



VOL. Xb. No. 45.

NEW YORK, SUNDAY, NOVEMBER 20, 1904.

WHOLE No. 491.

### By the Wayside.

Again the Eleventh of November, the judicial murder of the "Chicago Anarchists," has been commemorated in the larger cities in this country. In Chicago the daily papers reported the meeting, trying to conceal only that an American had been one of the speakers. In Philadelphia the gist of the speeches was reported fairly by the press, while in New York there was a conspiracy of silence—even among the "revolutionary" Socialist papers. The Chicago *Record-Herald* thinks it rather strange that all the jurors who found the Anarchists "guilty" died an unnatural death—five of them concluding their conscience-smitten lives in the insane asylum.

\* \* \*

"The people who at peace congresses speak against war," argues the editor of a daily sheet, "express the sentiment of the great majority of mankind, but the time is not yet ripe for universal peace." On other occasions, for instance after the election of tough-rider Roosevelt, we are told that "the voice of the people is the voice of God"; consequently, according to the logic and wisdom of these college-bred editors, the people and God are against war, but the time, which therefore is still more powerful than "God Almighty," is still against peace. But why not speak plain English, Mr. Editor? Why not say, "the great majority of mankind hate war, but the small minority of legalized robbers realize that its parasitical existence depends on violence in its own countries and the conquest of weaker nations by force of arms, and hence the necessity of government and war"?

\* \* \*

On Saturday, Nov. 12, Cooper Union was crowded with several thousand people who were anxious to see and hear the delegates of the Russian Revolutionary Socialists, Katharina Breshkovskaya and Dr. Shitlovsky. Those familiar with the Russian revolutionary movement knew the name of Breshkovskaya, who in her early youth abandoned wealth and "high society" and allied herself with the revolutionists. Being aware that she had for twenty-two years spent her life in solitary imprisonment and the cold regions of Siberia, the public expected to see a broken-down woman. But they were agreeably surprised. In spite of her sixty-one years and white hair she looked youthful and her enthusiasm burns undimmed, and there was an inspiration in the delight and rapture with which she greeted the audience. She had never seen so many revolutionists and sympathizers gathered in one hall or place, and she was overcome with joy while tears were running down her cheeks. The mission of the delegates is to acquaint the public in this country with the situation in Russia and to raise funds for the support of the Russian revolutionary press.

\* \* \*

In order to prove that trades-unions must enter the political arena if they expect to emancipate labor from the thrall of capitalism, the *Toiler* (social democratic) points out that the powerful unions in this country were being defeated just when they had reached "their high-

est stage of perfection." This is a distortion of the essential facts, however. If the membership of Social Democracy were composed of people whose views on the social problem were as much at variance as those of the members of trades-unions, and thus would be prevented from realizing the aims and principles of Social Democracy, the *Toiler* would not think of asserting that Social Democracy had been defeated when it had reached the "highest stage of perfection." And trades-unionism will become invincible only when its members cease to believe that the present system of wage slavery and the institution of property are ordained by God. Let them learn that laws and governments are but means to keep them in subjection, ignorance, and poverty, and they will proceed towards the abolition of these institutions over the heads of their conservative and pusillanimous leaders, and in spite of political parties.

\* \* \*

"My wife does not love me," was the reason a man in Los Angeles, Cal., gave to the court in his endeavor to secure a divorce. The judge frowned, and said: "The question of love does not enter into this at all. If this love question did enter into the matter of giving divorce decrees, 40 per cent of our marriages could be annulled and the very foundation of society would be undermined." Consequently, the "very foundation of society" is held together by force of law and prostitution! "If a man and woman form a partnership to raise chickens," comments a correspondent in *Lucifer*, "and find they cannot work well together, they are at liberty to separate. No court can compel them to continue the partnership, altho society would not suffer if they did. But when a man and woman form a partnership to raise children, and afterwards ascertain that mutual love—the only true basis of such partnership—no longer exists, and that society will be injured by the addition to its members of the ill-born offspring of such a loveless marriage, then courts and the church hold that annulment of marriage for such cause would undermine the very foundation of society."

\* \* \*

The editor of *Wilshire's Magazine* feels exceedingly happy that, at last, men of genius have come to the support of Socialism, namely Jack London and Upton Sinclair, who are both men of mark in the literary world. It may seem singular that it took fifty odd years before two or three "men of mark in the literary world" joined Socialist parties; but anyone who is familiar with the history of Socialist parties—or any political party for that matter—will not find it strange that men of genius cannot, and will not, affiliate themselves with political parties in which they have to comply with a program—a platform—which of necessity clips the wings of Pegasus and keeps it chained to the Procrustean bed. True, Jack London and Upton Sinclair, who have exhibited to the literary world flashes of genius, have joined the party of Social Democracy, and at present expound Marxian theories in their writings; but their genius will before long dwindle into mediocrity if they allow themselves to be cramped into the arena of dogmas and platforms. And that Upton Sin-

clair is either ill-informed or else uses the term Socialism in its broadest sense, can be seen from his article on Socialism in *Collier's Weekly*, in which he throws men like Björnson, Måterlinck, Sudermann, Hauptmann, Ibsen, Tolstoy, Zola, and Gorky in one pot and calls them Socialists, altho every one of them, with the single exception of Björnson, are outspoken opponents of any and all political parties. Sinclair only needs to read Ibsen's "Enemy of the People" to find out what he expected from political parties and the intelligence of majorities. "Even Kropotkin," Upton Sinclair insists, "who once carried the red flag and cried out for dynamite, has joined their ranks; even the followers of Nietzsche are doing it." Hold on now, Mr. Sinclair, lest your genius carries you beyond the "Unknown." Kropotkin is still carrying "the red flag" and still cries out that mankind cannot free itself thru acts of congress or party legislation, but "thru local actions: peaceful, if peaceful it can be, or insurrectional if the nation cannot break otherwise the privileges and the monopolies bequeathed to it by its fathers." Only recently Kropotkin has written a pamphlet, "The Coming Revival of Socialism," in which he says, among other things: "It is self-evident that, when we speak of a revival of 'Socialism,' we do not mean a revival of 'Social Democracy.' The writers of this school have done all they could to make people believe that Social Democracy is Socialism, and Socialism is nothing but Social Democracy. But everyone can easily ascertain himself that Social Democracy is only one fraction of the great Socialist movement: the fraction which believes that all necessary changes in the Socialist direction can be accomplished by parliamentary reforms within the present state; or at least, that only such reforms need be spoken of; and that when all main branches of production shall be owned by the state, and governed by a democratic parliament, and every worker will be a wage worker for the state—this will be Socialism. This is their creed. There remains, however, a very considerable number of Socialists who maintain that Socialism cannot be limited to such a meek reform; that it implies much deeper changes, economical and political; and that even the above reform cannot be realized within the present state by its representative institutions. Many begin thus to see that it is not by acquiring power in parliament—under the unavoidable penalty of ceasing to be a Socialist party, and gradually becoming a "moderate radical" party—that the changes required by Socialism can ever be realized. . . . It is, then, a revival of Socialism altogether that we see coming—one of its causes being precisely the failure of Social Democracy to bring about the great changes which mankind needs and claims at the present moment of its history."

INTERLOPER.

### For Chicago.

Under the auspices of Liberty Group a literary evening will be held in Workman's Hall, cor. 12th and Waller sts., Friday evening, Nov. 25. Comrade Barnard will address the audience.



# 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 20, 1904.

No. 491.

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*.

## Voltaireine of Cleyre.

Read "An Appeal" made in her behalf on next page, and send your contribution to N. Notkin, 1332 South 6th Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

## Attention, Comrades!

With over a hundred dollars debts on its head, FREE SOCIETY is compelled to suspend publication as a weekly for lack of support. A few devoted comrades have done all they possibly could do to keep the paper afloat, but the inertness of the comrades at large make the task too hard for these few to keep it up, altho it is important to have an Anarchist weekly, especially in these times of political reaction and capitalistic arrogance. Yet in face of it all, we shall be forced to discontinue its publication.

The comrades in New York alone could easily support an English Anarchist weekly if they recognized its pertinence. But they do not. The American-born comrades are few and far between; the Germans are afflicted both with indifference and with pessimism; the Italians have enough on hand to keep their own two weeklies a-going; and the Jewish comrades are utterly absorbed in the task of raising funds for the Russian Revolutionary Socialists.

And I do not complain. Each of us is doing what inspires him most, and in his enthusiasm often ignores wisdom and expediency. But I do not intend to throw up the cards. If some friends determine to rally in the effort of continuing the propaganda in the English language, I shall publish a monthly magazine containing articles of merit on social and labor problems, biographies and pictures of the heralds of freedom; and monthly reviews of the labor movement of the world.

The reduced amount of work demanded by a monthly will enable the publisher to make a livelihood independent of the income of the magazine, and thus reduce the expenses considerably. The size of the publication will thus depend entirely on the encouragement and help of its readers.

Should the magazine fail to come out on January 1 for lack of sufficient support, the sub-

## FREE SOCIETY.

scriptions received meanwhile will be returned, and the subscribers of FREE SOCIETY will receive the *Demonstrator* until their subscription expires.

A. ISAAK.

## Comments.

"Medicus" asks, with innocent wonder, whether Laura J. Langston "still believes in the long-exploded theories of Malthus"? It is to be hoped she does. For the theory of Malthus is as true, as demonstrable, and as unanimously accepted, accordingly, by those who understand it, as the multiplication-table. If it had been exploded long ago, the cranks would have quit trying to explode it. The persistency with which they keep on trying, after a hundred and six years, is among familiar proof that it cannot be exploded any more than the circle can be squared, the perpetual motion discovered, a society for forcibly preventing invasion be organized, which will not invade, or something be proved by a metaphysical first principle.

In another place "Medicus" opines that Laura need not be afraid of the Comstock crowd, if she publishes her contraceptive recipe. With cases like that of Ida Craddock before us, such opinions are worthy a "medicus" who denies that bearing too many children may be injurious to a woman's health or dangerous to her life!

There is, however, a way in which Laura may publish her recipe for preventing conception; a brothel-directory of the American cities, or anything else she likes, and be no more afraid of Comstock than the editor of the *Police Gazette* is. Need I say the way is to join the Society for the Suppression of Vice, and find out how much they charge?

\* \* \*

Questions like these remind me of the good little boy, who complained that the catechism was too long, and wanted a "kittenchism." The space of the Anarchist papers really is too small to be taken up with daily explanations of such infant-class topics. Won't some one get up a "kittenchism" of Social Science? I do not propose competency for the task; but the following questions and answers might serve as suggestions.

QUESTION.—What is the foundation of our social system?—ANSWER.—Lust.

Q.—How was our social system founded upon lust?—A.—Men enslaved women.

Q.—What was the original form of sex-slavery?—A.—Prostitution.

Q.—What are its other forms, in one word?—A.—Marriage.

Q.—How was marriage added to prostitution?—A.—Warriors, who took women from other tribes claimed them as their own.

Q.—Can marriage exist without prostitution?—A.—No more than a house can stand without its foundation.

Q.—What makes the difference between marriage and prostitution?—A.—Private property.

Q.—Can marriage exist without private property?—A.—No more than the third story can stand without the second.

Q.—What is the effect of private property, besides marriage?—A.—Poverty.

Q.—What is the joint effect of poverty and marriage?—A.—Overpopulation.

Q.—What is the effect of overpopulation?—A.—War.

Q.—Have we not seen that war is the cause of marriage?—A.—Yes; but the effect renews the cause.

Q.—What is the effect of war?—A.—Government.

Q.—Must there not have been government ever, since women were enslaved?—A.—Yes; but war extended its power over the men.

Q.—Can the men be free consistently with marriage?—A.—No.

Q.—Why not?—A.—Because marriage produces overpopulation, overpopulation war, and war government.

Q.—What is the remedy?—A.—Freedom.

Q.—Must it be absolute?—A.—Yes.

Q.—Must it extend to the women?—A.—Yes. Unless propagation is controlled by the passive sex, it will always be either excessive or injuriously evaded.

Q.—What, in one word, tends to produce freedom?—A.—Knowledge.

Q.—Does knowledge increase, and, if so, how?—A.—Very steadily, by means of induction, the method men always use, when they aim to effect a practical purpose.

Q.—Has it done anything towards producing freedom?—A.—Yes. In most countries it has substituted democracy for monarchy, and in all it has lessened tyranny.

Q.—What has prevented its doing more good of the same sort?—A.—Ignorance.

Q.—Is ignorance voluntary or involuntary?—A.—Much of it is involuntary; but ignorance of things like these, in our time, is voluntary.

Q.—What do they call voluntary ignorance?—A.—Superstition, when it is only half-voluntary; otherwise humbug.

Q.—How do you know it is voluntary?—A.—Because it always persecutes.

Q.—What enables it to persecute?—A.—Government.

Q.—Why does government persecute knowledge?—A.—Because knowledge would destroy it but for ignorance, and in spite of ignorance, but that lust makes men love ignorance.

Q.—What are the principal forms of superstition?—A.—Politics, or the belief that government is necessary; theology, or belief that a revelation has been made to any set of men; metaphysics, or belief that theories concerning the absolute have any place in social or other science; and ethics, which teach that individuals whose acts are contrary to the commonweal should be blamed and punished rather than pitied.

Q.—Have these superstitions any common root?—A.—Evidently, they all refer us for happiness to something else than knowledge and the means of increasing it.

Q.—What besides lust makes men, who might know better, superstitious?—A.—Fear.

Q.—What makes them afraid?—A.—Knowledge that they are doing wrong.

Q.—What makes them do wrong?—A.—Lust.

Q.—Then the radical remedy for slavery is knowledge, and slavery itself in all forms is a sort of quack remedy, which the slaves continue to take because they would like to be tyrants, are afraid to try, and think each other worse tyrants than those they do not see?—A.—And because most of them have, or hope to have, slaves of some sort.

Q.—Is this double propensity to enslave and be slaves equal?—A.—No. It is the measure of ignorance.

Q.—What can we do about it?—A.—Principally propagate knowledge, in spite of persecution; but actions, whenever we know fully what we know we are doing, teach more than words.

Q.—Is success certain, notwithstanding persecution, and, if so, why?—A.—It is certain, because knowledge is the instrument of success; and those who still cling to superstition will either be converted or perish in the struggle for existence.

A leaflet filled out in this way and sent to every contributor, who raises baby questions, would save the radical papers room for discussion of such as can be considered open.

\* \* \*

E. g.,—when Jonathan Mayo Crane says, Pentecost would be an outcast from society, if he always acted the truth, he appears to overlook, what I am quite sure he would allow, that, society being a wicked organization, doing right always involves becoming an outcast from it. He justly remarks that the value of a lie depends on its being believed, and that on one's reputation for veracity; whence the obvious in-



ference that lying should be reduced to a minimum. But the minimum is none at all. In the ideal state there is no use for deceit. In the actual state of war, there is; but here's a consolatory reflection—nothing deceives a liar so effectively as telling him the truth; for it is always the last thing on earth he will expect to hear, and the one which makes him most incredulous. Some statesman who were accused of lying habitually, but in fact did not—Oliver Cromwell, for example, and Louis the Eleventh, understood this diplomacy very well.

Laura J. Langston's contracepts are like lies. They belong to the state of sex-slavery, or war between the sexes. In the state of freedom—peace—they would be useless. How much they amount to in the other, really is a question for induction, not debating societies. C. L. JAMES.

### An Appeal.

Comrades,—Comrade Voltairine de Cleyre, who has been lingering in the valley of the shadow for some months, is now at the point of death. The chances of her recovery depend entirely upon the medical attendance and care she receives. She is now in a hospital in Philadelphia and is receiving the best of care; the expenses, altho not large considering the seriousness of her case, are considerable when judged from the standard of our means. The Philadelphia comrades are doing their best, but twenty dollars a week is more than they can raise. It is surely unnecessary to enter into a lengthy statement concerning the services of our comrade to the cause of freedom and the agitation that rests upon all who share her views as to the necessity of assisting her in her hour of need. For more than fifteen years she has given the best that was in her to the Anarchist and Free thought movement, and none who have ever come in contact with her could doubt for a moment the honesty, ability, and whole-hearted devotion she gave to those principles dear to many of us. Combining with sincerity and ability of a high order when the hour struck she was always to be found in the vanguard of our movement. Many will remember how she espoused the cause of Berkman, and how when others wavered and sought their tents over the McKinley affair she was as true as the needle to the pole. Last, but not least, how she showed a sweetness of character, depth of principle, and purity of being that surprised even those who thought they knew her best in her attitude towards the one who sought to kill her.

Comrades, we need that clarion voice, that charming personality which has carried the light of liberty in the dark courts of ignorance so many years. She is young yet and we must make an effort to save her. We may fail, and if we do, we shall be the poorer, but we should try. Money is needed,—she is too ill to be consulted as to the methods of raising it, so this appeal is issued without her knowledge. Every man and woman with a heart that throbs for liberty and a spark of solidarity in their nature must rally to our comrade in this her hour of need. "He gives who gives quickly."

Six of the largest trusts, the United States Steel Corporation, the International Harvester Machine Co., the United States Rubber Co., the Glucose Sugar Co., the Pullman Co., and the Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Railroad Co. have decided to reduce the wages of their employees, to increase the hours of work, not to employ any man over the age of thirty-five years, and to inaugurate a war of extermination against trades-unionism. If the toilers should resist these encroachments by going out on strike and attempt to persuade their fellow toilers not to take their places, the police will resort to clubs and revolvers, and our friends E. C. Walker and the "Critic" will tell us that the workers have no "right" to disturb the industries and peace of the cities, having only the "natural right" to go home and starve or to commit suicide.

### The Conception of a Christian.

In my discussion of the use of the term "Christian Anarchist," in No. 481 of FREE SOCIETY, I expressed the opinion that the out-and-out Anarchist would agree with the objections there stated, however he might differ from one in general conceptions. I presume that William F. Barnard's article, "Jesus Christ and Anarchism," is the word of an out-and-out Anarchist, and I have read it therefore with an interest even greater than that which it would, in any case, have commanded by its intrinsic value. His reference to the differences, which I have implied in my distinction between Anarchism and Christianity, seem, however, to make necessary a further word on my part.

Mr. Barnard is right, in the main, in his conclusion that I conceive of these differences as consisting in a belief in authority on the part of the Christian. I cannot, however, accept what is there implied as to the nature of this authority; and I trust I shall not be understood as writing in any controversial spirit, if I endeavor, briefly, to set forth more clearly the conceptions of a Christian.

Let it be said, at the outset, that I speak only for myself. Mr. Barnard has referred to "the wide range of opinion respecting the nature of their religion held by those who call themselves Christians." He contends that because "the query, What is Christianity, and what did Christ teach? may be answered in many ways," it can therefore be answered "in none satisfactorily." In these words, I think, is expressed the extreme difference between our conceptions of Christian authority. I am continually insisting in my sermons to my congregation that every Christian must have a Christianity of his own, that in so far as he is accepting it on the authority of a church, a council, or a book, things that he has not made his own by reason or experience, he is to that extent not a Christian at all. I am perfectly aware that this contention, in the opinion of 'the orthodox,' would mark me as being decidedly non-Christian; but is it any more than a logical outcome of the principle of 'the right of private interpretation' enunciated in the Protestant Reformation, but practically denied by the Protestant church ever since. I conceive it to be the very essence of the teaching of Jesus that the only real authority in a man's life is the authority of his own conscience, his own convictions, that there not only is not, but in the very nature of the case, cannot be, any external authority in the Christian life.

Therefore, I speak only for myself, just as any Anarchist can speak only for himself. It has not been my privilege to know many Anarchists, as St. Paul would have said, "in the flesh," but all I have met personally, or come in contact with thru correspondence have given me varying conceptions of Anarchism. One good Anarchist friend writes me regarding another good Anarchist friend that, "he is an excellent fellow but there are some holes in his philosophy." Why should Christian philosophy of life and conduct be less diverse in its expression in the individual than Anarchist philosophy of life and conduct? It is this diversity which is the expression of individual honesty and courage in the search for truth.

"Anarchism," says Mr. Barnard, "takes nothing upon authority." I think it would hardly be too much to say that, in the sense in which he uses these words, neither does the true Christian,—or, lest I should be too much the judge of other men, neither do I, as a Christian. If, taking the historical evidence and all the data into account, I have come to believe in a God and in Jesus as a peculiar and special revealer of that God; if, searching honestly for truth, I have come to the conclusion that there is such truth in Christianity that I feel justified in calling myself a Christian; what is the difference between my relation to authority and that of Mr. Barnard whose reasoning and whose conception of the data have led him to exactly the op-

posite conclusions? Are we not each simply following the authority of our own convictions? I certainly admit of no authority of Christianity in my life, beyond that which appeals to me as truth. Mr. Barnard may, it is true, marvel, as he says, that a man who thinks today can call himself a Christian, but ridiculous as it seems I confess that I am disposed to do so, and what I wish to insist upon it that I do so, not on any other ground than that which leads him to call himself an Anarchist, viz., "human experience and experiment," by which, I judge, he means the whole data upon which a man must determine his convictions.

Granted then, that a Christian may be as much an Individualist as an Anarchist, what is the difference as regards authority? I believe it lies not so much in the authority as the attitude toward authority, is non-external, and non-prejudicial to individual liberty, is easily seen, however, in the fact that man must first of all determine for himself whether or not there be any such God. Man himself is the ultimate seat of authority. When, therefore, Mr. Barnard speaks of Christianity offering its message to the world on the authority of God, which "commands unmistakably," it is to be borne in mind that to an intelligent Christian the authority of God is nothing but the authority of truth and, therefore, cannot other than command unmistakably. I offer the message of Christianity from my pulpit each week simply as FREE SOCIETY offers the message of Anarchism, because as I interpret it, I believe it to be true, and I should feel heartily sorry did any man accept it on any other ground than a conviction of its truth.

As man is conscious of material and spiritual powers, it would be strange if an explanation of the universe had not been sought on each of these grounds. It is quite natural that we should have both material and spiritual philosophies; and inasmuch as a great part of the data of such philosophy is common, is it surprising that sincere men should have come to such a similarity of result? It need not seem strange that extreme Christianity, and extreme atheistic Anarchism appear to have so much in common, when we reflect that the essence of one is represented as being devotion to truth, and the essence of the other is revolt against what is regarded as untruth.

But while this is true, there are characteristic differences, which consist not only in the standpoint, whether spiritualistic or materialistic, but in the fact that Christianity is essentially positive, while Anarchism is essentially negative, in the attitude toward life. I mean that whereas Anarchism represents a true world-order as ensuing from perfect freedom, Christianity lays the chief stress upon the true world-order, or the conception of such an order, i. e., the kingdom of God, and thinks of perfect freedom as resulting only by the attaining of that order. So then, it seems to me, Mr. Barnard is right in his claim that the attempts to harmonize Anarchism and Christianity are of little value, because they can meet with little success; but it is evident that I hold this to be the case on grounds rather different than those which he has asserted.

Nor does this failure to harmonize, imply that there is no intimate relation. On the contrary, I believe that there is an intimate relation between spiritualistic, positive Christianity, and materialistic, negative Anarchism; and further, I believe that the study of such a relationship is by no means unimportant. Why should we not strive to understand one another, and then sincerely differ? Nay, while we differ in essential matters, why should we not manifest a certain sympathy in so far as we find a common aim and hope? The extreme misunderstanding of Anarchism on the part of Christians, and the equally extreme misunderstanding of Christianity on the part of Anarchists, does not speak well for the common sense or breadth of either class, sincere tho they be. As I have said else-



where in writing to Christians, so let me say now in writing to Anarchists; that no good can result from the Christian's persistence in judging of the Anarchist ideal by the assassin, nor from the Anarchist's retaliatory judgment of the Christian ideal by the hangman and the soldier.

If we cannot harmonize these ideals, let us at least have an intelligent conception of what they are, and why they cannot be harmonized. It will be a broadening process and may lead us to a certain unity in our difference. If Mr. Barnard contends, as possibly he may, that the attaining of an intelligent conception of the Christian ideal is, for him, an impossibility, I can only reply in the words of one of the greatest among Anarchists, which I have before quoted in these columns: "On ne comprend rien que ce qu'on aime." (We cannot understand what we do not love). W. E. GILROY.

Broadview Church, Toronto.

### Contrary Children.

I once heard an earnest Freethinker remark: "It is a pity that radicals have so few children, as there will be none to take our places when we are gone." In my opinion, if the progress of radicalism depends on the children of radicals to push it along, it is hopelessly blocked.

How many radicals of today can point to a long line of freethought ancestors? I venture to say there are few whose own lives did not begin in the church and conventionalism. And how many can see their work or ideas being carried on by their children?

I am reminded in several ways that radicals, as well as conservatives, fail to make of their children what they wish them to be.

We all know of liberals' children, who have joined the church, who move in conventional society, and are heartily ashamed of their parents and of their ideas. Many others who are utterly indifferent, or utterly incapable of mentally grasping the principles of political or social liberty. Then there are others who gladly accept radicalism as they see it, whose state is worse than the first—successes that are worse than failures.

The young girl who accepts radicalism but sees in it only freedom from restraint of all kinds—religious, social, parental—and believes the worst sin she can commit is to be or to act in any way like the conventional girl, is likely to be loud, bold, and generally disagreeable. She delights in the use of so-called vulgar and obscene words and stories, just because they shock the Philistines, and she indulges without restraint in whatever sensual pleasure comes in her way. And she may be, withal, narrow-minded, selfish, jealous, and unhappy.

A plain-spoken friend of mine compares this sort of a girl with the daughter of religious parents, one of a large family (sent as presents from the Lord). She is full of old-fashioned ideas of morality, modesty, duty, obedience, and submission to Godly and parental discipline. She attends church, Sunday school, League work, prays devoutly, and is withal, a merry, warm-hearted, unselfish little maiden, and remarkably sensible and broad-minded. More likely mayhap to be a brave soldier in the battle for liberty than the former.

Illustrative of this idea I recall the story of a young girl I knew years ago. She was the only child of well-to-do, progressive, liberal parents, who were so radical in social and religious matters that they were, much to their credit, quite despised by their respectable neighbors. Some years after leaving their neighborhood I heard of her death. Writing to a member of the family, I inquired concerning the sad event. The reply was: "L— died of consumption. She got into trouble and got out of it, but was never well after." This struck me as a brief and summary disposal of the subject, but it tells a long story of abuse, suffering, and so-called disgrace. If, as I suppose, her

"trouble" was illegal motherhood, why was she allowed to "get out of it" at the cost of health and life?

Considering the ability and the beliefs of her parents, they were just the kind of people, who might be expected to shield their daughter with the most tender care, receiving her child as a welcome and most precious gift to their limited household. That she took the conventional route to "get out of her trouble" proves either that she acted on her own responsibility—following the gods of hypocrisy and respectability rather than the liberal principles of her parents—or else that the principles of her parents were not liberal enough to stand the test of social condemnation. In either case is shown the failure to educate the daughter to ideas of independence, freedom, and self-hood.

A news-item in a popular paper says: "The son of Tolstoy contributes an article to a Russian publication in which he assumes an attitude in direct opposition to his father." If the great and illustrious Tolstoy, the able advocate of peace, has raised a son who favors and glorifies war, it is not surprising that ordinary radicals make the same kind of failures.

To a great extent children are original, individualistic beings, who cannot be made to go contrary to their own innate tendencies, which they seem often to possess without regard to parentage, prenatal influence, environment or heredity.

LILLIE WHITE.

### COMMENT.

The contrariness of children to the beliefs and ideals of their parents is, in my opinion, not so much due to their peculiar "innate tendencies" as to the inconsistencies and spurious radicalism of their parents and educators. Most children in their infancy look upon their parents as sublime and perfect human beings, and when they observe that their life is not in accordance with their professions, the little human beings begin to doubt the sincerity of their procreators—and lose their respect for them. They begin to point out the discrepancy between profession and conduct, and instead of getting encouragement to develop their analytical mind, they are scolded and told to mind their own business," i. e., not to criticize their benefactors. In short, the parents assume the same attitude toward the children that the government takes toward its subjects: Obey and keep your mouth shut.

My children often reminded me, when "old Adam" crept to the surface, that it was not consistent with my confession, and I swallowed the reprimand rejoicingly, altho I often felt the sting of shame deeply. One of my boys was about eleven years old when I forgot myself so far as to threaten him with corporal punishment if he should fail to comply with my demand. He looked up and said: "If you hit me I shall certainly not do it!" I felt like shaking hands with him, but in the moment of anger a false sense of pride prevented me from doing the proper thing. And I am quite sure that neither of them will ever embrace God, Government, or Mrs. Grundy.

With most radicals their belief is only a matter of confession and does not alter their conduct. As Allen's "The Woman Who Did" it is in reality "The Woman Who Did Not," as Voltairine de Cleyre appropriately named the novel. The woman did not believe in the sanctity of matrimony, yet had not the courage to defy Mrs. Grundy or even to confess to her own girl that she was an "illegitimate" child, and the result was that both mother and daughter were "failures."

When the child of the conservative learns to despise the hypocrisy of its parents, it either joins another church or finds new inspiration and aspiration in the ranks of the radicals, where it soon learns that even here conduct and profession are in most cases two different things. But when the child of Freethinkers, who ridicule God and the Bible on all occasions, finds that its parents comply strictly with the moral code laid down by the very same "God" and the book it hears ridiculed, it goes back to the church to satisfy its soul which craves for some sort of ideal. And when the child of Anarchists or Socialists hears the parents talking against government and punishment, and finds itself governed and punished in the next moment; or when it listens to the beautiful speeches against tyranny and exploitation, and finds that there is a tyrant in the house whose commands mother and child must obey, or that people who talk against exploitation exploit others as soon as they have a chance to do so, it is no wonder that the child becomes indifferent or "ashamed of its parents."

As to Tolstoy's sons, it should not be forgotten that they had grown into manhood before their father was imbued with the radical ideas he now holds.

A. I.

### For New York.

Having received the information that Comrade McQueen's family is in distress in London, England, a few comrades have arranged an entertainment and dance for the benefit of McQueen's wife and children, which will take place on Saturday evening, December 17, at Müller's Bronx Casino, 2994 Third Ave., 156th St. Station. Tickets 25 cents, including hat-checks. All merry and good-hearted comrades are expected to be present.

The first performance of the Progressive Stage Society will take place on Sunday, Nov. 27, 3 p. m., at Carnegie Lyceum, 57th St. and 7th Ave. The program will consist of three one-act plays, namely, "The Scab," "The Broken Pitcher," and "Miner and Soldier." None but members will be admitted. Anyone may secure membership by paying the initiation fee of 25 cents and 50 cents of dues for November.

JULIUS HOPP, Pres.

Last week several people in this city committed suicide after having tried in vain to get work. If they had resorted to stealing society would have been perfectly willing to supply them with food, shelter, and clothing, but there is no place in this world of christian civilization for the proud, honest, and poverty-stricken individual. Have you ever heard that savages and barbarians die of starvation in a land of abundance?

### Letter-Box.

L. P., Quincy, Ill.—That you were discharged because you became known as an "agitator" is not surprising. Charles G. Rice, a retired business man of London, writes to the *Commons of Chicago*: "In America capital is very much better organized than labor. In a conversation I had with one of the managers of a great corporation I asked him whether he had any difficulties with his workers, when I found that the organization was so complete that if any agitator was found in their works he was immediately discharged. Detectives were constantly going thru these works, discovering such men."

M. F., City.—The third edition of Comrade Kropotkin's "Fields, Factories, and Workshops" has appeared in London, where it is sold for a sixpence. In this country the book is now sold for 25 cents, postage prepaid.