SOLIDARITY

A FORTNIGHTLY REVIEW

of the Relations between different sections of the Working Community of the United States and an Exponent of Anarchist-Socialism.

[Entered at the New York Post Office as Second-class Matter.]

No. 2. NEW YORK, JULY 2, 1892. PRICE, 3 CENTS.

All Letters, Subscriptions, etc., should be addressed to

SOLIDARITY,

85 EAST FOURTH ST.,

NEW YORK.

Subscriptions: Yearly, $1.00; Six Months, 50 Cents; Three Months, 25 Cents.

Postage Stamps are accepted.

SOLIDARITY.

The word is in itself a programme. It means that the social problem must be resolved, not in the interest of some class or fraction of a class, but of all—*i. e.*, in view of the total abolition of class distinctions and denominations. The word indicates also the method by which that end can be reached. To bind men together, to forsake and fight class-spirit, rivalries and interests, is our task. The present organization being distinguished by class hierarchy and class struggles, what we strive for must be characterized by solidarity. Solidarity implies liberty, as it may only exist among free men, and will guarantee the permanency of liberty in society. It also implies equality of social opportunities, without assuming uniformity of any kind. Economically, solidarity means co-operation all through; politically, it means the absence of a coercing power; morally, it means mutual help, mutual love and the greatest development of individual and social life. Solidarity, therefore, is the synthetical expression for Socialism and Anarchism, taking the broadest and deepest view of both, and of the nature, constitution and requirements of human society.

POT AND KETTLE.

Our friends who feel that they must vote at every election are in a quandary, if they desire to be consistent. They loudly proclaim their devotion to Labor. They believe they can help it by performing what Adolph Fischer called "sawing the air with a piece of paper." Many are gray-headed, but their faith is still young and fresh. The superstition of the political idol has their devotion.

On the one hand we have Trade Unions loud in their denunciation of Reid, who for ten years has bitterly opposed them—and may again next year. They are swearing revenge, and sharpening their knives for his political scalp. On the other hand, to the workmen of this State especially, the "Stuffed Prophet," Cleveland, is equally well-known as a bitter antagonist, the candidate of the "swallow-tails," of the monopolists and money-lords. The outlook for our friends is not hopeful.

Yet choose they will between the kettle and the pot, equally black and begrimed. The superstition demands it, and their narrow-chested and antiquated "patriotism" will impel them to yield to party whipsters, and "fall into line" to elect their foe, vote as they will. They stand between the devil and the deep sea, and think they must rush one of the two ways.

As for us, we decline to inflate our lungs to shout for the plethoric Pot or the *Tribune* Kettle. While thousands do so we smile at their folly.

Friends, is there no other resource? Are you bound year after year to follow some political bell-wether like a flock of sheep? Have you no choice but to ratify bargains and sales of office for a nomination? Can't you conceive of something of more practical import to Labor than holding your hat to such men, like a blind beggar?

If ever there were nominations calculated to make workingmen disgusted with politics and political tricksters, it would seem to be these. If you are disgusted, why not voice it? Why not swell the cry of energetic protest against longer dependence upon such leaders and their methods?

Think it over, comrades. When disgust speaks, it generally leads to action. Your political prayer-meeting gives you stone for bread. Why not return the stones and take *your* bread?

WHAT WILL BE THE END?

We are no prophets. Nobody is a prophet in our time. We know, however, what we strive for—and for what millions of men throughout the world strive. And what millions of honest, laborious, energetic men will, a handful of parasites cannot prevent. This is the ground for our prevision—as to *what will be the end.*

We will have—as disgust for the present political system and hatred against the present economical system will have penetrated the very hearts and souls of the people—we will have a great Social Revolution,—first in this or that country, soon after, all over the world.

Past Revolutions consisted chiefly in change of Governments. This one will consist, after overthrowing the powers that be, in the expropriation of the monopolistic class, not of one particular kind of wealth (land, means of transportation, machinery or money) but of all; for all is needed for the subsistence of the people and for their independence.

The expropriation will not be, must not be, cannot be the work of a legislation, enacted by a Parliament and executed by a Government through an army of officials. That way would be too long, too roundabout and dangerous too; the enthusiasm of of Revolution subsiding, the actual monopolists would agree with the politicians at the backs of the people, and either things would be left unmoved or another system of public monopolies would be invented in which the capitalists would occupy a place as prominent and get a reward as high as they have in the present industrial system.

The expropriation of the capitalists, landlords and other monopolists must be accomplished by the people in a revolutionary way.

Expropriation it must be—and no compensation whatever, no tinkering with laws, no day lost in vain talk and in attempts to reconcile the irreconcilable.

The tumultuary expropriation of landlords and capitalists by the masses of the people will pave the way to a new organization of Labor. In shops and factories where now are a crowd of workmen under the rule of one man, this rule will cease and workmen will work by and for themselves. Railroads and other companies will be organized by the association of their respective managers and employees, the former coming down to the level of the latter, or, what amounts to the same, the latter rising up to the level of the former. There will be a great process of social organization: all distinctions of ranks, all artificial barriers between classes will fall down. Stores, docks, warehouses, will be taken by associations: *i. e.*, the people employed in the different operations of distribution and exchanges will continue their work as associated trustees. By and by the relations between the different sections of the community will be fixed; agreements will be entered into by different groups; local federations, trade federations, regional federations of groups will be established for more or less general interests.

There is no doubt that a new industrial system richer in resources than the present one, and far more differentiated, will spring out of the Revolution.

We can hardly realize the change. What will be the workshop of the future, what will be the home of the future, what will be the township of the future, what will be the man of the future,—we can hardly foresee.

Immense changes have taken place in this century; greater still are in store. We know this much—that no man willing to work shall be shut off from the means of production; that there must be no distinction between noble labor and mean labor, all kinds of labor being equally needed in society; that men must work with their hands as well as with their minds, alternate their efforts and develop all their faculties; that labor must be moderate and performed with the assistance of all the means required to protect the life, the health and the mental development of the individuals, and surrounded by all the comforts and attractions which now are reserved to the homes and clubs of idle men; that there must be in society no idle class, no class of "sweaters" and monopolists, meddling in the relations and interfering with the businesses of the producing classes. No industrial boss; no political boss. No middlemen, no speculators, no profit-mongers of any kind. It must be a true society composed of true and honest men. No centralization. General rule is common subjection. The old machinery of Congress, Government, taxation and coercion will be obsolete. The new society will not be worked by "machines," but by free men united together by the bond of common interests.

SOME LESSONS FROM THE ABOLITIONIST MOVEMENT.

[Extract from an address given before the Socialist League of America, on June 22d, by Miss Ida M. Van Etten.

"For Socialists the history of the abolition movement is full of hope and promise. It was a small despised and persecuted movement, and still it brought a nation to do its will. The abolition movement was not only a small movement, but it always remained small. It never was numerically large and gained its greatest victories with comparatively few members. And what is still more encouraging—they never had much money; when John Brown began the work which was destined to deal the death blow to slavery, he only asked for eight hundred dollars. The Abolitionists too held small meetings which were often the object of ridicule. Daniel Webster described the abolition movement as 'a succession of school house lectures—the mere efforts of a few men and women to talk together, excite each other, arouse the public attention—and its only result, a little noise.' He

...it a 'rub-a-dub' agitation. But Wendell Phillips replied to this in these words which ought to be written in letters of gold: 'No matter where you met a dozen men pledged to a new cause, wherever you have met them, you have met the beginning of a new revolution.'

But it is in its attitude towards political action that, I hold, the abolition movement teaches its most valuable lesson to Socialists. It has been truly said that political action is an American method, but still the Abolitionists, who were all native Americans, educated and trained in the atmosphere of politics, deliberately turned away from political action as a means of propaganda, recognizing the truth that is as true now as then, as true for the Socialist as for the Abolitionist, that moral awakening must precede political action;* believing the words of Wendell Phillips when he said, 'great popular movements must be led by heroes who *fear* nothing and who *win* nothing.' He might have added, not by politicians who have everything to fear from fearless speaking and everything to win by a discreet silence.

Political methods are the same in all times and in all places—ever ready to sacrifice the eternal principles of right and justice to miserable, petty questions of policy and temporary advantages—ever shrinking from fearless speaking lest some party measure or favorite candidate may suffer. This is the very nature of politics, and all history proves it. If we doubted this we have but to turn to a bit of contemporary history that shall establish it beyond a doubt. What do we see in Germany, where the political method has been tried, and successfully—its friends say? *Let the riots of Berlin be the answer.* When the Social Democratic party of Germany turned a deaf ear to that cry that sounded through the streets of Berlin—that cry of the starving masses for 'bread or work,' it proved itself recreant to every generous impulse of humanity—but when, not content with indifference, it turned and denounced the rioters as 'the scum of the population' and publicly disowned any sympathy with them, it was guilty of base treachery to the very principles of Socialism itself, and this act must forever brand the leaders of the Social Democracy of Germany as traitors to the cause. Great Heavens! Socialists denouncing the robbed and disinterested masses as the 'scum of the population!'"

(*To be continued.*)

* If by "political action" is meant tinkering with laws, and electioneering, what precedes it cannot be moral awakening, but demoralization. Moral awakening leads straight to revolution; such is obviously the lesson of the abolitionist movement.—ED. of SOLIDARITY.

Persons receiving this paper, and wishing to have it continued, should write at once.

THE POLICY OF TRADE UNIONS.

On the question of Trade Unions' organization and their policy we receive the following communication:

A century ago the Trade Union was as narrow and sectional as a religious denomination. Those familiar with their history will remember to have read of the bitter jealousies which existed between them. A crowd of journeymen of one trade meeting some of another trade, a conflict between them was not infrequent. They seemed to regard themselves as natural enemies, and broken heads were as natural a result as at Donnybrook Fair.

To-day that spirit has been long past and forgotten. Trade unions no longer, like rural churches, draw social lines at the door of entrance. The wider feeling of a common interest and a common purpose has drawn them into closer affiliation and into common accord. From sympathy they have risen to federative alliance, and present a spectacle of an organized host which some day will become far more formidable than timorous "leaders" now foresee.

In reaching out more and more in this country for private plunder, in organizing into thieving trusts under the sanction of legislation, the exploiters of labor have "builded wiser than they knew." Every turn of the legislative screw which has sanctified extortion, every priestly blessing on the head of greed and avarice, has but solidified the workers into closer unison.

There is an unconscious spirit guiding Unions, a spirit born of mutual interdependence, which ever arises the closer men are drawn into social relations, and against which the short-sighted "leader" of the moment is powerless. Already we see the Unionists turning from political action and quietly and resolutely pursuing their economic ends. The politician is becoming as useless in their ranks as the blathering priest. Year by year they are growing more self-reliant, and confining their efforts to economic ends by their own actions and efforts.

True, we hear much reproach. Our friends of the Social Democracy, to whom the political superstition is a creed as sacred and binding as the five points of Calvinism, still hug their pocket vote—after annually getting rid of their most intelligent members. We have no time to waste words with them, Prohibitionists, and other small-fry political hobby-riders. For lack of better reason they now show their inherent opposition to Trade Unions by objecting to the head of the American Federation of Labor, totally unaware that while they are wasting breath fighting an individual, Unions are increasing and leaving them in the rear of the procession.

The Trade Union is here, and here to stay. There are several reasons why we should give it our hearty support without regard to "leadership." It is a solidified organization, not a mob.

It is bound together by a common dissatisfaction against existing economic conditions.

The growing spirit of federative action presents a nucleus nowhere else visible against a common foe.

The same spirit which unites them, arising as it does from social contact, will continue to widen and break down old-time conservatism.

This is seen in the action of cognate trades federating still closer, as in building trades, iron workers, leather industries, etc.

It presages a future in which the United Federation will become, so to speak, a United States of Trades, and in so doing intensify the unconscious social spirit animating them.

For these, among other reasons, the earnest, active worker who desires the entire overthrow of the present system and is willing the Devil should foreclose his mortgage upon the shriveled souls of the Trust cormorants as soon as possible, he will assist the good work by throwing himself heart and soul into the lines which are so plainly marked out for him. And his opportunity for zealous, intelligent propaganda there lies in the separation of the Union as far from the political caucus as from the religious gospel-shop. So long as their votes and souls are exploited only as individuals, and not as a body, the new spirit will assert itself.

One active man in a small and compact organization can accomplish more good work than nightly addressing a mob where no common tie unites nor bond holds. Nor do we say this in the spirit of the "opportunist." We believe that the growing protest in every nation always marks out its own line of action, and finding the only *organized* form of protest and dissatisfaction arrayed under the Trade Union banner, and having no pocket vote to trade, we find there one field of action. This protest and dissatisfaction should be strengthened, the broader character of the conflict pressed home upon them, the essential nature of the struggle emphasized.

"In union is strength" and here lies the field ready for the sower, a field in which he can conscientiously labor, and only in which he may expect to reap a harvest where organized reapers are to be found when the day cometh. — D. L.

We do not wish to pour cold water on the enthusiasm of our correspondent, nor do we wish to throw discouragement in the rank and file of Trade Unions. Fight the men *must*, and the more forces they can muster and put in the field, through their Unions, the greater will be their chances for victory. The principle of Labor organization is therefore out of question. The discussion may fall on the details of the organization and on the tactics to be pursued. Is the present organization of Unions the best possible, and are their tactics the most advantageous? That the organization and the policy of Trade Unions are not the very best, we vaguely suspect from the fact that, unhappily, in our days almost every new strike is a failure for the workingmen. The number of "scabs" and unemployed is daily increasing; and it seems as if the Unions, however powerful some of them may be, were unable to cope with the arrayed forces of Capitalism. Illusion or dissimulation of the truth will do not good. The outlook for the working classes is very gloomy. The present juncture requires their earnest consideration.

There are two policies by which any separate section of workingmen may try either to better their condition or to prevent it from getting worse. One policy is for them to put restrictions on the admission of new individuals into the trade and to try and get the advantage of their own limited number and of the need their employers may have of them. Another way is to sink the sectional in the general interest, to claim employment for all, to fight the battles of others as their own and indeed all battles of Labor against Capital, in order to bring "a change from below" and a general rise of the conditions of the mass of the people.

The action of Trade Unions, it must be avowed, though occasionally inspired by the second principle, has mainly been prompted by the first.

By high entrance fees and shutting of the books, Unions have tried to secure to their members the monopoly of their respective trades. They have repelled from their bosom many who have consequently swelled the ranks of the unemployed, and have made them their enemies. They have to a certain extent created the "scabs"—whom they are now fighting against.

One admitted effect of Trade Unions (as well as of Labor Legislation) is that they assist great capitalists to crush small ones, and thus increase the force which they are called to combat. Perhaps the very assistance which Unions extends to their members out of employment ultimately benefits the capitalists, permitting them to concentrate and shorten the processes of production, and throwing on the workingmen themselves the burden of relieving their needy fellows.

We acknowledge that these are necessary evils; workingmen must protect themselves against unemployment, and each section of the working-classes is forced to defend its ground against the others, in spite of its better impulses and knowledge. For the evils we have pointed out, Unions are not responsible, but the competitive system.

But then Unions ought to realize this fact and work hard, work energetically, work perseveringly for the abolition of that system. Nowadays their main object is the improvement of the conditions of the respective trades; the overthrow of Capitalism is but an accessory—a vague, pious wish. It should be quite the reverse. They should strive for a thorough change in the social organization, and but temporarily try to scrape out just as tolerable an existence as possible.

There should be more educational work in the Unions. A spirit of revolt should inspire the men, and strikes should be conducted, not on the common capitalistic "cash" principle, but by acts of revolt, individual and collective. There should be harmony between the different Labor organizations, and solidarity with unorganized Labor. The fact that a man is unemployed should be considered a more just cause of strike than the admission of a "scab" in a workshop. Finally the men and their Unions should play a greater *rôle* in the international movement, and prepare for the coming Revolution.

TRUTH.

This paper is an experiment, but it is an experiment that, as it seems to us, should be made to succeed. There is unquestionably a want of some English organ that shall have no moneyed interests to promote, no candidate to elect, no cause to serve save that of truth. For it is truth alone that can make us free.

Krapotkin has well said that what is checking the advanced forces of the European movement is not the tyranny of rulers, or the power of their standing armies, but the quarrel between the individual and the State. Until this is settled; until we have made up our minds whether our aim is to be the multiplication of laws, or their restriction, it is obviously impossible to move.

We see the same phenomenon here also. Setting aside the standing quarrel between State socialists and Anarchists, we find the same divergency of opinion paralizing the ranks of organized labor, and of the reform movement generally, throughout the country. While, on the one hand, there is a steady agitation for increased factory laws, eight hour laws, inspectorship laws, etc., etc.; on the other hand there is a steadily increasing sense of the danger that always attends the lodging of power in the hands of the politician; a constantly growing apprehension that here again we are copying the mistakes of the older countries, and creating a conscienceless bureaucracy that is destined to rule us with a rod of iron. Hence the bitter opposition of a large and most thoughtful class to everything

looks in the direction of socialism; hence, in, the determined objections of what is known "pure and simple trade unionism" to the proposal that it should wed itself to any particular party, and confide to the tender mercies of some politician what it has hitherto been endeavoring to accomplish itself. It should be evident that, until reformers have made up their minds which of these two roads is the one leading to the goal, orderly advance is an impossibility. Without this knowledge there can be no power, be our organizations ever so numerous, our adherents ever so enthusiastic, our treasury ever so full.

The trouble is that, while there are a number of organizations in existence, with their official organs and their official speakers and representatives, such organs, speakers and representatives are all the time *official*. By the very necessity of their position the allegiance that they can give to "Truth" is at best a divided one, for they are paid, and hold their positions, on the understanding that they champion such and such a line of policy, and if the facts in the case do not agree with the policy, so much the worse for the facts. This is the exact position of the old party hack, and this position is the one that the bulk of active reformers are still unhappily forced to occupy, because partisanship still rules the roost. It is among the evil legacies that we have inherited from a past steeped in the ethics of military conflict, and it is a legacy that has got to be relinquished before true progress can be made.

This paper is free. It has no party or personal interest to serve: its sole objet is to seize on the more important phases of the labor question, to tear them open, and to riddle them with light. As such it can perform invaluable work; when it ceases to be such its day of usefulness will be past, and it will be time to bury it. Meanwhile it should live, and we believe that there are enough sufficiently imbued with a consciousness of the value of truth to join hands with us in enabling it to live. In the words of the great emancipator of the negro races, we shall be always "as stern as truth, as uncompromising as justice;" nothing more and nothing less.

E. OWEN.

Individualist Anarchism *v.* Socialist Anarchism

[A letter addressed to the Editor of *Liberty*.]

It is high time that I should keep my promise and explain why I am not an Individualist but a Socialist Anarchist, taking the word Socialism as the common term for Collectivism and Communism and reserving the specific differences for future discussion, if necessary.

We agree, I suppose, in conceiving the future society as composed of groups of workingmen in actual possession of the requisite means of production, and of, let me say, a relative independence. The question at issue is what kind of relations ought to exist between the groups; shall it be free competition, or "organized solidarity"?

I think it must be "organized solidarity." Groups will agree together on their mutual relations, and organize production, exchange, etc., not for competition, but for their common advantage. They need not curtail the liberty of the individual, nor submit to any central committee or other machinery politic; they may freely take mutual pledges and fulfill them.

Society as a whole, *i. e.*, the federation of groups, will take care that everybody has free access, either directly or through the groups, to the means of production. Exchanges will be carried on in a spirit of solidarity, not on the competitive principle. No group shall be allowed to monopolize land, or mines, or ways, or advantageous situations; nor to squander natural resources (as in the case of woods, fisheries, etc., they might do), nor to accumulate wealth and use it in buying the labor of others.

Group-monopoly would be as bad as private monopoly is. Without "organized solidarity," individual interests of groups would prevail over the general interest. Competition would destroy equality of conditions, and lead to the enrichment of some, the pauperization of the masses, and ultimately to the revival of the Government.

These consequences cannot be evaded. Groups most advantageously located, or having control of things existing in limited quantity (even omitting personal differences of needs, capabilities, etc.), would be able to tax less favored groups. It is not "economic rent" of land alone that would survive, but also economic profit and interest, "rent of ability," and many other "rents."

To quote a few examples:

The possession of the Vermilion range in the north Michigan peninsula gives a command over the production of an iron ore peculiarly fitted for the manufacture of Bessemer steel. Presently, a combination of the owners of the mines situated in that region has in reality control of the production of the mineral, and keeps prices as high as possible. Would it be not the same thing if, instead of a combine of owners, we had a group in possession of the mines?

The great bridge across the Mississipi River at St. Louis is owned by a private company which charges exorbitant tolls for the teams and trains passing over it. Would the group which would step into the place of the company not have the same monopoly? Who could prevent it from levying tolls on passing teams?

Certainly, other bridges might be constructed, and some other iron ore might be substituted for the Vermilion mineral. But to do that would require labor and time, and people might be disposed to pay tolls or rents in order to satisfy urgent needs.

Every railroad, every big company is able to levy taxes on the community—to discriminate and to foster smaller monopolies. Why could not "free-competing groups" do the same? Why could not some of them combine against the others?

Think of the immense power which groups situated at ports, or at some inland centre of communication, or in certain cities would yield; and of the large tribute they could put on others! Think that the resulting inequality, small at the beginning, would be intensified by the growth of the population and the specification of industry, and perpetuated by inheritance.

Again wealth would be accumulated by the few, whilst the many would accept the situation, sell their labor, and work for wages. Ultimately a Government would be required to prevent destitute men or groups from revolting against the "upper ten."

Let us not lose sight of our aim.—We wish to have established in society not a temporary, but a permanent equality of conditions. We wish no exploitation of man by man, no monopoly, no coercion, none of the evils of which we complain at present; and I do not say no possibility, but no reasonable probability of their recurring again.

S. MERLINO.

POLITICAL ARITHMETIC.

At every election half the nation votes against the other half—without taking into account the indifferents. What becomes then of the sovereignty of the defeated half?

But the victorious half is again split into two or more sections—without counting the mugwumps.

At the conventions all other sections are suppressed; one prevails. To what proportion is then, reduced the "sovereign nation?"

Now these elections are for persons, not for measures; for leaders, not for laws. Measures are only indirectly influenced by the elections, if at all. There is no guarantee that the measures demanded by the small minority, whose nominees sit in Congress, will be carried out. Representatives easily forget what they have promised; they represent chiefly and above all, themselves.

Let us suppose, however, that votes take place not on individuals, but on issues. What would be the result? Would people be more united? No, they would be even less. The small electing minority would be reduced and splitted further on. The reason is that interests are different and opposed; that society is split into classes, classes into sections; that the interests of the workingmen are antagonistic to those of his employer; that manufacturers and merchants, farmers and railroads, etc., cannot agree; that the North, the South, the West and the East compete with each other for wealth and power.

With the growth of population, of industry, of trade, of wealth, of offices, of parties—the Government becomes less and less democratic. What may have been a fair organization of the American Commonwealth a century ago, has now become a "spoils" system, an oligarchy of scoundrels.

Laws—we are told—are more "honored in the breach than in the observance."

A MULTITUDE OF COUNSELLORS.

A multitude of importune counsellors urge themselves on the workingmen. One recommends the abolition of monopoly in land. Another is wild against the railroads and the billionaires. A third one shows great indignation at the privilege of issuing bank notes, which is enjoyed by a few bankers. Another still is not satisfied with the working of our commercial competitive system and would substitute for it a cooperative one. Still another hits hard at the Government and swears that it is all important to have it swept out from the face of the earth.

Now, we opine that the workman should listen to all and take the good which is contained in each doctrine, without binding himself to any. We need not be at war with any of those reformers, but, before they may claim to have the working classes with themselves, they should come to some agreement between themselves. What if the land-nationalizer or the single-taxer would convince his free currency friend that monopoly in money there will always be so long as there is monopoly in land, or indeed in any kind of wealth? The nationalist has very good arguments to persuade the single-taxer of the incompleteness of his doctrine and of the fallacy of his remedy. The free trader may show the evils of protection, and the protectionist those of free trade. The Anarchist (individualist) may point to them all that a big monopoly is concealed under the harmless appearances of a democratic government, and indeed of any government. Workmen, listen to all, applaud them all; but be convinced that nothing short of the overthrow of the whole political and economical system of to-day may give you peace and welfare.

For years it has been the fashion in certain circles to deplore the lack of an English organ of Anarchist Socialism.

Now that organ exists. It may not yet be up to the mark, it may not be to everybody's taste: but it exists. That matters.

Now that such an organ has come into existence, all people interested in the English propaganda should come to the rescue, and show what they can do for the cause.

Besides the pecuniary assistance, — which, of course, is no small matter for the life of SOLIDARITY, *—besides finding subscribers and readers to the paper, and distributing it at club meetings and in other places,—our comrades may help in rendering* SOLIDARITY *much more interesting and attractive. They should send us items of news concerning the labor movement in their respective places of abode. If we can give at every issue accurate reports of the main labor events all over the country, we will secure to* SOLIDARITY *a large number of genuine workingmen readers, and a great moral influence with the working classes. We present this matter to the earnest consideration of our friends.*

We have done our best. We have refused no bona fide assistance; we have listened to all advices tendered to us; and we shall be but too glad of any suggestions which may come from any quarter for the improvement of SOLIDARITY.

Here, however, our duties end, and begin those of our friends. It depends entirely on them whether this paper shall live or not, and whether it may contribute more or less to the progress of our cause.

Should this attempt fail, a considerable amount of energies will be wasted, and long time might pass before other people will feel encouraged to put themselves to the same task.

Comrades and sympathizers should all be present at the

SPECIAL MEETING,

which will be held at 85 East 4th Street, 1st Floor, on Saturday, July 9, at 9 P. M., to consider the question of the present publication.

NOTES AND COMMENTARIES.

The fundament of the American commonwealth is still slavery. Those negroes who are kept at Chickamauga in shanties and compelled to work, because they are too ignorant, or indebted to the commissary, and those Italians of the Pom Pom phosphate mines and other places, who are watched by armed patrols that they might not escape, what are they but slaves?

"There is no such thing as race prejudice in this country, however much it may be flaunted—unless unwillingness to have the negroes rise in power and influence is called by that name."

The contractors of the Star Route mail service must be a happy set of people. Their only work is to sublet the routes for a lower price than they receive at the hands of the Government. The men, to whom the routes are sublet, have to work every day in rain, snow, sleet, or hail, and yet do not make fifty cents per diem. Besides, they have to furnish their own conveyance. The case is very characteristic of the present industrial system.

"It is not many years ago," we are reminded by the Civil Service Record, "that public men of all shades of political opinion began instinctively to realize that with the enormous increase of population and the steadily advancing *ratio* of increase, with a corresponding multiplication of public officeholders of all kinds, a time would come, and that very soon, when it would be quite possible for either of the two great parties to perpetuate itself indefinitely in power and create an officeholding oligarchy."

This looks like a new version of the theory of rent—its extension to politics. Somebody should write a book on "Progress and Tyranny" as a necessary complement of "Progress and Poverty."

"Will the newspapers and politicians who, some of them ignorantly—but others, we are sure very insincerely, are calling upon Congress for "more legislation against Trusts," give us surcease of such nonsense? It has already been shown that such legislation was powerless; it now appears (from an opinion of Judge Jackson in the case against the Whiskey Trust) that Congress has no power to pass it."

"The only effective legislation—adds the *New Nation*—against the trusts is nationalisation."—But has Congress the power to pass it? and will it ever be passed by Congress?

The Nicaragua Canal Bill is a colossal job. If the canal must be built at all—says the *New Nation*—it must be built by the United States in conjunction with Nicaragua and Costa Rica, without partnerships of any sort with private capitalits. "It must be a public work, carried on at cost.—What public work was ever carried on cost, we would be fain to know.

A definition of nationalism. "The substitution for the present industrial system of the public conduct of all industry by the people through their chosen agents, for their equal benefit."—By the people through their chosen agents? It seems more correct to say: by the agents, thanks to the choice of the people—or to the "machine." Another question is if the industry will be conducted by the agents for their own, or the public interest.

If the workingmen get disgusted with politics—says Judge Gresham—they will resort to revolution.—Amen.

POLITICS AND UNIONISM.

"The experience of the last few decades has clearly shown that, in the present stage of evolution, the economic organization of the American working class is seriously injured by the attempt to force the organization, *as such*, into the political conflit. The corruption and disorganization which the so-called forced politics have introduced into the labor movement are too well known for it to be necessary for me here to dwell upon them. But the class politics of Socialism have also, in spite of, or perhaps precisely because of their importance, being one of agitation alone, proved only too often an apple of discord, and given the most uncleanly and the most purchasable elements in the various organizations the opportunity of posing as "pure" trade unionist, and of representing the Socialists as enemies of peace. Class consciousness has thus been repeatedly endangered, instead of being furthered, and, upon the whole, even from the point of view of agitation, the results are problematical, as is shown by the fact that the Socialist vote remains about stationary, and that all attempts to make an English labor paper self-supporting have failed. This is owing simply to the fact that the existing economic, social, and intellectual conditions have as yet failed to arouse the mass of American workers to the necessity not alone of class politics, but, I might say, of *any politics* at all, in the ideal sense of the term. Their horizon does not reach beyond the struggle for certain special measures whose importance is in most cases worse than illusory. Inasmuch, therefore, as such special measures are always to be had in the quack drug-stores kept by both the exploiting parties, the necessity of throwing both parties over-board has never been really appreciated. The forcible dragging of the organizations into politics cannot change this, but, on the contrary, by the discontent that it creates it will discredit the ideas in the eyes of the masses, and thereby endanger the harmonizing of economic interest.

"This is how matters actually stand. In reality the political herring-salad which, for example, is to be found in the brain-plate of "Grand-Constitutionalist" Powderly, is typical of the ideas of 90 per cent. of the American workingmen. And, until this herring-salad shall have been sent the way of all other indigestible food, a political class movement, in the large, world-shaking sense of the term, is—a mere dream."

"SERGIUS SHEVITSCH."

THE EIGHT HOURS-DAY.

We reprint here a manifesto distributed in New York on May-day:

"Once more we call upon the ruling classes to alleviate the burden of labor—a burden that rests solely upon us. Yet, even this time, we presume our demand will remain ungranted.

"The very classes and Governments, who—though themselves living by violence—denounce in indignant terms that employed by mobs and revolutionists to further the cause of justice and progress, and find no punishment too severe to inflict upon the perpetrators, remain unmoved by our pacific appeals and humble entreaties.

"To disregard our sufferings and wishes is the beginning and end of all their wisdom.

"In this they are all agreed. Politicians, capitalists, lawyers and economists, forget their domestic quarrels and rivalries, and bring the whole machinery of law and authority, as well as that of wealth and scientific humbug, to bear against our most sacred rights.....

"In vain! They may postpone for a short time the fulfillment of our hopes; avert it they cannot. Their very resistance to demands so moderate as are ours to-day, serves our cause and renders its triumph nearer and more sure.

"*The capitalists oppose the eight hours day, that the workingmen may not claim more afterwards; and the workingmen will claim and get more at once, simply because the capitalists oppose the eight hours day.*

"Small reforms are more difficult to realize than are great ones.

"The failure of the eight hours movement justifies Social Revolution.

"Were we to get this reform, our lot would not be appreciably improved. The benefit of short hours, counteracted by increase of machinery, by stricter factory regulations, by a more extensive employment of women and children, and an aggravation of the sweating system, would be nil. Our dependence upon the capitalist and our submission to his despotic power would be increased. We should not all indeed be satisfied with the change, but some would. Division and discord would creep into our ranks. Besides, whilst we strive year after year for an insignificant reduction of our daily toil, or for the addition of a few cents to our daily wages, the capitalists accumulate millions by the hundreds. Speculations, poolings, watered stocks, protective duties, raids on the Government and the Municipalities, bring to them in one day more wealth than they may lose in years by restrictions put upon them as employers of labor.

"Such is the evil nature of the system, that its iniquities are increased by the very attempt to heal or palliate them.

"Such a system cannot last; it is doomed to ruin. But, inevitable as the downfall of capitalism is, it will not be brought about by mere accident. Men uphold it; men most attack and destroy it. No amount of passionate declamations, nor even of good arguments are of avail against facts. Ideas are a force, but only when we act upon them. We must make up our minds to fight. Capitalism has had its day and is now an anachronism. The division of mankind into workers and idlers, servants and masters, is a monstrosity not to be tolerated any longer. Every step forward that civilization takes, makes the system more untenable. To uphold it more iniquities and crimes, more frauds and robberies have to be committed with every day that it endures.

"We are called upon to live a nobler life, by getting rid of monopoly and oppression, by putting an end to the owning, hiring and exploiting of man by man; by taking possession of the instruments of labor, and organizing production for the common welfare.

"Workers, rise! Emancipate yourselves from your masters! Organize, co-operate, respect, help and love each other! Be free and united; as just, as equal, and as happy as men may be.

A Group of Socialist-Anarchists.

NEW YORK, May 1st, 1892.

NOTICE.—A few copies of this manifesto having remained in our possession, we will gladly remit them to anybody wishing to circulate them. Write to the address of *Solidarity*.

SYNOPSIS.

I. Every man, if he is able, shall work in order to share in the benefits of society.

II. The labor performed by the individual must be useful to society. Usury, speculation, monopoly, are injurious work, if they are work at all.

III. In order to work and produce, the means of production are needed, that is to say, the land, machinery, factories and raw materials. Therefore these things should be possessed in common by the workers.

IV. Labor shall not be a sheer manual toil, but shall be alternatively manual and intellectual, and not excessive. Class distinctions shall cease to exist. Medical doctors, architects, accountants, etc., are surely useful members of society; but agriculturists, artisans, etc., are still more useful and there is no reason why the former should rank above the latter.

V. Work is generally done in co-operation by a certain number of men. The means of production being, therefore, in the possession of the different associations, will practically be at the disposal of all the workers.

VI. Each association will discuss and fix the conditions and arrangements for the work to be carried on in it, but arrangements will be made between the associations for the common interests.

VII. The exchanges will take place directly between the associations, without middlemen, forestallers, commission agents or speculators. Money is not needed.

VIII. No ruling-class, no Parliament, no Executive must be allowed in such a society; any centralization leads to power, and power breeds privilege and monopoly.

IX. The sexual union shall be prompted by love alone, not by interest. The woman shall be economically emancipated from the man, and *vicersa*. The sons, attached to their parents by ties of affection, are also related to society, which owes to each child subsistence, instruction and, at its proper time, the means wherewith to work.

X. The realization of these principles cannot take place under the present system, nor can take place under the present system any substantial amelioration of the lot of the working classes. Reforms have been tried everywhere with no effect; they all break against the established power and the vested interests of the ruling class; hence the necessity for Social Revolution to destroy Government, expropriate capitalists, and reconstruct "society" on the basis of Solidarity and Freedom.