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. 3. NEW YORK, JULY 9, 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.

THE LESSON OF THE HOUR.

Once again in this country, and this time upon a larger scale than ever, the labor movement has been baptized in blood; once again organized labor, following strictly the lines of its natural evolution, has found itself confronted with the position which the present economic system forces the capitalist to occupy. We ourselves are often sick enough of the game, when we consider that the counters are always human lives, but the game has nevertheless to be played out to the bitter end. Luckily this end draws nearer with every trick we win, and now once more we have won a most important trick.

Let us consider, with the most unscrupulous impartiality, the exact position occupied by Mr. Andrew Carnegie and his partners. They own an enormous business at Homestead, in which they employ some 4,500 men. They are the chief beneficiaries of a tariff which gives them a protection of 70 per cent. on every ton of steel they manufacture, and 55 per cent. on every ton of iron. This tariff is supported by public opinion, in the belief that it enables them to pay good wages to the men in their employ. Incidentally it may be noticed that, by the operation of this tariff and in consequence of the labor of these 4,500 men, Mr. Carnegie alone has been transformed from a penniless lad into a plutocrat whose wealth is reckoned at $50,000,000.

As the result this firm is the legal owner of an immensely valuable plant and premises. The law considers these the personal property of Mr. Carnegie and his partners; it regards these as being solely the outcome of the investment that they have made; as belonging to them absolutely; as things that they may use, or allow to lie unused, exactly as it may please their fancy. It takes no note whatever of the fact that it is really the labor of the men employed there that has created these enormous values: all that it looks at is the money investment.

Messrs. Carnegie & Co. have recently decided to exercise their legal rights. They have said: "This is our private property which we are entitled to use precisely as we please. If you deny us this right, you must deny, in the same way, the right of the humblest laborer in the land to use his kit of tools in the way that he thinks best calculated to bring him profit. These are *our* tools, and that is all there is about it."

What are we going to do about it? The law says that Mr. Carnegie's position is all right; and the capitalistic press cries "Amen." The law is bound to take this position, for the law is not the mouth-piece of abstract justice, but merely the official seal and stamp of the system that for the time being prevails. When we had kings it endorsed kingship as right, declaring that the king could do no wrong. When we had chattel-slavery in the South it endorsed chattel-slavery, declaring that absolute property in human flesh and blood was eminently proper, and should be upheld with all the forces of the Union. To-day, when we have capitalism, it indorces that also, and 8,500 of the State militia are moving upon Homestead to enforce the absolute right of Messrs. Carnegie & Co. to what, in reality, their workmen have created.

But the workers know that, whatever this written law—forged by politicians and dictated by the ruling class—may say, justice has a vastly different story to tell. They know, as Senator Palmer said upon the floor of the Senate in Washington, that men who have given their lives to the building up of a business should not be treated like worn-out horses, dismissed at a moment's notice when it suits their masters' convenience. While they may not as yet understand that these enormous values are *entirely* the product of *their* labor—since labor applied to land alone produces wealth—they feel instinctively that they too have some investment in the business—a vested right which cannot be taken away without adequate compensation. While they may not, as yet, have risen to the comprehension of the sole and only solution of the labor question, viz., that they should be their own masters, they clearly see that the present boss cannot any longer be permitted to be the autocratic dictator of the situation.

To curb this autocracy, to wring some fragment of liberty from the unwilling hand of power, the workers have combined in their various trades unions, sinking all minor differences, standing shoulder to shoulder against the common foe. The conservative minded join them, because they recognize that unionism is the sole condition upon whith they can save themselves from complete annihilation; the radicals, who are far-sighted enough to see that it is the whole system of master and servant that must go, support them because they recognize that from the control of autocracy to its total abolition is but a step.

Meanwhile Carnegie & Co. have taken their stand. They claim their full legal right — the right to be the sole managers and disposers of their own property. They have counted the cost and taken stock of their resources in the fight. Those resources are — the law of the land, with all the forces that stand behind it. They thus are in command of every judge and policeman in the country, of every National guard and militiaman, of every United States soldier. Against them stand organized labor, and a public opinion, still sleepily rubbing its eyes, but dimly conscious that the laborer has justice on his side.

The lesson of the hour is that the conflict is irrepressible: that this is not a mere vague phrase coined for the use of loud-mouthed demagogues, but the statement of an actual fact as grave as any that humanity has ever had to face. Between capitalism and its servant the law, on the one hand, and labor and equity on the other, there can be no permanent compromise, though many temporary halts can, and will most certainly be made. It is our business to stand solidly together and see that every halt is at a station, not farther from it, but nearer to the final goal; to see our way clearly, and to press on untiringly, fearlessly, careless of results, and recognizing that justice must be done though heaven itself should fall.

W. C. OWEN.

MOSTLY ABOUT CARNEGIE.

The existence in this country of a vast conspiracy of capitalists to reduce the wages of American workmen to the European rate, is now a matter of certainty. When the conditions of all the workmen of the world shall have been reduced to one dead level, then some International Labor Legislation might be passed, and the wage-system made somewhat tolerable, in order that it might last for ever.

All wonder what has been Mr. Carnegie's aim in provoking all this trouble upon the very eve of the Presidential election. There was no fear of his becoming bankrupt, if he did not curtail at once the wages of his employees. Does he now want "free-trade"? Is he cornering or concocting some gigantic "trust," or what is his object?—Anyhow, it is terrible that a man may provoke, for personal interest or caprice, so much suffering and bloodshed.

Many people are angry at the Pinkertons, and so are we. But let us not forget that these Pinkertons are mostly men out of work, in charge of large families, and that consequently they consider themselves happy if they can get a "job," even if a murderous one. Most of the Pinkertons sent to Homestead were either kept in ignorance of the state of affairs there, or actually deceived about their destination and the peculiar service they were required to render. The chief culprits in this affair are "Bob" Pinkerton and philanthropist Carnegie.

The storm clears the sky: and this Homestead tragedy must have dispelled many illusions from the peoples' minds. Protection and Free-trade, Republicans and Democrats, Pinkertons and Militia, they are all flour out of the same sack.

Some people blame the Homestead strikers for not having retained possession of the mill, or, if they could not do that, for not having destroyed it.

They forget that these steelworkers are not revolutionists. Resistance to oppression is not Revolution. Revolution is fighting for an idea, for a radical change. These Homestead people are conservatives. They have got in Homestead their homes and families, and they want to stay there. Ah! if other workingmen had struck in sympathy with them; if, instead of meeting and passing resolutions, they had acted, then the Homestead revolt could have grown into a Revolution. A *general strike* only could prevent the Homestead strikers from being crushed. But, so far, there is no sign of such an event.

The mine monopolists of Cœur d'Alene, Idaho, have been too cautious, or too stingy to go to the expense of hiring troops on their own account, but we notice that they have arrived there all the same. It is very simple; they merely get the good paternal Government, that watches so anxiously over the welfare of the laboring man, to do their shooting for them. Our readers will doubtless have seen the despatches in the daily press, which exhibit very clearly the resources that capital has at its **command in the legal machinery of the country.** First the Sheriff summons a number of citizens to his aid. These proving insufficient, he applys to the governor for State aid. That proving also insufficient the governor applys to the President, and the workers find themselves face to face with all the forces of the country.

The lesson that the Cœur d'Alene struggle, coming on the top of that at Homestead, teaches us that the abolition of Pinkertonism, instead of solving the problem, merely brings it more prominently to the front; for, as long as monopoly exists it will use its wealth to maintain, in one form or another, what it deems its rights. Whether the union men are conquered by Pinkerton Hessians, by blue-coated policemen, or by uniformed soldiers, is immaterial. They are conquered all the same—or they conquer.

In Europe it is said that people cannot revolt because they are too poor. Here it is contended that they will not, because they are too prosperous. In Europe it is pretended that, before the people can revolt, they must conquer political freedom and the electoral franchise. Here the people have got the franchise; but it is contended that they must not revolt, because they *may*, if they wish, change the laws and the Government. In Europe people complain of emigration, here they complain of the importation of pauper labor.

People who wish to shun the duties and dangers of the battle never lack excuses. It is useless to argue with them.

CARNEGIE'S GOSPEL.

Two years ago Mr. Carnegie sent round a tract in which he dealt with the use that wealthy people should make of their surpluses. Mr. Gladstone wrote on this tract a sermon for the *Nineteenth Century*, eulogising Mr. Carnegie as a great philanthrophist, and quite the marvel of his class and age. He forgot all about Mr. Carnegie and his peers; he forgot all about the ways and means of surplus making. The matter was, however, not allowed to drop, and another contributor to the English review thus commented on Mr. Gladstone's sermon on the gospel according to Carnegie.

The question, wrote Mr. H. P. Hughes, is not how to get rid of the superfluous wealth, "but how to save people from the calamity of finding themselves possessors of a huge fortune which is full of most perilous temptations both to themselves and their children, and so calamitous to the workingmen and the community at large."

Mr. Gladstone tells us that Mr. Carnegie is of opinion that "rank, as it exists among us, is a widely demoralizing power. I am bound to say that an American millionaire ironmaster, the artificial product of such measures as the McKinley Bill, is a far greater demoralizing power. . . . No one now argues that millionaires are needed to carry out great public works, because modern joint-stock enterprise makes us entirely independent of millionaires, and, indeed, capable of enterprises which no millionaire could attempt. They have no beneficent *raison d'être*. They are the unnatural product of artificial social regulations. They flourish portentously in the unhealthy forcing-house of Protection, but everything else fades and dies beside them. We infer that fresh air millionaires at one end of the scale involve paupers at the other end, and even so excellent a man as Mr. Carnegie is (*sic*), is too dear at that price. Whatever may be thought of Henry George's doctrines and deductions, no one can deny that his facts are indisputable, and that Mr. Carnegie's 'progress' is accompanied by the growing poverty of his less fortunate fellow-countrymen. I say 'less fortunate,' because I am sure Mr. Carnegie is much too sensible a man to suppose for a moment that his vast fortune represents a proportionate superiority over the rest of his fellow-citizens, or even of those who combined to create his fortune. Thanks to unrestricted competition and the tariff, he has pocketed much more than his equitable share of the joint product of Labor and Capital.

"If he thinks that he has made this great pile, so to speak, off his own bat, let him set up business on a solitary island and see how much he can net annually without the co-operation of his twenty thousand men, and the ceaseless bounties of the Republican majority in Congress."

The Platform of the People's Party and the Omaha Convention.

We have had a Republican convention at Indianapolis. We have had a Democratic convention at Chicago. And we have had a People's Party convention at Omaha.

Each party is very emphatic in its denunciation of the others, and of the evils of the present system; but all come to the same piteous conclusion: "Pray, grant us your votes." In the platform of the People's Party we read that the nation has been "brought to the verge of moral, political, and material ruin;" that "corruption dominates the ballot box, the legislatures, and Congress, and touches even the ermine (oh!) of the bench." It is further stated that "the people are demoralized;" that many of the States have been compelled to isolate the voters at the polling places in order to prevent universal intimidation or bribery, that "the newspapers are subsidized or muzzled, public opinion silenced, business prostrated, our homes covered with mortgages, labor impoverished, and the land concentrating in the hands of capitalists." Lastly, it is said "a vast conspiracy against mankind has been organized on two continents, and is taking possession of the world;" that "the fruits of the toil of millions are boldly stolen to build up colossal fortunes, unprecedented in the history of the world," and that "from the same prolific womb of governmental injustice breed the two great classes—paupers and millionaires."

This is an eloquent indictment of the present political and economical system. What a pity that it should only serve as a pretext for a new nomination! The Omaha convention has been a new "caucus;" its incidents recall those of the Republican and Democratic conventions. The supporters of the different candidates were as eager to win and as *personal* as were the supporters of Harrison and Blaine, of Hill and Cleveland. The tale of the sufferings of the people ended piteously in the nomination of two candidates to offices.

As for the platform itself, the People's Party, to cope with the evils of the present system, demand that all land now held by railroads and other corperations, *in excess of their actual needs*, and all lands now owned by aliens, should be reclaimed by the Government and held for settlers only; that the Government should own and operate the railroads "in the interest of the people," and, above all, that the amount of circulating medium be speedily increased to not less than fifty dollars per head, and money be lent by the Government at a tax not to exceed 2 per cent.

The scheme seems to be very radical, and the programme of reforms a very sweeping one. But those are partial reforms, and partial reforms, we know, prove to be futile, when it is attempted to carry them out. As G. Stuart Mill once said, "small reforms have not even small effects; they have no effect at all."

Why take from the railroads such land as they possess in excess of their *actual* needs, and leave their thousands of acres, say, to the Astors? Why confiscate the property of aliens, or non-resident landlords, and respect that of "absentee" capitalists, "sleeping" partners and shareholders? Has a man, only because he resides in a country, a right to own more land than he can cultivate?

Increase the amount of circulating medium to 50 dollars per inhabitant. This, again, is a sham reform. Firstly, it does not mean that each individual will dispose of 50 dollars, but only that so much more money than at present will be under the control of the bankers and capitalists. Secondly, the monetary circulation of a country cannot possibly be kept at a fixed amount, nor the rate of interest arbitrarily determined. No one conversant with financial matters can admit that possibility.

Then, the question has been put, how is the 2 per cent money-borrowing scheme to open new avenues for employment, and to increase the earnings of mechanics, laborers, clerks and storekeepers. To answer that "if the farmers can procure plenty of money cheaply, they will employ more labor," is to argue like the Protectionist, **who pretends that by enriching the capitalist, you** secure higher wages to the workmen.

The facts, however, are that the richer the few are the worse the many must fare. The quantity of money circulating in a country cannot possibly influence the distribution of wealth. So long as land and capital are monopolized the fare of the workingmen will be reduced to a minimum. Monopoly is simply transferred from one hand to another. Monopoly in one thing is equivalent to monopoly in all things. Monopoly is the power to tax the fruits of labor. If the soil of a country is the private property of a few people its raw products are taxed for their benefit. Were, however, land common, but machinery private, the tax would fall on manufactured goods. Were, again, manufactures managed by the workmen on the co-operative plan the monopoly would still operate through private possession of the means of transportation, *i. e.*, the products would be taxed all that the tariff would bear, and the condition of the mass of the people would not necessarily be better than it is at present. If land, machinery, and means of transportation were common property, and money alone were monopolized, the taxation of the fruits of labor would take place in the exchanges. The same would happen if, all other things being common, private individuals were allowed to forestall some products and control the market, as is the case with the Chicago Beef Trust. Here the tax falls directly on the consumers. And, if in a country there were no other monopoly but the big monopoly of Government, Government could tax each and all for any amount. The people having to pay no other tax, rent, or interest to individual landlords or capitalists, they would be able, and they would be made, to pay much more to the Government.

Monopoly is a cancer; it cannot be limited; it must be extirpated.

POLITICAL ACTION.

AN ANTI-PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN.

The reader will find in another column some extracts from a lecture by Miss A. Van Etten.

We have already pointed, in the last number of SOLIDARITY, to a flaw in the lecturer's argument. Politics are a corrupting influence. Great changes must be achieved by great moral forces, not by political trickeries and legislative "will o' the wisps." We must have moral awakening first, then material revolution. Our attitude toward our enemies must be defiant, not submissive. The people at large must be indignant at the state of things, and not nourish any hope for its peaceful amendment. In the old phrase, we must have our assets burned behind us, if we wish to have a revolution, *i. e.*, if we are persuaded that, revolution being inevitable, the sooner it breaks forth the better for all concerned. The attitude of the revolutionist, so different from the attitude of the reformist crank, is his force. He would be a poor revolutionist who would discard it and join the vast crowd of office-holders and office-seekers. We Anarchists, as distinguished from the common Socialists, who only care for the economic question, know what the real nature and function of government is,—we know that the monopoly of legislation is as inevitable as the monopoly of land and capital;—that the same inability of the workingmen to compete with his employer on the economic field exists also on the field of politics; that a law as inexorable as the law of gravity pushes the working man down and elevates the rich man up in the political domain; and that our business is not to put the political machinery under the so-called control of the people (*i.e.*, of the *pro tem.* representatives of the people, a few politicians), but to destroy that machinery, to destroy centralization, to recognize the right of the men and of the associations to manage their own affairs, and to do away with the standing

army of public officials, useless bureaucrats, professional law-makers and law-breakers, wire-pullers, lobbies, and other political parasites who drain the very blood of the nation.

We all know that. We know that nothing but fraud and delusion can come from legislation; and yet we would countenance politics, go electioneering, stand up as candidates, and by our deeds belie our principles!

The example of the Abolitionist movement is entirely in our favor, and against Miss A. Van Etten's position. Why, Miss Van Etten's position is even more reactionary than that of the common Socialist. She wishes us to forbear from political action until we shall be duly educated and prepared for it. She wishes us to wait! How long should we wait? Who would tell us when the time is ripe for such action? How many years are we going to allow for moral awakening? How many more for political action before we reach the stage of revolution? If we *must* have the curse of political action, the sooner the better. We cannot afford, in presence of so much suffering, to wait! Why, the experience has been made—and the results are known. We have the example of Germany. We have the more instructive one of New South Wales. In almost all cases political action was to be a means, and it became very soon an end. Such is its evil nature. The end may justify the means; but bad means always lead to wrong ends.

Of course, there is no thing so bad that no use can be made of it. Drunkenness was employed by the Spartans to teach temperance to the youth. The vices and crimes of governments are the lessons of the people. Now and then some great iniquity has given the signal to a revolution. But we leave crimes and iniquities to those to whom they belong. We stick by our principles, and act up to them.

Opposition to politics does not mean inaction. Abstention from voting is not abstention from the struggle. We are now in the throes of a Presidential campaign; shall we cross our arms, and by our indifference assist the treacheries and trickeries of politicians, and the stultification of the people? By no means. We must take another attitude. We must work—agitate—advertise our principles. We must ask the workingmen to refuse their votes to all parties.

What is the issue? Protection? Are they not undeceived upon the promised benefits of Protection? Will they vote for Free Trade? Will they get their own President? What would be the benefit? They must take another attitude. They must discard voting. They must fight politics. They must agitate for the destruction of the political system.

If they expect some mild reform, they will be sure to get it more easily by "outside pressure," than by representation in Congress. Politicians are always glad to have in their midst some "representative" of the workingclasses; they cajole them and yield nothing. Such a campaign as we propose—an anti-Presidential campaign—will put fear in their hearts.

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.

(*Concluded.*)

"In our city the effects of too early a political movement are still more deplorable. It has for years now effectually paralysed the Socialist movement. It has robbed it of its free character as an agitation movement and committed it to a narrow political policy, confined it within a strictly party movement, and consequently deprived it of all freedom of speech or action—almost thought. They have reversed the natural order of things, and instead of moral awakening preceding political action, they have put a political party in the place of an agitation movement.

"Perfect fearlessness of speech is essential in every effectual propaganda, and absolute free speech is incompatible with political methods. Instead of a great moral agitation that shall have aroused the whole country, as the Abolition movement did in the fifties, it has carried on a 'political campaign' for about six weeks in each year—instead of a grand agitation campaign that should last the whole year round—from November to November.

"About the 1st of November the old creaking political machine is got out and set in motion, and following exactly, so far as ability and means will allow it to compete, the old political parties, it sets out upon a third or fourth rate political campaign. Not even their so much a teaching of principles, a fearless arraignment of the existing social state, as a still hunt for votes.

"At the end it registers a few votes more or less than the preceding year—and then the paraphernalia of 'the campaign' is put away, and silence and dust and inactivity reigns once more in 25 East 4th Street.

"How many agitation meetings has the Socialist Labor Party held in New York during the last few years? How many converts has it made among Americans, than whom there are no people more ready to espouse a great cause, provided it is worthily presented to them?

"I repeat, without honest fear of contradiction—say it in the light of the history of my own country—that no greater calamity can befall a reform movement than *too early* political action. It is true, I hold with most Socialists, that political action may be made a very effective means of propaganda—especially in America, where men turn naturally to political methods to accomplish their purposes. And I consider the men or women who declare unreservedly and absolutely against it to be narrow doctrinaires."

"But the danger arises when we make it an end instead of a means, when it is forced upon a movement at too early a date. When we make a "fetish" of what is, after all, but *one* means of propaganda, and of all means the most easily corruptible and often most reactionary one. When we not only ignore all other means of propaganda but even vilify and misrepresent them. When we fail to remember that, in this country, no great question was ever yet settled by the ballot—that in times of great public excitement, like the settlement of the Kansas question, both parties refuse to abide by its decision—that it was the agitation of the Abolitionists and the crack of the rifles of John Brown in the Mountains of Virginia that freed the slave.

"If the Socialists of this city had spent the time and money they have expended during the last five years on political campaigns, in "all year round" agitation, does not every thoughtful man believe that the cause of Socialism would be very much more advanced in this country than it is today? Would not the time for a really effective and intelligent political movement be much nearer than it now is? For, I contend, the Socialist Labor party has most effectually defeated its own professed objects, and is itself the worst enemy of any political action worthy of the name. Just as I believe the Party in Germany has committed not only a crime but a blunder in repudiating the riots of Berlin."

THE IRON LEAGUE.

This association was formed of iron-manufacturers last year during the housesmiths' strike for eight hours, and is considered to be the most formidable body of organized employers in the country. They successfully defeated the housesmiths, and since that time have been energetic in inducing other branches of employers in the building trades to assimilate with them. Their meetings have been of the most secret character and each member was pledged not to give any information to any individual. So far they have managed to work in this mysterious manner, but a copy of their bylaws and constitution has fallen into the hands of the board of walking-delegates.

According to this constitution the objects of the organization are "to foster, protect and promote the welfare and interests of persons actually engaged in the construction or manufacture of iron work for buildings, and by interchange of confidential views relative to workmen in their merits and demerits, in order to encourage the good, industrious and moral and protect them against the vicious and indolent."

The initiation fee is $100, and the yearly dues $50. They have an arbitration committee to settle grievances among themselves, but are averse to any arbitration with their employees, and if any strike takes place against any member of the association the executive committee is empowered to order a general lockout. If this extreme measure is not considered advisable there is a clause in their constitution which provides that:

In case of any strike or lockout of employees of any member of this league, no other member thereof shall employ any of the workmen on strike or lockout until the matter has been investigated and passed upon by the executive committee, and no member shall contract for or execute any work for any building where the employees are on strike or locked out, except by permission of the executive committee.

Violations of this rule are punished with a fine for the amount of the injury done, such fine to be received by the injured member. The most ominous clause concerns blacklisting. It reads:

All members of this league shall report to the executive committee the name and address of an employee who shall deliberately work against the interest of his employer, with a written statement of the case and reasons for his discharge.

Obviously enough, anyone who is active in his organization is considered to work against "the interest of his employer." A short time ago all members of the association took down the addresses of their workmen. This is an unusual thing to do, but now that the objects of the league have been divulged the men understand its purport. Several first class workmen, holding positions in the union, have been suddenly discharged. They thought little of this, as it is of common occurence in the trade, but when they applied for work at other establishments they were told to call again. They believe now that inquiries were made for the "reasons for their discharge," and when they called again they were politely informed there was no work for them, although other men were taken on within a few hours. The league does not stop at the men, but seeks to prevent the re-employment of apprentices who shall cause the displeasure of its members.

The league was the cause of the great building strike against the Pelham Hod Hoisting company, and are at war with the iron workers on the new criminal court houses.

ANOTHER COMBINATION.

It appears as if, in Detroit, the employers are again minded to throw down the gauntlet to the union. The small bosses are reported to be cherishing the plan of uniting once more with the quartet that has caused all the trouble. It must be said, however, that we have as yet no official news of this, and we for our part can scarcely believe these people can be so smitten with blindness. Simultaneously with this comes the information that the baker bosses of Detroit, Cleveland, Chicago and Indianapolis, are meditating the formation of a national league for defense against the union.

THE CHICAGO BEEF TRUST.

The operations of this Trust are thus described in the report of the U. S. Senate Committee.

Dressed beef is shipped to every part of the United States in refrigerating cars, and to foreign countries in the refrigerating compartments of steamships constructed especially for that purpose. Canned beef reaches every mining and lumber camp, and is sent abroad in vast quantities.

"This great business is practically in the hands of four establishments at Chicago. Armour & Co., Swift & Co., Nelson Morris & Co. and Hammond & Co. are the largest houses, their maximum capacity for slaughtering being 3,500 cattle, 3,000 sheep and 12,000 hogs every ten hours.

"Besides the houses at Chicago there are branches of Armour & Co.'s establishment at Kansas City, Mo., and Omaha, and of Nelson Morris & Co.'s at Kansas City and St. Louis.

"Whatever difference of opinion was expressed as to the existence of a combination between these concerns not to bid against each other in the purchase of cattle, there was no hesitation on the part

of witnesses, even when obviously prejudiced in favor of the packers, in stating that the control of the market was absolutely within the grasp of these four houses, if they saw proper to exercise it. Indeed, your committee, from the first day of their sessions, were compelled to notice, (and especially in Chicago), the influence of these great operators. Commission men and cattle raisers who were shipping to Kansas City and Chicago were obviously reluctant to testify as to facts or opinions which might prejudice them in future transactions."

Apart from the fact that this combine has in its power to raise prices at will, and practically exclude beef from the workingman's table, it should be obvious to every one that the tens of thousands of men employed in this industry alone have no more chance, under the existing system, of becoming their own employers than they have of being elected President. They are now a fixed wage class, and what is to be said of them holds good of a hundred and one other occupations. But in the eyes of every politician in the country this state of things is the perfection of government.

SLAVERY IN THE UNITED STATES.

(BY ONE WHO HAS ENDURED IT.)

Although the political press almost every day registers new cases of slavery enforced upon working-men, few people realize the extent of the evil, and still less are aware of its general effects on the situation of even the most favored working-classes.

Here is a narrative—a simple, truthful, heart-rending narrative—by an Italian laborer. We recommend it to the attention of the Labor Press and of all working-men. It is high time that such ignominies as are here described should be stopped by the deliberate action and the united efforts of all the working-men of this country.

"We started"—thus our friend, C. C., began the narrative of his experiences as a "common" laborer—"we started from New York on November 3d or 4th, 1891, under the guidance of two bosses, named Gai. We had been told we should go to Connecticut to work at a railroad, and that we should earn at least $1.75 per day. We were taken, instead, to South Carolina, originally to a place called Lambs (?), and then, after a month or two to the Pom Pom mines. The railroad fare was $8.85, and for this sum we were indebted to the bosses, as well as for the price of the requisite tools—nearly $3. Thus we had incurred a debt of $12 before we started work.

"On our arrival we were received by an armed guard, which kept constant watch over us, accompanying us every morning from the barrack to the mines, and at night again from the work to our shanty. The work consisted in breaking the rock from which the phosphate was to be extracted. It was a very hard job, and we never would have undertaken it voluntarily. Our day-work went from 'sun to sun,' with hardly a release at mid-day. As wages we received 25 cents per cubic foot of phosphate mined by us. It required an experienced hand to make more than 50 cents per day. I, myself, was not experienced, and, therefore had to be satisfied with much less at the beginning.

"A part of our salary went toward the extinction of our debt. The remainder was invested by us in as much food as we could procure for it at the 'pluck-me-store.' Of course we were obliged to spend our money there, and we only got as much as would keep us from actual starvation. Every article cost us twice or three times its regular price, some even more. A pound of rice, for instance, costs us 12 cents, a small loaf of bread 10 cents, and so on. Our daily fare was coffee and bread for breakfast, rice with lard at dinner time, and bread and sausage in the evening. Yet after a while, as we were not able to pay off our debt, we were provided with bread alone, and with only this stuff to sustain us we had to go through our daily work. By and by we became exhausted, and some of us fell actually sick. We then decided to try, at the risk of our lives, to escape, and waited for an opportunity. One day a quarrel broke forth between the gang to which I belonged and another gang, also composed of Italians (we numbered altogether about 230), who worked close by. From words it came to blows, and there was a great uproar in the mines. Some of us availed ourselves of this opportunity to run away, eluding the vigilance of the guards; and in this we succeeded. I and a comrade of mine had run for an hour or so when, being very weak and needing rest, we decided to stay in a forest. A storm occurring soon after, confirmed us in this determination.

"We were, however, soon surprised by the appearance of the bosses, together with two guards. They thrust guns in our faces and enjoined us to return to work or they would shoot us down. We answered that we would rather die than resume our former life in the mine. The bosses then sent for two black policemen, who came and insisted that we should follow them. We went before a judge, who was sitting in a bar-room. The judge looked at me, and seeing my weak complexion and sick appearance, said I was not fit for work. Moreover, he could not oblige us to work, as there was no written contract. But here the bosses, the policemen and the judge confabulated together in English, and the result was that the bosses having paid a sum (I believe it was $45), the police put the manacles on our wrists, and we were marched off. We were now certain that we should have to undergo severe punishment for our unsuccessful attempt at escape, but one of the policemen, who seemed to pity us, insisted on accompanying us to our place of work, and we owe it to him that we got so far scott free. It was, however, not long after that I fell really sick, so sick that I could not stay on my legs. I stated my condition to the bosses, but they answered, with a grim laugh, that the time had come when they would have their revenge; and they forced me to work by threatening to club me. I was very much afraid of losing my life at their hands. At last, on April 1st, the weather becoming too hot, we were all dismissed, and the works were stopped. My more fortunate comrades took the train for New York. I possessed only one dollar, and with this, not knowing either the country or the language, I had to walk my way down, sleeping in the open air, begging for bread, and selling such clothes as I could possibly spare. After 42 days and 42 nights, I arrived in this city—exhausted, unable to work for a while, and even now weak and sick. I believe that I will bear all my life long the effects of the terrible sufferings of my six months in South Carolina."

Now, such hardships are not borne only by Italians. Slavs, Scandinavians, Germans, and even native born Americans are equally subjected to them. The daily press reeks with just such narratives. The Parliamentary Committee on the Labor troubles in the anthracite region of Pennsylvania, in 1888, discovered a similar state of things in the coal and iron mines of Pennsylvania. It seems as if the vaunted prosperity and civilization of this commonwealth could only rest on the deepest misery and slavery of the people. So, in the ancient world, slavery was the keystone of society, and the cause of its ruin.

SMALL NOTES.

We held some good meetings, last week, in Boston and New Bedford. At the meeting in Boston a few individualist-anarchists happened to be present; but none of them availed himself of the invitation to refute what had been said by the lecturers. Mr. Tucker often boasts of his followers. Our impression is that, they are, speaking in general, a set of *amateurs* socialists, and that they take in the social problem the same scientific speculative interest, as in the question of the population of the moon.

Victor Yarros made some time ago the startling statement "that the more deeply one thinks, the more industrially one studies the past and present, the less eager he is to act and work—except in the sense in which, according to Byron, "words are things."

A correspondent writes:

"The first American *Solidarity* was published here (New York) in the sixties and was set up by its editor, who refused the same position on one of the leading dailies at that time, because he knew he would be fettered by politicians."

This is a good record for *Solidarity* of old, and a lesson of disinterestedness for all engaged in the propaganda at the present day.

Dr. C. R. Teed, has established a Communistic society at Washington Heights, a suburb of Chicago.

No sooner had the doctor and his followers moved to their new home than the prudes of Washington Heights got together in vast numbers, held "indignation" meetings—in fact, became a howling mob—threatened the most direful physical vengeance, advocating tar and feathers, fire, bombs, pistols, etc. This was all done, so they said, "because this man Teed is coming out here for the purpose of breaking up our homes, persuading our wives to leave their homes," etc. "How does this, wittily remarks the Chicago *Freedom*, speak for the good "husbands" and "happy" homes of Washington Heights!"

From the Manifesto of the Pittsburg cloakmakers we extract the following passage, which has been ignored by the daily press:

"The present system of production, exchange and communication which has brought forth the Carnegies, Vanderbuilts, Jay Goulds, etc., on the one side, and on the other side the impoverished wealth producers, the tramps, beggers, prostitutes, criminals, is the CAUSE OF ALL THE DIFFICULTY. Strikes, boycots, arbitrations, will not nor cannot effect a change of the system. All peaceable measures are doomed to failure.

"The strikes of modern times must be on a different plan from the ones of the past.

"The factories, mills, machinery, property, in short, the wealth that Carnegie CALL HIS, was created by us, the workers, and of right should belong to us. Therefore we should STAY IN THE MILLS THAT OF RIGHT BELONG TO US, and thus strike and defend ourselves against intruders; for, mark you, brothers, the same oppression, injustice, strife, warfare and bloodshed will and must continue until the tools belong to the toilers, the products to the producers, and the workshops and mills to the workers.

"When we resort to revolutionary methods, we should be consistent and change the infamous system of production, which is the cause of all our trouble. Brothers! become Anarchists."

The Italian Anarchists have held a large number of meetings in and out New York, during the last two months. They are now publishing a paper entitled *El Grido degli Oppressi*, 116 Bleecker St., N.Y. City. Also our French comrades are busy working. They have issued a pamphlet, containing an explanation of the Communist-Anarchist principles. This pamphlet is to be had by writing to the French Group, Frank Hall, 123 W. Houston St., N. Y. City. There is a general uplifting of the working classes in this country—which promises well.

In Philadelphia, Pa., the *Knights of Liberty* have arranged for a meeting at Odd-Fellow's Hall, 10 South St., to take place on July 23d, at 7.30.

S. Merlino will speak at that meeting, and probably lecture next day at the Liberal League on "Communist-Anarchism."

A mass-meeting, convened by Anarchist, will take place to-night (Saturday, July 16th) at Irving Hall, Broome Street. Subject: The situation at Homestead.

The Solidarity Group of this City meets EVERY THURSDAY *night at 85 East Fourth St. All persons wishing to support the present publication are expected to attend.*

In Brooklyn a "Solidarity Club" has been started for the purpose of carrying on a propaganda among the English-speaking proletarians. Anybody wishing to become a member of this Club or to subscribe to SOLIDARITY *should apply to Sec. Wm. Himmler, 23 Tompkins Avenue, Brooklyn.*

LETTER-BOX.

NOTA.—Subscribers who do not find their remittances acknowledged, will oblige us by writing at once.

F. R. Elgin, Ill. Letter at hand. Thanks.
J. Cl., Pigeon-Cove. Please send articles.
M., St., Chicago. All right.
Sec. Solidarity Club, Brooklyn. Received 50 c.
J. J., Philadelphia. Received $1.
F. S., New Haven. Received $2.
Barcal, New York. Received $2 60.