office at a certain time, or goes down to the store every day for the city daily paper, when there are no rounds of delivery to where you live? And what is the difference between the former and the latter, and the difference between the former and the latter a matter of convenience to any? In other words, the central post office has been erected, and the system of delivering mail over the central post office—and the reader will hardly fail to see that the central work would be much lightened, besides, by the fact of many letters being carried direct between intermediate places without going through the mail box at all. The fact is that the sorting would in the main be performed automatically, and as persons got in the habit of carrying mails would certainly provide themselves, or be provided by comrades, with proper conveniences for doing so. There would be in cases of many a mere matter of emptying each collection box into a separate receptacle; the inward mails from distant places, however, would certainly be sent to the nearest post office in order to be radiated out from the local centre.

But even here there is absolutely no difficulty. There would always be some people at hand with whom it would be a matter of pleasure to sort the mails and deliver them. The reader will see that there might be for them or, in the case of young persons, for the sheer pleasure of the exercise. As a boy I should, I know, have been delighted, and there are plenty of other matters in which what is in itself indifferent or even tedious to the older person is recreation to the younger. One way and another there would certainly be no lack of volunteers for all the sorting required, and if the work was specially heavy at any place, such as, say, Chicago, in consequence of a concentrated population, there would be all the more help—er, at least, there would be a certainty of finding people who would be willing to make a specialty of working in this branch for the general welfare, and it will be seen that this applies to all the regional needs.

However, I see no real answer for any more specialized working in the larger city than in the ordinary country township. If a thousand tons of mail matter came into the city in the course of a day—apart from the reduction, independently sorted and transmitted along the streets and railways from one post office to another the greater part of this mass could certainly be divided at once according to the districts from which it came. Thus all this heavy first day correspondence, the Melbourne and suburban, from Bendigo, would form a postal club; those who generally had it from Ballarat, another, and so on, and the mail bags from the chief district centres would thus go direct to the combination of those for whom the bulk of that correspondence would probably prove to be. They would have their own volunteers for sorting and all the special arrangements that are necessary in the city, and the letters which were not so got rid of to people in writing would meanwhile be placed in the order of locality and made up into bundles, to go out to the remaining places by the ordinary means of transport.

Thus it is all a matter of dividing this subdivision of mails according to source to the degree of fineness that the addresses themselves found convenient and perhapes subdividing the clubs themselves into more special local source letter experiments (for instance a club a for letters from the British colonies, another for the French, "Welsh letter" and Irish letter" groups) the sorting and distribution would be effected as at present, probably a little longer, without any centralised, single, postal organization whatever existing. The clubs or groups mentioned, would consist of the free association of persons to take particular matters in hand, and not in the "incorporation of persons as members" of any formal body.

Equally, there might be several postal clubs for the same letter source, supposing there were two, one might arrange to have the mail sent in a specially named club, the person directly connected requesting their correspondents in the district to mark letters, "Say "Per Red Bag." Then, of course, the letters gathered in from the district outposts would be marked as one parcel at or in the way to the district centre, at the time of being sorted, and there would be one more receiving box there, to facilitate the automatic sorting by letter petrol pumps, and many such clubs might exist in and about Melbourne for receiving and distributing letters from Bendigo. It is almost certain that the Bendigo people would not have to make uo any new apparatus for separate mail boxes that would be required in order to decentralize the Melbourne arrangements in the only other way apparently possible, that is by sending the mail over in lots for each separate suburb or part of a suburb or of the main city, separately consigned. This clubbing system then, in large centres of population and travel, appears much superior in every way to the present system, because the work is done by separate parties, who are, or at least are closely connected with the actual addresses of the main post office, while the present system is done by a council of parties, who are, or at least are closely connected with the actual addresses of the main post office. The system is one which would, of course, be set up by each separate post office, and the result that would be achieved in the end is a better result with less trouble, and it is manifestly much more economical.

But it will be seen that the vital point of this post office system which has been expounded there, is not a single postage stamp, and no postal Department, salaries, contracts or regulations. It is purely voluntary and based upon the enlightened self-interest and fraternity combined, or solidarity, of the people. This is what constitutes the true post office applied in a reformed society or nation. The other elements are mechanical, and might be applied in connection with the present postal system, but—especially as the collection and distribution of these letters would not be required to be worked in the Anarchist way, and in order to yield properly satisfactory results all around should be operated in an Anarchist condition of general society.

T. A. Andrews.

184. If free men cannot trust free men their counsels, the sharers of their good and ill, for these friendly services, how can people whose own hands are not at stake as they do, be trusted, and are distinctly isolated from them by the present social system, who are merely mercenary slaves doing task-work, and amenable to the tyrannies and corruption of their "superiors"? I have seen and received letters, covering hundreds or even thousands of miles of distance, through perfect strangers, quite outside the State postal system and equally clear of all commercial considerations—and this, too, in the most casual manner, without the advantage of any such habitual or concerted arrangements as I have just outlined.

J. A. A.

Wool and Its Uses.

There was a clashing of many tongues in New York pulpit Sunday over the propriety of the Bradley Martin ball. In synagogues and in church, from Baptists to Methodists, Reformers to Jews, the eloquent and eloquent chorus of the dashing nate was denunciation of the rich for talking their pleasure magnificently.

But the clergy regard the question at issue from the wrong point of view. The legal right of a man to do what he will with his own, provided it be not harmful to another, is not to be questioned. It is scarcely to be questioned except by those who accept literally Christ's command, "Sell all that thou hast and give to the poor," and we fear the apostles of this new and newness of life are not to be argued with. If the attack on the participants in this much discussed festivity borders upon impertinence, but not attack upon a social and industrial system which creates such contrasts as, to quote Rev. Cortlandt Myers, "250,000 people in want of food and coal and 250,000 squander in a single society ball." Yet the clergy with one hand ignore the cause of the contrast and concentration of wealth and the dissemination of poverty.

Perhaps the falsity of the pulpit's point of view is most clearly shown by the present-day preacher's apologizing as a philanthropist Mr. John D. Rockefeller, and contrasting his employment of wealth with that of the Bradley Martins, lastly to the latter's devotees in thirty years. It is not true, risen from the position of a bookkeeper to the eminence of the richest man in New York. His charities are said to be enormous—so great, indeed, that according to report, he pays a man $10,000 a year to supervise them for him. His benefactions to the University of Chicago are unparalleled. Is he therefore to be lauded in the pulpit as a philanthropist—"a lover of mankind?" Was Robin Hood deserving the applause of the church because a part of his spoil went to the poor? Rockefeller! The richer, the more the poverty of the world! The richer, the more the profit of monocacy. The standard Oil Company, of which he is the head, and for which he must account, is the most typical and absolute, and, has attained its present impregnable position by nothing short of criminal methods. Against its monopoly and exploitation, of conspiracy, bribery, arson, riot, fraud and burglary, all the Christian church may take its stand in the court or before legislative committees. It has made and unmade United States Senators, Judges and Legislatures for it, for them and its profit. It has ruined the industries on every side of it, and the thirty years "business" campaign which ends by making Rockefeller a capitalist as far as not what are against whom he waged industrial war ruined. It is the Church shall not take cognizance of these things, who shall?

It may well be doubted whether expenditure of ill-gotten gains in philanthropic causes, even philanthropic expenditure, is not more insidiously harmful to the social well being than lavish disbursements, in times of dep-
Echos from Foreign Countries.

GERMANY. Rosa Berle, the responsible lady manager of the "Poor Courant," who was arrested before Christmas, was released lately, but the prosecution is going on just the same on account of the outrages perpetrated against the Germans in France. Some Frenchmen are now in such dread of being accused in Germany, that they have left the country. Both he and his partner, Friedrich, are accused of having libeled the police and inciting the populace to open revolt. The trial was held this spring, and the jury is now expected to pronounce sentence. The case is a side show broke out in the orange and basket factories in Paris. Somebody went to the largest establishment and exploded a bomb. The police went straight to the address of the "Forward," a local Anarchist periodical. The editors were arrested and are yet in jail, but the workmen obtained what they asked for, and a few of them are nowiks in the factories. The whole thing is a fool's errand. The same thing happened in the factories in Brazil. The workers asked for a holiday, and instead of getting one, they were brought to the work. The result was a revolution. The workers refused to obey the new laws, and the government had to give in. The workers then asked for a strike, andinstead of getting one, they were brought to the work. The result was a revolution. The workers refused to obey the new laws, and the government had to give in. The workers then asked for a strike, and instead of getting one, they were brought to the work. The result was a revolution. The workers refused to obey the new laws, and the government had to give in. The workers then asked for a strike, and instead of getting one, they were brought to the work. The result was a revolution. The workers refused to obey the new laws, and the government had to give in. The workers then asked for a strike, andinstead of getting one, they were brought to the work. The result was a revolution. The workers refused to obey the new laws, and the government had to give in. The workers then asked for a strike, and instead of getting one, they were brought to the work. The result was a revolution. The workers refused to obey the new laws, and the government had to give in. The workers then asked for a strike, andinstead of getting one, they were brought to the work. The result was a revolution. The workers refused to obey the new laws, and the government had to give in. The workers then asked for a strike, and instead of getting one, they were brought to the work. The result was a revolution. The workers refused to obey the new laws, and the government had to give in. The workers then asked for a strike, and instead of getting one, they were brought to the work. The result was a revolution. The workers refused to obey the new laws, and the government had to give in. The workers then asked for a strike, andinstead of getting one, they were brought to the work. The result was a revolution. The workers refused to obey the new laws, and the government had to give in. The workers then asked for a strike, and instead of getting one, they were brought to the work. The result was a revolution. The workers refused to obey the new laws, and the government had to give in. The workers then asked for a strike, andinstead of getting one, they were brought to the work. The result was a revolution. The workers refused to obey the new laws, and the government had to give in. The workers then asked for a strike, and instead of getting one, they were brought to the work. The result was a revolution. The workers refused to obey the new laws, and the government had to give in. The workers then asked for a strike, and instead of getting one, they were brought to the work. The result was a revolution. The workers refused to obey the new laws, and the government had to give in. The workers then asked for a strike, and instead of getting one, they were brought to the work. The result was a revolution. The workers refused to obey the new laws, and the government had to give in. The workers then asked for a strike, andinstead of getting one, they were brought to the work. The result was a revolution. The workers refused to obey the new laws, and the government had to give in. The workers then asked for a strike, and instead of getting one, they were brought to the work. The result was a revolution. The workers refused to obey the new laws, and the government had to give in. The workers then asked for a strike, and instead of getting one, they were brought to the work. The result was a revolution. The workers refused to obey the new laws, and the government had to give in. The workers then asked for a strike, andinstead of getting one, they were brought to the work. The result was a revolution. The workers refused to obey the new laws, and the government had to give in. The workers then asked for a strike, and instead of getting one, they were brought to the work. The result was a revolution. The workers refused to obey the new laws, and the government had to give in. The workers then asked for a strike, andinstead of getting one, they were brought to the work. The result was a revolution. The workers refused to obey the new laws, and the government had to give in. The workers then asked for a strike, and instead of getting one, they were brought to the work. The result was a revolution. The workers refused to obey the new laws, and the government had to give in. The workers then asked for a strike, and instead of getting one, they were brought to the work. The result was a revolution. The workers refused to obey the new laws, and the government had to give in. The workers then asked for a strike, andinstead of getting one, they were brought to the work. The result was a revolution. The workers refused to obey the new laws, and the government had to give in. The workers then asked for a strike, and instead of getting one, they were brought to the work. The result was a revolution. The workers refused to obe
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A Reply to Herbert Spencer.

By PETER KROPOTKIN.

Herbert Spencer has just brought out the third and last volume of his "Principles of Sociology," and one of the clashing chapters devoted to "Industrial Institutions," he evidently had to torn up upon co-operation. In this last volume, which is already practically, for hundreds of years, since, millions of ordinary men. More than that. Just because these millions have known the institution of "co-operative piece-work," and from this experience, they continually abandon it in the principle of "reward proportionate to merit" within their own co-operative institutions, probably because it is not accompanied by the experience of the impossibility of carrying this principle through, and that failure from being justice, as Spencer believes, it is a crying injustice.

A few instances, concerning the modes of carrying on productive co-operative enterprise, which propose to be thought important enough to communicate in advance to the worker co-operative, Mr. D. J. Holowsky. It was published in the October issue of Labor Co-Partnership.

Coming as it does from the evolutionist philosopher, and representing what Herbert Spencer arrived at after so many years' work in Sociology, it deserves our full attention. It shows where a philosopher—well-meaning, but having spent his life amid bunk and books—can think, and in the religion of Wagedom of "reward proportional to merit"—would come to, if his last word of wisdom is.

Fully recognizing the importance of labor co-partnership in a highly organized business, and that the condition of the worker and the employers in industrial co-partnerships have a prejudice against piece-work, and this prejudice is justified, it is to him that the idea of the co-operative enterprise is a private employer (which he is)

But in a co-partnership, where each worker receives a share in the profits, proportionately to his wages, it is the work of piece-work, the worker being doubly interested in producing more, the productive power of the concern would be greatly increased, and the control and the present time, he would be diminished. "Jesuoles among the workers would disappear.

A competent thinking remuneration too as compared with that of B, since each is now paid just as he works. Renting against the former, who ranks some above others no longer finds any place. Overlooking to check idleness because superfluous, the perjury disappears, and another cause of demoralization is.

And then Spencer... gives a full column to show the advantages of that sort of work, the transition from the compulsory co-operation of military service to the voluntary co-operation of industrialism is completed.

... the day-wage worker is more coerced, but under the arrangement described his activity becomes voluntary, and his wages he... "the transition from status coercive (capitalist) to contract reaches its limits; coercion is vanishing, and it comes, as the work unqualifiedly...

The whole organization is based on contract. Reward is proportionate to merit, both adjusting themselves. The best motive is the best discipline, the business is not only in the hands of the capitalist, but in his hands is not that (of course) that the highest type of industrial "artesians" "are only possible without ensuring that they will be... a few examples of the work—labor and skill which are attached to the goal of the business-class ambition." So far Mr. Spencer.

Now, it is always refreshing in our times, when the... mortal enemies of German Socialism have such an ascendency, to meet with a philosopher who seeks for a more perfect material in agreement, in... transaction is a free and... which is dealt in by us when we are sold—compelled to recognize under the penalty of extracting—that the idea of social organism

with such co-operations. Nay, the railway-porters, the privileged dock-laborers who have permanent em-employment, the man who load and unload the goods on the exchanges a highly privileged class, the carriers, the messenger in towns, and so on, are all organized in such a way.

In St. Petersburg you call an "eldest" of the Town Messenger's Artel, you give him a packet containing 1,000 rubles, demand to call him to Mr. So and So—and usually no receipt is taken; the messenger has just to sign his name to an artel, and of course the private banks the keys and seals of the cash-boxes are in the hands of a special artel. And so on.

If Spencer knew man, we could take his words relating to the "higher type of industrialism," he is "possible only with the best men" as highly complimentary to the Russian nation. But the fact is that (especially, the Great Russian) worker and peasant are imbued with the artel principle into every nook of their lives—not because they are the best men. "They do so simply because the village-communities have not yet been wrecked by the State, and they carry on into industrial life the spirit of the institution which makes the essence of the agricultural life of the nation.

Why then, in the working part of the Russian nation, taken as a whole, will suffer more than the working parts of the West European nations? To this we shall answer in our next number. But now we must proceed to the point of Spencer's words.—"Simply because the distribution of earnings, amongst workers who produce for themselves and not for the capitalist, is the least difficulty in the Social Question. When wages go up in France, the workers find out and work out, thousands of new forms of sharing the earnings, more equitable than perhaps our time wages.

Like most middle-class writers who know little of the workers, Herbert Spencer, spite of all, the force of his genius, was dragged into it—"to be the voice of the present workers in the good old days by the throat when they come to distribute the fruits of their labor? What is to be done to prevent idleness among the workers?" The question is not a new one: just as the articulation lies elsewhere—namely, in "How can the workers be enabled to produce for themselves?" When they will have that, they will find much better means of a distribution of their productive sharing of the fruits of their labor than those which any man of genius could find out for them in advance.

It was mentioned in the preceding article how widely distributed in Russia are these forms of co-operation and sharing of earnings, as, in Herbert Spencer's opinion, would imply a higher development of human nature, and be largely need be included in the Social Question, similar artesians are of every day occurrence in all branches of popular life. As soon as five, six, ten or twenty peasants come to St. Petersburg, or Moscow, or Odessa, they work in a fan, and go to their lodgings in company, take their meals in common, and—if their trade allows—it they try to get work for the articles of the common house, convinces on their way to Siberia, and in hard labor, live in an artel.

Whose elected "elder" is the officially recognized representative of the co-operative artel in its relations with the authorities, food of the artel, controls with the authorities, work, and so on.

That racial characteristics would be of no value to explain these facts that Spencer will see at once, and he need not once, and he need not again try to explain those facts. In contrary, the importance of the communal institutions which exist in Russia for the maintenance of that type of life is such that this peasants have been permitted to constitute their own "aristocracies"—not only do they largely use that right for a variety of purposes, but facts are known of their treating the leading officials of the common property (for granting and the like). To use the words of a recent official report, facts multiply their trade, and they have no place in common to distribute their money, and it would be collectively.

Why then—then it was asked at the end of the last ar- ticle—to the Russian peasants, workers, artisans and farmers in such terrible poverty although they are so willing to associate, and associate in such an excellent way?

I might mention the ruin of the masses by taxation. But even a big subject neglected by modern economists, would require the attention of the people, they will find the name of an eminent German work on the subject. When Russian peasants are named in the article "Russia" in Encyclopaedia Britannica.

(The Important has just been brought into prominence in the twenty-second annual report of the U.S. Labor Board.
ment. There is, however, another still more important reason why it is not enough to be imbued with the co-operative spirit. It must be brought into daily practice by making out good forms of co-operation. Men must know what to associate, besides their hands and brains.

Secondly, like all middle-class theorists, the chief difficulty for the Socialist is to explain away the (presumed) incapacity of the worker to understand his own interests. He is sure (that is a matter of a separate controversy) that his interests and those of the workers of such a factory, or mine, or railway become owners of that factory, mine, railway, they would quarrel, there would come a period in which his incapacity to agree to the scheme or proposal, necessarily, he shall let his eyes to the facts of real modern life which would bring him to conclusions different from those just mentioned.

But the reality of modern life is this: As soon as the workers or the peasants, of any nationality, are brought by any circumstances to the common ownership of anything, and as soon as the State ceases to interfere by creating artificial differences of wealth and poverty among them, they admirably find out in a relatively short time methods of living that common property in the general interest.

Let me mention one or two examples out of thousands. There was in the Ural a royal iron works, Votkinsk, that the Government had conceived the idea of converting into a co-operative. They accordingly proceeded to take it, as an act of State, and gave to the act some of those contracts which are given to co-operation. The management began a few years ago to give some of the contracts to co-operatives on the conditions that the industries would be undertaken and by thousands of wicked tricks of the other dealers. And this is why the English co-opera-
tives, who are known, of course, by co-operative production when they had to find buyers for their goods in the consumer market, succeed now that they have their own market—more honest than the usual commercial market—in their own practical co-operation.

But this is only a small part of the difficulty. The other, much greater part is—what to associate. At the present time land, capital, knowledge, State and Municipal encroachments, even education (how many children work in factories, mines, as newspaper sellers, and so on)?—all these are constituted monopolies in the hands of the rich. And, so long as these monopolies exist, all efforts of the co-operatives are bound to remain eternally limited in scope. More than that. All attempts are bound to remain eternally bound with a narrow egoistic idealistic conception of its own co-operation in which it is impossible to bring to the public, not to the workers themselves, but to the aristocracy also, that the end of co-operation is the development of the co-operative spirit which is common to the co-operative work. This is true, as well in their own practical co-operation, as, of course, under the present conditions, co-operation is itself imbued with that same spirit of capitalist morality which it pretends to combat.

This is only normal and natural. This is so eternally that it is always all the time away with, or is only limited in its application, the co-operative spirit grows in proportion. It is that spirit, if that capacity for sharing the earnings is so immensely developed in Russia, or in some French villages, it is only because those Russian or French peasants are—so to say—extreamly freed from one of those monopolies, land monopoly. The great landlord in common, and this alone is sufficient to develop among them the co-operative spirit which Spencer longs for and is ready to consider as the first step to be reached in times to come by the human race. Take one of the monopolies away and the co-operative spirit develops much more than in a half a century of practice in individually egoistic "Co-operative Societies".

This is why Spencer would do infinitely more for human progress if, instead of directing his attention to the invention of some new "co-operative work" for "idle people" in "sharing in the profits, he would inquire into the substance of those institutions which breed jealousies, and of those which diminish them. While he does not possess and formulate two opposite currents of ideas and habits which exclude each other.

As to the still more limited panacea of piece work, which he so warmly advocates and exaggerates in its consequences, it hardly need be criticised here, as the practical commonness of several correspondents to "Labor Co-partnership" has sufficiently shown the stupid character of that panacea. One of the correspondents puts it especially clearly in its proper light, in this way. A thousand clothing, the buyers are holders of 3½ shares; and they start a cloth factory. But, with the present cost of machinery, a capital of £1000 is nothing, a titre of stock is enough, enough to give work even to a hundred clothiers. Let us say, nevertheless, that they start a factory for a hundred men. They introduce, on Spencer's advice, piece-work; and by the exercise of much cleverness, seller in work men soon on, the production is increased so much that each of the hundred workers has to be paid £2 or £3 more. What will be the result? As a result of this so called "Simple" system, Spencer will say: "Myself, I hardly reach 26s. in the factory which I work in. Why should I—employer of these hundred men—be paid less than they are? They must not have more money out of their trade. If fine reasoning will induce the capitalistic—reasoning shareholder to pay his worker more than he earns himself. And the ultimate results of that discussion is that capitalism and capitalism, falls to the ground.

We admire Spencer when he comes forward to claim the land of the country for all those who live and work on it. We admire him when he comes forward to claim the power of higher principles in politics. We admire him, also, when he appears as the champion of the Individual against the general theory, at least, though not in many of his practical reasonings. But he must leave the workers to find out for themselves how to come to an equitable distribution of what they have produced, how to provide for the real needs of their production. Their systems will be more equitable and more practical than whatever may be invented in his study by the evolutionist philosopher.

That, at any rate, he perfectly well knows himself: Great changes of society are not produced by small tricks. Great changes of society are not produced by sententious words which are quoted as "Dutch auctions" and "piece-work wages", which are bor-
rowed from the old mood of thought itself.

Herbert Spencer knows the value of principles. Need he be reminded of them?—Freedom, London.  

An Ethical Basis.

We think that our friend Mr. Underwood in his "The Ethical Basis of Socialism," which appeared in the "Teach" January 25, expressed the sentiments of every true Socialist on the Pacific question. Yes, not limited to an ethical basis, and because we have had no definite standard we have been the butt of ridicule of societies that have.

Take for example the question mentioned in the editorial of the Free Thoughts Magazine for this month, e, the subject of the name of the man as Mr. Green, that free love is one of the most deadly and seductive enemies of the human family. Why does the question of "Bear love" interest our society for those who are so radically opposed to each other as free lovers and those of our opinion, to try to work together? We think not, for free lovers belong to one organisation and those of us who otherwise would gladly put their shoulder to the wheel and be a great power in working for humanity, will hold themselves aloof and finally our society is nothing but a free love affair. But on the other hand if we adopt a moral code and have some definite guide and the men who have their own society, there will be no misunderstanding and all of us, of course, we will fully understand his duties and privileges. Our society has suffered very much from this very cause not only account of what to be the most ruinous doctrines yet devised, free love, but also from other so-called reformists.—Torch of Reason.

It surely is time that the Socialists began to look for an ethical basis for their movement and get down on their bellies and crawling to the ethics of the priesthood they claim to despise, and call "unworthy." They have, for a long time, been calling for "free thought, free speech and free press," and now that there seems to be a slight tendency to think and speak, they get very scared and yells for an ethical basis; one that will prevent free speech, and oppose free action. In other words they don't want freedom; have no conception of what freedom is, and are only out to frighten a doctrine. "Even the orthodox churches have well-nigh given up. And yet such men come before the Liberals as teachers, editors and leaders. Should the people put their trust in them? It would be a great loss to the leaders of the blind." So far as "best people" are concerned some individual must differ with Mr. Hooper as to what "best people" are. Our plate contemporaries call the wealthiest one the "best people." Ask Mr. Hooper? After all it matters but little what he refers to as "best people," for, after all it is only his opinions who is "best." It already shows this, however, that Mr. Hooper is in common with a good round number of others who are known as "Liberal," and "Free-thought" editors, leaders and teachers, is not in favor of free speech and free action. Bah! what hope is there for the growth of any movement, thought, speech or action if such men are to be recognised as leaders. True freedom of thought ad-
mite of free speech, and leaders, not co-workers and fellow investigators.

Government Illogical.

A RECOGNITION of a necessity for government, implies also the necessity of determining the rights of the governed and the governing classes. This is not a matter which the many, we call it tyranny, if the many govern the few, it is tyranny also, but in a less intense form. It implies that the governing class has more right than the governed, which may, and is disputed by many of the minority governed. This required demand, (and it is a reasonable de-
mand,) that an invariable scale be furnished which may be measured. They demand to know just how much less the rights of the governed are than the governed classes. The laws of the government which the governing class to show just how much more rights they have than the governed and why.

Until they do, as one of the minority governed, shall persist in depriving their rights to govern all. It is argued that the greater number know more in the aggregate than the few, and that there is not other way of determining right, to which I reply that I the minority of reformers who have suffered martyr-
dom in the past bears loud testimony in argument that the minority is more right than the right than the majority. How was the majority of the corporations on Servetus, Galilee, Columbus, and a host of others I might mention. The fact is, the greatest and best thinkers are never represented in government and have no voice in making laws by which they are governed. What voice has Mr. Wm. Lloyd Garrison? What voice have Henry George, Judge Mc. Guire, Tom L. Johnson, and other Single Taxers but to form opinions that may prevail after they have suffered martyrdom at the hands of the majority.

What voice have the advocates of peace—the oppo-
ers of war in a government that tax their to pay pensions to soldiers by which the brutality of war is not only not abated, but is increased. Is there a government that taxes him to support churches and chaplain?
What voice has the free trader in a government that people are willing to be punished for opinions and persons? The Declaration of Independence says: "Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. When a government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute a new government." What voice has the people that the government will not be, nor do I know of any one who does: however inconsistent he may be wanting to govern others. All governments are composed of bad men. The best government is a sham, and the "liberal professions" only fit to squeeze the bloody dollar. —A. KLEINER.

Clippings and Comments.

In all ages men have differed. Those who saw the evils which existed in society, and attempted to apply remedies, were often persecuted by the upholders of the existing system. A new government will have conquered in the end, but it has often been bathed in blood before final victory was gained —Longshoreman.

CONGRESSMAN LEOHART R. GEROLD (Republican) of New York, an experienced newspaper man, says of the Loud Bill: "If enacted into law it would not disburse with a single post-master, clerk, railway postal clerk or a single mile of rail service. All of these would remain and continue to increase whether or not the class of matter in question was kept out of the mails."— Printers Ink.

The State cannot make the rich unsatisfied, but it can make them richer and more able to live the way they do with what it takes from the poor. The representatives of the rich may be more compassionate than the representatives of the poor, but when the rich are the people, the House of Representatives is a capitol bureau from which the rich obtain the aid of the people. Another way of saying it is, "The better you are off, the richer you are." The latter furnishes the means of operating a machine which the rich use to destroy them.—Coming Nation.

The above is correct, but the editor of the Coming Nation is an upholder of the State.

A true government would be one that profited by the habits of the past, and then, by the new opportunities for the free play of the higher activities of man today, and erected no barriers to courage tomorrow. Such a government, however, has never existed. Government is organized to fight, fire, flood, famine, and disaster; princes and paupers, and can't, and corruption, and can't, and the keys are covered with rust and the plug is oiled and hungry, "saints" and slaves, robbers and r第十个se.—Coming Nation.

The "true government" above described would be no government at all. Why not honest, Ed- wards, and declare against all governments?

T. Lincoln, Neb., "Independent" (Pop.), with wonderful introspection, says: "Some men are so ignorant that they give themselves away at almost every opportunity." And forthwith proceeds to furnish an illustration of its own maxim with the following dialogue: "O, the pangs they are suffering, the burdens they bear, the toil and the strain. And yet there’ll be no stopping, nor any rep for the children of toil. We will make the dry bones rattle, will win the heart of every beast of burden, For we surely won the battle and will surely eat the PIE. We always have the support of the enemy, in the case the Pop politicians are altered, is a transfer of the "rubbish" from the old to a new set of political hacks. —The People.

But of course De Leon and his gang wouldn’t eat any of the "pie"—until they win an election. "Vested with authority all men are alike," says Proudhon.

That system of political economy which makes wealth and not man the ultimate is based on a monstrous fallacy —on a fallacy so slavish and so detestable that the wonder is how accomplished and per- sonally amiable men can be found as its abettors. The fallacy is in taking the rents of the landlord and the profits of the capitalist as the measures of good and evil, instead of taking the condition of the cultivators and of the laborers (the many) as the sure index of the character of a system. Whatever tends to improve wealth, to make him physically, intellectually, or morally a lower being, is bad, however much or however little the wealth produced may be. The wealth is not the stable 128. a. a. a. and the stability of the capital is an important, adjacent, man is the stable element. His con- dition is the standard. His improvement is good. Guiraud in the "search for truth" holds that even secondary, dependent, subsidiary, to the great inten- tion. Man is not as useful as he sustains, ameliorates his condition, invests his capacities, gives opportunities
for his further cultivation and aids his progress in the great scheme of human regeneration.—[A Physician.]

The Armony Board to-day decided that the new Site will be that where the Armony shall be built at Lexington Ave. and 254 St., the present site of the College of the City of New York. It will take up the ground in front of Lexington Ave. between 251 and 254 Sts., including the two houses owned by Mrs. Abram Hewitt, on the 251 St., and the business men of the locality have made several protests against the siting of the College by the Armony board, and they appeared in the Mayor's office in force to-day and read the objections to the siting.

The board, after listening to all the objections, voted unanimously to adopt the report of the Committee on Site. A former report recommending that the armony be built on 251 Ave. between 6th and 7th St. was rejected.

Charles F. Wingate, of the Social Reform Club, entered a strong protest against the adoption of the Col不对 for not turning into an armony. Again, on behalf of several labor organizations, I wish to see this college building under the management of a Board of Trustees, who will permit workingmen to use it for a meeting place. The work is indispensable to the city of New York and want a meeting place that will be away from the influence of saloons and barrooms.—N. Y. Daily News.

This shows the steady growth of militarism, and preparation of the governing class to meet the outbursts and bread riots which are unavoidable if "hard times" continue. Property and privilege must be upheld anywhere at any cost of life. What is the life of the worker worth, anyhow, in the eyes of military commanders and politicians? But to change all this will be quite easy when workmen are strong enough to refuse to be use an army. What can the military commanders and politicians? And the vicious political schemers do if the workers would not obey and uphold them? Nothing. Let unionists and non-unionists alike refuse to work on the construction of armories and who will build them? Comrades, the workers are all-powerful if they will but act wisely.

H. A.

Correspondence.

TO THE EDITOR:

A TOLEIAN SOCIALIST.

Through the influence of my friend, sister Alice McMillian, of Circleville, Ohio, I send you fifty cents for your paper, The Firebrand, to be distributed among the workers and Anarchists. Will you read my literary anyw and cooperate with me in every way possible to bring about a change. With best wishes I am for right if I can only know what to do. G. B. HARRIS.

Bruceton, Texas.

Work in their own way.

Your marked copy of The Firebrand was duly noted and must have arrived on the last but first week has neglected to reply. However, I will say that all thoughts of benefit from elections have been beaten out of me for a long time. A government made of no earthly use, and as Thomas Paine says is the origin of all evils.

As to the book The Old and the New ideal I would like that as well as several other works on the subject. If you can get me a copy or a pamphlet on the subject that is published, I would gladly aid in the labor of the office for the good of the cause. But as that is out of the question, we are the best of men in thinking of a large monthly paper and to have a small press and some type and we have practiced on setting up our articles of agreement, cards, etc. Of course we do not expect anything, financially, from you but we will try and add our small common good.

I have started a book on The Firebrand, but as the book has been more and more neglected by me, I give it up, not wishing to intrude on your limited space.

We as boys are doing as the common run, have plenty to do fixing our houses etc., and are conscious with the old men. We shall gradually pay our improvements and show people in time that we can better our conditions by labor, without money.

J. J. McINERTY.

Propaganda Fund.

C. S. Philadelphia, 4th St.

Sawyer, Lee, Parsons, Groves

Bohemian Group in Newark, e.g. 41, 55

Lehman, Revans, Taunton

States, Birkett, S. W. Smith, Young

Worlds, Rev. Mr. Purcell, Rev. J. A. Johnson, etc.

McIlwain, Read, 38, 361, etc.

Leeman, 43, Bates, Revans, Rev. Mr. Purcell, etc.

Curtis, Kemp, Horrow, etc., 151, 123, 124, Taunton, etc.

The Letter-Box.

J. A. Novak, N. J.—We sent Vol. 2, No. 1, Vol. 1, is ready.

J. A. Waterson, Conn.—Two classes of "The Old and New" have been sent, but the "Bomba" we ordered from Whitlock and Anderson will arrive in a few days. The address of T. is changed to New York.

J. A. Chittick, N. Y.—The book has been sent. Letters like yours are so numerous that it is almost impossible to answer all. It is our very best, according to the propa
ganda guide.

New York City—Somebody subscribes for The Firebrand, but we are not even comprehended as the subject of the message. It seems to be the same sort of "thinks." The party will write again and so that we can reach.

Rev. W. H. Paterson, N. J.—Thank you for your encouraging letter. We are of the same opinion: If this pamphlet gets into the English language it is neglected the effects of the foreign speaking people will have very little effect.

To pretend that a "prudent" marriage generates love, is the same as to sow papaw seed and wish them to produce melons—Monteagle.

A small boy asks his Father's pertinent Questions.

Papa, what is place that?

That a brickyard, my son. Whose brickyard is it, papa?

It belongs to me, my son.

Do all these pikes of bricks belong to you?

Yes my son, every brick of them. My how! Long does it take you to make them?—did you make them by yourself?

No my son; those you see working there made them for me.

Do those men belong to you, papa?

No my son; these are free men. No man can own another. If he could the other would be a slave.

What is a slave, papa?

A slave is a man who has to work for another all his life for only his board and clothes. If a slave gets sick who pays for the doctor?

Well, his owner does. He can't afford to lose his property.

Why do these men work so hard, papa?—do they like it?

Well, no, I don't suppose they do; but they must work or starve.

Are these men rich, papa?

Not to any great extent, my son. Do they own the land?

I rather guess, no, my son, Have you any horses and nice clothes and do they go the rounds when it's warm, like we do?

Well, hardly. It takes them all their time to earn their living. What is living, papa?

Why, a living—well, for them a living is what they eat and wear.

Isn't that board and clothes, papa?

I suppose it is.

Well, are they any better off than slaves?

Of course they are, you foolish boy. Why, they are free; they don't need to work for me if they don't like; they can hire out when they choose. And if they leave, won't they have to work? Yes, of course; they will have to work for someone else.

And will they get any more than a living from him?

No, I suppose not.

Well, then how are they any better off than slaves?

Why, they have votes; they are free men. If they get sick do they pay the doctor, papa?

Catch me! What have I to do with that? They must pay for their own doctor.

Can you afford to lose one of the men who work for you, papa?

Of course I can; it don't make any difference to me.

I will hire another whenever I like.

Then you aren't so particular about them as if they were your slaves, are you, papa?

No, I suppose not.

Then how is it better for them to be free?

Oh, don't ask foolish questions, papa.

What are bricks made of, papa?

Clay, my son.

Do your bricks belong to the man who makes them?

No, my son, they belong to me. Why, when they make them, papa?

Because the clay is mine. Did you make it, papa?

No, God made it, my son. Did he make it for you, papa? No, I bought it. Brought it from God? No, from a man. Did this man get it from God?

No, of course not; he bought it from another man, I suppose.

Did the first man it was bought from buy it from God?

No, I suppose not.

How did he get it, then? How was it his any more than anybody else's?

Oh, I don't know. I suppose he just claimed it. Then, if those men should claim it now, would it be theirs?

Oh, don't bother asking such foolish questions, papa. If you didn't own the brickyards and the clay, is steady work a good thing, papa?

Oh, I don't know; I suppose I would have to work. Would you make bricks, papa?

Maybe I would. Would you like to make bricks for your board and clothes, and let the man who made the brickyard have everything else?

Nobody'd care how I liked it. Poor people must work for their living. If these men had brickyards of their own, would they work for you, papa?

No, pretty; they'd work for themselves probably. Isn't it lucky that that man claimed this land first and that you bought it?

Yes, if he hadn't, maybe somebody else would have claimed it, and then maybe one of those men would own the land, and then you'd have to work for your board and clothes.

Maybe you ought to be thankful to Providence for his chance to you in giving you a father who can support you without working.

Should these men's little boys be thankful to Providence too, papa?

Well, I suppose they should.

What for, papa?

Because their pan have steady work.

Is steady work a good thing, papa?

Of course it is, my son. Then, why don't you work, papa? Nobody could keep you making bricks, could you, papa?

No, I don't want to keep men out of a job. If I worked, there wouldn't be work for another man.

That's kind of you, papa. Do you think, if you were to have that man's bareance, while he rested, that he would be mud at it?

Oh, peah! Gentlemen don't wheel barns. What's gentlemen, papa?

What's gentlemen—men who don't need to work—the upper class.

I thought there wasn't any upper class in this country. I heard a man say all men were equal.

The man who said it was a Socialist or Anarchist, or something; or maybe it was at election time, and he was trying to catch votes. Say, my pan-school teacher says we are all God's children. Is she a Socialist, or Anarchist, or is she just trying to catch votes.

Oh, no; that's the right thing to say in Sunday-schools and churches.

Well, pan—honest now—are these God's children just as much as we are.

Why, yes; my son; to be sure they are.

Say, my son, do you remember when you bought that clock for brother Jim and me, and I grabbed them and all made Jim give me his top before I'd let him play with them, and you called me a greedy little child that can't pay for their own clock.

Yes, my son, remember.

Well, do you think you did right?

Certainly, my son; a parent does right to correct his children and keep them from acquiring bad principles. I bought the marbles for both Jim and me. Both had as much right to them as you.

Well, papa, if these men are God's children as much as
you, then you and they are brothers; and if you make them give you all the bricks they make for allowing them to use the clay which God made, isn't that the same thing as giving them what gives them their bread to play with the marbles? Oh, bother! Don't ask such stupid questions. Say, pa, do you think God thinks you are a greedy little hog, and that he will punish you for grabbing that clay? Oh, don't talk so much. Say, Mary, put this child to bed—he makes me tired!—Finland Priest.

Sample Copies.

To all who receive The Firebrand without having ordered it we would like to say that the copies you have been receiving have been sent by a friend, and we will continue to send it to you for a reasonable length of time. Our subscription is voluntary, i. e., all who read it can send in as much or as little toward the support of the paper as their means and conscience will permit. If you wish to read The Firebrand, you should subscribe, if you are not already a subscriber, and let us know, and you will receive the paper just the same. After reading a paper a person has a claim on it as long as the time it was printed and if we do not hear from them we will discontinue sending it. We want every one to have the paper who desires to read it, but we cannot call whether you want it or not if you do not let us know.

ADVERTISEMENTS.

** ** HELPING THE FIREBRAND ** **

W. Whitlock has kindly donated to us ten copies in paper of his splendid book "Bombe'" and 50 cents in cloth. Anybody needing them of course fifty cents will receive a copy in paper, or for seventy-five cents a copy in cloth. It is a very appropriate present for friends to love and read. It will also be a great help to The Firebrand.

FLOWERS & SHRUBS.

Anyone who will send a donation of ten cents to The Firebrand, or a 50 cent subscription and a two cent stamp to pay postage, will send three nice plants. Among them are rose bushes, bulb, house plants, and hardy outdoor plants. This is a splendid opportunity to get some nice flowering plants and help The Firebrand at the same time.

Order of Samuel Spofford, 742 Glenn St., Portland, Oregon.

The Firebrand will be sent all over the United States.

NEW OCCASIONS.

A Magazine of Social Progress.

EDITED BY FREDERICK UPPHAN ADAMS.

Somewhere in the United States, somewhere among the Republics of the World, thousands of thinkers are laboring to bring about the Social Good. The ideas of the thinkers are the material of this magazine. The Firebrand.

Subscription.

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION $1.00.

WANTED.

Sold by all Progressive Newsagents.


Mrs. Walbrook's Book.

My Century Plant.

$1.00.

(My century plant has grown from a root bulb.

The century plant is a succulent plant, and if fed sufficiently, it will produce edible leaves.

The century plant can be used for food, as it is rich in vitamins and minerals.

The century plant is a hardy plant and can grow in most climates, making it a suitable choice for those with limited space.
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