



By the Wayside.

"Politics never did anything for organized labor," says the *Mine Workers' Journal*. "Politics put the eight-hour law on the statute books only to have the judiciary decide it unconstitutional. But you have it, nevertheless, because of your union. . . . Politics may pass a law, but without your organization it is not worth the paper on which it is written."

* * *

The police in Germany who constantly annoy and worry the Anarchists by arrests and banishments, are now aided in their endeavor by some prominent members of Social Democracy, and it gives the Anarchists a foretaste of the freedom they would enjoy under a regime of "scientific" Socialism. Comrade Grimm, organizer of the porcelain workers, found that his fellow workers in the different cities had been notified of this coming by a Socialist editor, who found it necessary to tell them that they should be on their guard and keep an eye on him because he antagonizes the party.

* * *

Anent the recent general strike and the present precautions taken against the unrest of labor by the Italian government, the correspondent of the *Brooklyn Daily Eagle*, points out that the firm and determined attitude of the trades-unions has for several years been a constant menace to the stability of the conservative government, while political action of the Socialists has proven to be rather a safety-valve in the order of things. Of course, he attributes the radicalism of labor organizations to the vigorous agitation of the Socialists, but the fact that the government has been forced thru strikes and riots to retire officials who attempted to imitate a Peabody's methods should furnish food for thought to both the Socialist parties and the trades-unions in this country.

* * *

Some well-meaning but short-sighted trades-unionists are now advocating the concentration of trades, alleging that the weakness of organized labor is due to the autonomy of the various unions. These people are evidently good men, but poor musicians, as the German saying goes. They still labor under the delusion that there is strength in organized numbers, which is a disastrous delusion indeed, for it is not the "concentration of forces that makes a movement invincible, but the aim and spirit by which it is actuated. Let the toilers become conscious of their slavery and degradation, and learn that the only remedy for their misery lies in the complete annihilation of wage-slavery and the institution of property, in the abolition of the ownership of the means of production and distribution as well as of natural resources; let them learn that, and they will then quickly perceive that "an injury to one is the concern of all," and march in a solid phalanx against the encroachments of capitalism and government.

* * *

Hulda B. Loud, editor of the *Rockland (Mass.) Independent*, seems to be afflicted with the well-known disease of old maidens called *gossip*. In criticizing the Socialists, she finds it necessary to tell her readers that "Socialism

of the present day in this country is embraced by men of reckless, dissolute habits, with no respect for law or social custom, unhealthy in body and mind. . . . Government as it is is bad enough, but Socialism would be simply government-madness, like the French Revolution and the Paris Commune." Now, this statement reflects altogether too much honor on the Socialist leaders, and I feel impelled to take issue with her. If it were true that the Socialists have "no respect for law or social custom" they would be the harbingers of a new era—an era of freedom and solidarity; for, "good men do not respect laws too much," as Emerson said. In a word, those who have no respect for laws or social custom have always been the precursors of social advance in society. A continued reverence for established institutions signifies stagnation and decay. As regards the "madness" of the Paris Commune, Hulda could learn from any unbiased history that there was never less distress or greater security in Paris than there was during the brief life of the Commune. Even the professional prostitutes found the city too quiet and migrated to Versailles, where among the upholders of "law and order" they found a more profitable soil. True, during the turmoil a few traitors were killed by the Communards, but these "crimes" dwindle into insignificance by the wanton slaughter of over thirty thousand men, women, and children by those who "respect law and social custom."

* * *

"If there were in Russia a government for, or by the people it would be generally recognized that the proper vehicle for the homeward transportation of Alexieff would be, not a triumphal car, but a coffin," the *New York Times* suggests. It further brands him for bringing about the Russian-Japanese war, as "a huge malefactor, an enemy of the human race . . . who deserves the gallows." True, indeed, but the indignation of the editor would immediately sink to zero if he had been able to detect the beam in his own eye, instead of beholding the mote in the eye of his brother. What about the "concentration camps" in South Africa, where women and children died like flies; what about the wanton burning of farms in order to conquer the Boers and their rich mines for the benefit of a few exceedingly pious and "god-fearing" parasites of the nation? What about "benevolent assimilation" of the Filipinos, where men, women, and children have been slaughtered by the soldiers of an alleged "free republic" for the benefit of a few money-lords and for national aggrandizement? What about the slaughter and mutilation of human beings at the railroads, in the mines and factories, simply because human labor is cheap and plentiful? And last, but not least, what about the appalling death rate among the children of the poor and those who toil, caused by want and misery, while our "captains of industry" complain of over-production and by force of arms, the Bible and whiskey, seek forcefully to sell their plunder to so-called barbarians and "uncivilized" people? And all this occurs before our eyes, and is looked upon as a latter of course, simply because people hug the delusion that they are a part of that deity called government, and that without it all their

"evil" propensities would creep out and turn this world topsy-turvy, just as they once believed that it was God who kept things going in this world. But people are beginning to realize that the belief in a god has tainted the pages of history with blood and wanton crimes, and that the world is getting better in spite of the "Almighty," and from this recognition it is but one step to the realization of the fact that God's substitute—government for, of, and by the people—is an equally pernicious delusion, invented to keep the slaves in subjection, and that the real malefactors in society are those who rule and plunder the toilers by deceit, by the institution of property, and the police club. In short, if the real enemies of the human race; i. e., the upholders of the present order, deserve a gallows, "if rewards were proportional to deservings," as the editor suggests, the coffin would at once find a ready and large market.

* * *

"The Labor Problem" is the title of a book published by the so-called Citizens' Alliance, the perusal of which would not be amiss to those inclined to think that organized labor is the only instigator of violence. The author is Herbert V. Ready, of San Francisco, a notorious strike-breaker and captain of thugs. "It is the dirtiest, most contemptible piece of work that an agent provocateur could set into the world," says the *Brewers' Journal*. The book is accompanied by a pamphlet on the front page of which are made known the aims and objects of the scab-recruiting office, a program which must have a soothing effect upon the peace-loving and law-abiding citizens. Here are a few extracts:

"Probably you are not aware that the strikes this spring were only the preliminary skirmishes of the opposing forces, the heavy engagements are yet to come. Probably before election, absolutely after. If it were diplomatic on our part, which it is not, to acquaint the public with the future labor troubles you would be appalled. We never show our hand. We will be as well prepared to fight their strikes in the future as we have in the past.

"Listen to the following questions we put to some we engage:

"Young man, if we engage you as a watchman or special police, and we put two guns in your hip pocket, two in your hand, and fill every chamber with lead, will you allow the mob to destroy the company's property until every chamber is empty? If he quivers an eyelash we do not hire him. To be prepared is sure success, which we attain every time."

"We trust you will carefully read the enclosed book, and continue to do in future as you have in the past. Send us your orders for help. You can always depend on us in times of labor, Peace or War!"

This shows that there is war in the air and the employers will not shrink from brutality and violence in their endeavor to annihilate trades-unionism. And in their utter blindness and stupid arrogance they fail to see that such measures will serve as an excellent eye-opener for the toilers and provoke a revolt which is bound to recoil upon themselves.

INTERLOPER.

FREE SOCIETY

Formerly *The Firebrand*.
Issued Weekly by FREE SOCIETY PUBL. ASSOCIATION.
A. ISAAK.....Editor.

ONE DOLLAR A YEAR.

Address all Communications and make all Money Orders payable to FREE SOCIETY, 230 East Fourth Street, New York, N. Y.

Entered as second-class matter March 3, 1904, at the postoffice at New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879.

The publishers as such are not necessarily in agreement with any opinions expressed by the contributors.



SUNDAY, NOVEMBER 6, 1904.

489.

If these figures are ahead of the number printed on the wrapper of your FREE SOCIETY, it indicates that your subscription expired so many weeks ago.

ANARCHY.—A social theory which regards the union of order with the absence of all direct government of man by man as the political ideal; absolute individual liberty.—*Century Dictionary*.

If you receive this paper without having paid for it, some friend paid for it. It will not be sent any longer than your friend paid for. Will you not subscribe?

All delinquent subscribers are earnestly requested to renew their subscriptions if they wish to receive the paper. A blue pencil mark on the wrapper indicates that the subscription expired.

The Election.

Now once more with roar and rattle,
We again behold a battle,
Twixt the thick-skulled, thin-brained cattle,
And to determine—what?
Whether Democrat shall steal,
All their rags, and their last meal,
Meanwhile the patriots 'plaud with zeal,
But gumption not a jot.
Or Republicans shall skin
Them of their all save smut and sin,
To tumble they will ne'er begin;
Ar'n't they a lovely lot?
Or if Populists shall pick
Their pockets of their final nick—
Eh: don't it make one wish to kick
Each where himself cannot?

CHARLES E. NICHOLS.

And Still the "Critic."

Mr. James says that the statement that like begets like, and that, therefore, evil begets evil, is a mere rhetorical phrase; I say that it is the fundamental law of life. You can think these two statements over and take your choice. For my part, I find myself now unable to play the politician, and I will here explain what I understand by that term. In its broadest, truest sense the politician is one who believes in the trick of policy; one who, having a particular program that he wishes to put thru, fancies that he can see his way to the accomplishment of that great good by the working of a little evil. There is a number of so-called Anarchists who have as their program the universal strike and imagine that the greatness of that end will justify the employment of almost any means, holding with the Jesuits that the end justifies the means. I have no space here for a historical discussion and will simply say that this Jesuitical doctrine has broken the back of every movement into which it has been allowed to creep; that the strength of a movement has always been the tenacity with which its princi-

ples (provided they are true), have been held by its followers, and that as soon as its followers have weakened or abandoned their principles for the sake of some supposed immediate gain the movement has become a rope of sand.

The movement of which FREE SOCIETY is the champion has for its basic principle the right of private judgment and of secession, on behalf of which—for example—during the period of the Protestant Reformation, from which this movement is lineally descended, tens of thousands were willing to die. But now when in the exercise of his private judgment, a workman of today declines to join a union, there are apparently Anarchists who approve of such workman being punished and persecuted for his rebellious contumacy. It is my most emphatic opinion that he who, calling himself an Anarchist, takes that stand has not the remotest conception of the true principles of his professed creed. It also seems to me easy to see how it is that a movement which cannot make up its mind as to where it stands on so vital a question should be still, after years and years of effort, still struggling, and struggling and vainly struggling to obtain a hold on contemporary thought. This question which is a test of your fidelity to principle, is now calling loudly for an answer. The question of the "open shop," which is now up for settlement, is simply—Shall the employer be compelled to employ only union men, and shall the working-man therefore be compelled to join a union? To me such compulsion contains the very essence of tyranny.

How do you answer that question, for an answer you have got to make, and it should be a firm and decided one? If for the sake of your program of the universal strike you answer in favor of compulsion, then, as it seems to me, your movement, as a movement of principle, is dead—assassinated by its authors.

Anyhow, that is a line along which you stand, to lose, for if you indorse what is known as the movement for the closed shop you will be endorsing a movement that does not dare to come out into the open or show its hand. It may be possible for a time to cloud the issue by bewildering the public judgment with the details of this and the other strike, but, sooner or later, the question must be put plump and squarely to the American people—"Do you believe that men should be compelled willy-nilly, to join a union; do you believe that employers should be compelled to refuse employment to a man because, for reasons of his own, he does not care to join a union?" To that question which must be ultimately put, the answer will be thunderingly, "No."

For, feeble tho the voice of liberty may seem to-day to be, there is a stubborn individuality abroad which will not tolerate the tyranny of forcing a man into a partnership against his will; or of forcing a man to work where he does not wish to work; or, since what is sauce for the goose must also be sauce for the gander, of forcing a man to give work to those to whom he does not wish to give work. That coercive road as an exit from our social troubles has fortunately been barred long ago, and fortunate indeed is it for the future of the Anarchist movement that it has been barred.

The truth is that evil begets evil, and that encouragement of tyranny along one line sets back the triumph of freedom along all lines. It revives bad habits of thought that the true forces of civilization have been slowly but steadily pushing into oblivion, and sets people on a false trail; causing them to look for help where no help is to be found, and luring them from the firm ground they have already won back into the quagmires from which they pulled themselves with such unspeakable exertion.

"THE CRITIC."

COMMENT.

"The Critic" does himself great injustice when he says he is unable "to play the politician"; meaning by that, one who "fancies he can see

his way to the accomplishment of some great good" (such as preventing a scab's head from being punched) "by the working of a little evil" (such as taking by force from the producers every year a few hundred million dollars to support these systems of landlordism, sex-slavery, and other slaveries, which make the scabs). So far from being unable to "fancy" any such thing, the "Critic" must be acknowledged a very skillful advocate of his clients, Judge Gary, President Cleveland and Governor Peabody, immortalized by acting just so. There is very subtle sophistry in his demonstration that Anarchism, being founded on "the right of private judgment and of secession" (?), is inconsistent in showing a soft side to any movement some of whose friends may have followed their private judgment to the result of punching a scab's head. There is brilliant forensic eloquence in his (anonymous) call for "a firm and decided answer" upon those who when menaced, not with loss of a job, which, if servility to capitalism be any recommendation, they had abundantly secured, but with Gary law, lynch law, plunder, fire and massacre, saw only the opportunity McKinley's assassination gave the to flood the secular papers with their views; who extorted by their courage, calmness, and clearness, the reluctant admiration of the bitterly prejudiced editors; and among whom it was specially observed that not one descended to the use of a fictitious name! There is also a twenty-Philadelphia-lawyer power of misrepresentation in his description of Anarchism (which has made much more rapid progress than either Christianity or Protestantism at their first heat) as "still, after years and years of effort, struggling and struggling and vainly struggling to obtain a hold on contemporary thought." That which in three decades has completely conquered those spheres of contemporary thought called Art and Science, has no call to worry about the rest. Enlightening mere stupidity is not only a slow job but a labor of Sisyphus. Superstitions are immortal. Their hopeful characteristic is that they cease to do much harm when those cease believing them who are smart enough to govern. And that is always soon after those smart enough to be artists or scientists.

Were I inclined to dodge, as the "Critic" so artfully insinuates, I should say the labor unions compel no man to join them, and no "employer" to refuse scabs. They only say to the employer, "You can't have scab's and us too." But I do not feel it my cue to defend the labor unions. Their funeral, if as near as the "Critic" thinks, is none of mine. So instead of giving that firm and decided answer, I rather think I shall go on playing the politician, much as he does. When the Citizens' Alliance form rebel army, and depose United States judges, in order to break up co-operative stores, the "Critic" seems to admit that this is a little evil; but the good is so great that he comes very near calling them the true Anarchists! When Von Plehve is resolved into primordial nebula, I will admit it's very naughty and un-Anarchistic, if you like; but I'll be Gary-lawed if I can find a tear about me.

This common-sense way of looking at things is so disagreeable to Anticrats that I am real glad of an opportunity to indulge one with a harmless battle of words. Our readers are invited to enter whether the words "Evil begets

evil are a mere rhetorical phrase or a fundamental law of life. Well, let's consider. It contains only two words. Two words are the minimum out of which a sentence can be made. It is therefore a mode of terseness—a high rhetorical quality. One of the two words is used metaphorically (to say that evil begets anything, literally, would be like saying that error rides a bicycle). Looks rather rhetorical, don't it? And what does that other word "evil" mean? The "Critic" may be allowed a few centuries to answer this question; for when he has done it (satisfactorily) the scalps of Moses, Zarathustra, Buddha, Plato, Mani, Augustine, Pelagius, Calvin, Hopkins, Wesley, Whitefield, Jonathan Edwards, Epicurus, Zeno, Aristippus, Hegasias, Locke, Bentham, Dumont, Tak Kak, Kant, Fichte, Schelling, Hegel, and Schopenhauer, will adorn his wigwam. If a sentence made up of an undefinable term and a figurative one be a fundamental law of life; the foundations are removed, and what can the righteous do? If it be not a mere rhetorical phrase; of what harder substance than adamant are such expressions as "scripture shines by its own light?"

To this, perhaps, the "Critic" may reply that all language is capable of being resolved into metaphors and metaphysics. "As true as preaching"; and therefore no language is more a very imperfect instrument of reason. It is handy—often necessary. So is a watch. But the value of a watch is tested by the sun. The value of language is tested by translation into things—that is, by experiment. If it be too vague to admit of such translation, it is as useless as a child's watch set by thumb. And that's what's the matter with all these gnomonic formulæ of which "deductive" moralists and "sociologists" think so much. The more concise and pointed they are, the more a practical reasoner sees that they have the character of proverbs; which may stimulate a person's will, if his judgment is already convinced, as the toy watch may exercise the curiosity of the child; but which can have no effect on his judgment, except to mislead it, because their whole point and beauty is in strong statements which make them flatly contradictory; "take time by the forelock"; "slow and sure"; "evil begets evil"; "error is the pioneer of truth."

I, therefore, utterly deny that Anarchism has for its basic principle any such phantasmal rock as "the right of private judgment and secession." That indeed has been "struggling, and struggling, and vainly struggling," during not years alone but centuries, for a hold on contemporary thought, like a cloud driven by the wind; but contemporary thought has sometimes got an Ixion hold on it; and boasted of embracing Hera, until the result appeared, which was begetting monsters like the really not unfamiliar assertion that Gary, and Cleveland, and Peabody are Anarchists! If the words *reductio ad absurdum* have any meaning, such results prove the total error of such premises.

The basic principle of Anarchism is that combinations for the purpose of controlling social actions do harm—of course, in the popular sense of harm. It is that such combinations induce poverty not wealth, discord not peace, ignorance not knowledge, stagnation, not progress, excess not temperance, mortality not long life, ugliness not beauty. These truths we offer

to prove by experiment and observation; the way of finally proving anything; and on that issue we stake the merits of Anarchism without fear.

C. L. JAMES.

An Editor Set Right.

In *Bran's Iconoclast* of August there is a remarkable statement made by the editor about Anarchists—remarkable because of its absence of truth and facts, and peculiar in the editor of such a journal, inasmuch as he tries to place blame or crime of killing kings, presidents, governors, etc., upon Anarchists alone, and says it in the editor's own peculiarly sarcastic way, which naturally calls all those people and all others who wish to see fair play, to challenge the statements in the interest of all parties concerned.

When a student of public questions attempts moulding public opinion he should not try to be particularly funny, for such grave occasions should be educative as to facts and literal truths in statements.

The editor cut and slashed into his characterized Anarchist as tho his readers were in the habit of believing any kind of statement appearing in the *Iconoclast*. He does not seem to realize the Anarchist character, hence he seeks to clothe them in governmental garb, when, in the nature of things, so garbed, they are ready to do as governmentalists do.

But the Anarchist does not do as governmentalists do. He is a man of peace! He minds his own business—many of them being so philosophically anarchistic, as to be non-resistant. All of them endeavoring to educate the nations and individuals to become so just that no law or government would be necessary.

Now let us apply this rule of action to the many killings and causes thereof in our own time and country, and in how largely the Anarchist figures in them. Honest now, Mr. Editor, come and let us read the records and get straight for the sake of all your readers who wish to know. Let us apply the anarchistic rule to the assassination of President Lincoln. J. Wilkes Booth, the assassin, was not an Anarchist, but a Baptist, and believed in killing. Why did he shoot President Lincoln? All the causes urged may not be susceptible of truthfulness. But let us examine a matter of political history.

During the closing hours of the last session of Congress in March, 1865, the radical republican leaders of that body drafted a very unfriendly measure against the seceded states. Zack Chandler of Michigan brought a copy of it to President Lincoln for his signature. That paper was "pigeon-holed" in the president's pocket, and the wrath of those radical Republicans was extremely rancorous over his action. Not two weeks after that occasion President Lincoln was shot by a Democrat. No Anarchist had a hand in all this criminality and conspiracy.

Who was Guiteau, the assassin of Garfield? A Republican and Presbyterian, antipodes of anarchistic belief. The papers quoted Guiteau as a disappointed politician and half crazy. Nothing anarchistic in that.

Before Garfield was nominated for the presidency, Conkling and Blaine had had their startling duel of debate in the House and were bitter enemies ever after. Garfield appointed Blaine secretary of state, and turned out Conkling's man for custom collector in New York City. Whether anything can connect all this rancorous politics with the death of Garfield is but conjectural at most, but strange to recite, Guiteau shot Garfield while arm in arm with Blaine in the Washington railway depot.

Czolgosz, who shot McKinley, was a Republican living in Cleveland, Ohio. He was a member of the 26th ward Republican club, and he, with all his family relations, were Roman Catholics.

Not long after the Republican administration had declared war on Spain, President McKinley met his death in Buffalo. I heard Czolgosz say that he had been a member of the Socialist Labor Party for eight years. He became disgusted with the Socialists when they split. He was a so-called Free Thinker. He knew absolutely nothing about Anarchism. He said he did not. He was made an Anarchist by the sensational press because a copy of *FREE SOCIETY* was found in his satchel which he had received from some one in Chicago.

Governor Goebel of Kentucky was killed by a man in the employ of the Republicans of that state. This is political history, and all the zealous Republicans

of entucky are the most pronounced Christians. Then, too, the Republican and Christian governor of Indiana became *particeps criminis* in the assassination by refusing to execute requisition papers to the governor of Kentucky, thus becoming a compounder of murder. All this intrigue and criminality is utterly foreign to the Anarchist.

The shooting of Mayor Harrison is but a repetition of crime incident to political scheming where church and state become assistants to aspiring politicians. They wanted the mayor out of the way, and "the thirty pieces of silver" were sufficiently inducive to get him there. This is but recent history of which we are all aware, and the hands of governmental patriots are plainly apparent here.

The execution of five laborers in 1887, in Chicago, charged with participating in bombing the police squadron that was charging upon a labor meeting in Haymarket square, was a murder without cause. In the trial nothing was proved against them, yet the state hanged them. No one knows who threw the bomb that knocked down sixty-eight policemen as they came surging upon the speaker's stand, killing several of them. If the state had furnished any kind of proof that those men were in any way connected with the bomb-throwing, it might have had some excuse for the murder, but as it is there is reason to suspect it a convicted criminal in history.

Of all the foreign rulers assassinated I will select that of Humbert of Italy as particularly worthy of mention.

During a labor or bread riot among his subjects, he is said to have recommended a "diet of bullets." An Italian living in Paterson, N. J., a man of culture and learning, Bresci by name, on hearing the story, went to Italy and accepted Humbert's order as good for king as for subject, and prescribed and administered the bullet diet. Bresci was an Anarchist. He said so in court. None of his friends in Paterson suspected he would commit the deed, for he was a very quiet, peaceable man.

The supreme right of self-defense enacted in "the bullet diet program," placed Bresci above the pale of any known written or unwritten law, hence his imprisonment and torture unto death can never be justified short of acknowledged murder.

According to the editor's definition of Anarchism, the killing of kings, presidents, governors, mayors, and laborers by wholesale is a crime only when done by reputed Anarchists, but when done by good Christians, Democrats, Republicans, and state officials, "that is a horse of another color." Give the devil his due, Mr. Editor. It seems to an impartial mind that the state has no more rights to do wrong than has the individual, and is particularly amenable when it most deliberately puts to death men against whom a sworn jury found no charge of any kind. Those five Chicago Anarchists never even harmed a sparrow. Anarchists do not believe in killing, except when the good old "Mosaic law of an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth," is justifiable.

But the reporters of sensational and subsidized and even stultified papers do not hesitate in putting falsehood into the mouth of avengers of wrong, and upon the actions of bribe-takers, to satiate their hatred of so pure a thing as Anarchy. All Anarchists are very willing to shoulder any blame when backed up with proof, and the state should be as just, and accept truthful charges against it, no matter tho it be the state.

J. N. LEE.

For New York.

Sunday, Nov. 6, 8 p. m., H. M. Kelly speaks before the Radical Club, Cor. Leonard & Scholes, Brooklyn, on "Radicalism in England."

Sunday, Nov. 13, 8 p. m., A. Isaak speaks before the German Anarchist Group, 204 E. 80th St., on "Anarchism and Revolution."

For Philadelphia.

A memorial meeting of the Eleventh of November tragedy in Chicago, 1887, takes place Sunday, Nov. 13, 8 p. m., in Industrial Hall, Broad & Vine Sts. Lucy E. Parsons, James F. Morton, Jr., and Geo. Brown will address the audience.

The Confession of "a Christian Anarchist."

Comrade Barnard's observation that the Anarchist movement has a Christian phase, appearing within the churches as a revival of the early Christian spirit, and without their pale as a tendency to reception of Christianity by those who have long rejected it, is no less interesting than evidently true. *Experientia docet.* I feel like contributing my experience to the history of this phase. I was brought up a Christian, in the Evangelical wing of the Church of England. That a personal God made all things; that men had lost communion with God thru sin; that Jesus Christ, being God manifest in the flesh, suffered death, thru their wickedness, but with a view to their redemption; that those who believed this, with personal application to themselves, were assured of pardon for past sin, and also regenerated into pursuit of holiness by this signal example of divine love; that such faith is not natural, but implies previous conviction of sin, fear of damnation, shame, and regret at the bondage of wickedness, and thus realized need of such a redeemer; all of which sentiments, except, perhaps, the fear, are beyond our fallen nature, and are only put into us by a higher power; that God may thus be viewed in three ways, as the Creator, the Savior, and the Sanctifier, which trinity had been the subject of much probable unprofitable controversy—all this was familiar teaching to me before my teens. I was not insensible to its difficulties. The Agnostic argument against an eternal personality, a creation out of nothing, the very conception of infinity, all came to me without teaching, earlier than experience of such evident facts as generation and death, whose equal mystery compelled me to acknowledge the need for hypothetical explanation of much which admits none satisfactory. Of the religion a boy is taught, he believes in only as much as responds to something in his heart. The following points responded to something in mine. First, sin. Mere fear of the gods and desire to propitiate them is common to all religions. But the sense of sin, as we find it in the seventh chapter of Romans, is Jewish. It became the basis of a religion, as I have since learned, nowhere but in Palestine. Far from being associated with superstition, it was a great slaughterer of superstitions. The God of the Jews, at least in the prophetic period, was the personification of conscience, which is an exacting power—"a jealous God." It banished the cults of natural forces and natural passions, and with them all the follies of polytheism—auguries, oracles, omens, incantations, immoral and cruel rites; all to be found in archaic, but not native Judaism. It was the only thoroughly successful monotheism: for those of Jesus and Mahomet presuppose it. I do not think "my genius"—what there is of it—at all Jewish. I conceive it is very Aryan. But, for an Aryan, I had the sense of sin extremely strong, and all its sequelae I believed. These, it will be seen, include the duty of perfection; failure to perform it; impending perdition; recognition of the redeemer when presented from without, tho no power to make him out of imagination; pardon; capacity for holiness; finally, that every step in this transformation is effected for me by Another, and not, any more than my creation, by myself. Thus, from the age of about seventeen to twenty-four, I was considered a pretty thoroughgoing Christian by myself and others. But this is not quite all.

The sense of immortality, hardly separable from Christianity, is quite separable from Judaism. The Jews probably learned it from the Aryan Persians. It is conspicuous in the Aryan religion—Brahmanism, Buddhism, Platonism, Zoroasterianism, and the group of Jewish origin, since the Babylonian Captivity; but not in other extra Aryan religions. It is an Aryan distinct. In my Aryan mind it was always very strong. Materialism, deriving the Subject from the Object, always seemed to me, as it still does, the shallowest of metaphysics.

The Aryan intellect is analytical. It roused to consider his ways (which comes natural to a Semite), the Aryan inquires in what sin and righteousness consist? Of course the Semite does too. But that the Aryan here has the advantage of him appears, I think, from this, that no Aryan religion—not Brahmanism, not Romanism—ended in such slavery to ritual as the Judaism of the Talmud, after all which the prophets, from Samuel to John the Baptist, had done in the way of spiritualizing it. Formalism and

moralism contend in all religions; but among Aryans successive reformations always advanced the latter at expense of the former; while in Judaism, the most ethical of religions, formalism, for want of analysis, triumphed till reformed Judaism arose, in Europe, under Aryan influence. The same contrast of national tendency is shown in other ways. The Jews and Arabs preserved mathematics and science during the Dark Ages, when a Semitic fanaticism threatened to destroy them. But science is of Aryan origin. It began with the Greek, and was renewed, late in the Dark Ages, by the Teuton.

Analysis naturally carried me far away from what is called orthodoxy. That the traditional origin of scripture is not the historical; that the infallibility asserted for the writers by Aryan metaphysicians had no place in their own Semitic minds; that their theory of creation is as wrong for the stars and for man, as for the crust of the earth; that the Fall and the Redemption have only a figurative truth; that that revelation of the Savior which seemed supernatural to me might be explained by the nature of a Semitic Paul; that theology, rooted in the false method of training myths into records, and metaphors into syllogisms, which constitutes metaphysics, could be only a pseudo-science; that the frightful evils of fanaticism spring spontaneously from those positive dogmas developed out of penitential experience; that the true method in morals and religion, as in other things, is the inductive; that in many transcendently important points of practical ethics, the other had misled mankind; was all familiar to me at twenty-four, when I was preaching the gospel. But one element of my former belief appeared vital still. If Christianity alone induced holiness, then it was still true that there is no other name given under heaven whereby we may be saved than that of Jesus. I ceased calling myself a Christian when experience forced me to acknowledge that the perfect sacrifice of actual self to that ideal self which conscience sets before us is to be found (I still think, less frequently,) among Brahmins, Buddhists, Freethinkers, etc., as well as among Christians. For, granting this, Christianity sinks into a party name, of whose mischiefs we need but mention persecution in order to be convinced. These mischiefs, it seemed to me, Jesus must answer for—not that I believed he said all which is attributed to him; but, like other half fabulous persons, he cannot be taken to pieces. We know him only as the root of an historic movement from which Torquemado sprang as normally as Francis Assisi. And against the dogmatism, the intolerance, the priestcraft, the pseudo-science, of this system, I suppose I am as earnest now as I ever was.

How, then, has Anarchism brought me nearer to Christianity. Well, as Barnard remarks, it has brought what passes as Christianity much nearer to me. Having occasion lately to read the Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge a good deal, I was quite surprised to find how far the churches had accepted criticism with all its anarchistic consequences. Analysis has brought down the requirements of orthodoxy to what all Christians always had in common; which is sense of sin and reception of atonement—conviction that we must mend our ways; and perception that the most generally efficacious, tho not the only, incentive to perfection is the ideal of the divinity, as martyr to holiness, represented in literature by Jesus. On the other hand, this conviction and perception, in the Christian Anarchism of Tolstoy, rests altogether on experience, and not in the least on authority. I do not think it will confuse the issues between us and "the world." I do think it may avail to unite those who are "not of the world," and to divide those who are. C. L. JAMES.

Noteworthy Events.

In Bialystok, Russia, a young man attempted to execute the chief of police by throwing a bomb into the police station, but the culprit—the chief of police—escaped uninjured.

The Anarchists of Belgium recently held a well-attended convention, at which it was decided to consummate a federation of all the groups in the land, in order to inaugurate a more vigorous and national propaganda.

In Fall River, Mass., there are still 26,000 mill workers on strike. Over one-half of them have be-

come paupers and were compelled to apply to public charity for aid, which deprived them of the right to vote as the law does not allow paupers to use the ballot. Thus all the rich need to do in order to prevent the workers from annoying them thru politics, is to deprive turbulent laborers of an opportunity to make a living, and the thieves in and out of office will not be disturbed in their noble occupation of skinning the "sovereign citizens."

Letter-Box

C. N., St. Louis.—We cannot very well report the death of Comrade Voltairine de Cleyre as long as she is among the living. She will be amused to read the obituaries that have already appeared. True, she is in a hospital, but according to private information she is slowly improving.

M. C. Akron, O.—If you will take the trouble to read the article "The International Congress" in the October *International Socialist Review*, you will find that the compliments Jaures and Bebel pay each other vindicate the accusations FREE SOCIETY makes against Social Democracy. Says Jaures, among other things: "You have groped hither and thither and concealed your powerlessness of action by taking refuge in theoretical formulas that conceal the political aim." Bebel replies: "There has been no great battle in the last four years in which the Waldeck-Rousseau, Millerand ministry and the Combes ministry have not used the military against the laborers. In November, the Paris police broke into the labor headquarters in the most shamefully violent manner and clubbed and wounded seventy laborers. Yet some of our Socialist friends in the Chamber refused to vote for the punishment of the chief of police."

New York, Attention!

A concert and dance will be given by the federated groups of Russian-American Anarchists on Saturday, November 5, 8 p. m., in the Pacific Hall, 209 East Broadway. Tickets, 15 cents.

* * *

The German singing societies "Freiheit" will give a grand vocal and instrumental concert and dance on Sunday, November 6, 7 p. m., in the New York Männerchor Hall, 203-207 East 56th st. Tickets, 15 cents.

* * *

A meeting to commemorate the Eleventh of November of 1887 will take place November 10, 8 p. m., at the Grand American Hall, Second ave. and First st. Emma Goldman, Lucy E. Parsons, James F. Morton, Jr., and Harry M. Kelly, and A. Lott, will be the speakers.

November 11, 8 p. m., the same speakers will address a massmeeting on the occasion at the Labor Lyceum on Willoughby ave., Brooklyn, N. Y.

For Boston.

Under the auspices of the group "Progress," a concert and performance, "The Innocent Walking Delegate, or Justice by Force," will be given for the benefit of a library fund in Paine's Memorial Hall, 9 Appleton st., Sunday, Nov. 6, 7:30 p. m. Single tickets 20 cents; 35 cents for man and woman.

ATTENTION!

All readers whose subscriptions have expired some time ago, and whose copies have been marked with blue pencil on the wrapper, will be dropped from the list unless they notify us that they wish to receive the paper.

Reason is treason in the camp of credulity.—B. G. RICHARDS.

* * *

Under the regime of property, labor is not a condition but a privilege.—PROUDHON.