# SOLIDARITY

A FOF NIGHTLY 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. 7. NEW YORK, SEPTEMBER 24, 1892. PRICE, 3 CENTS.



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

SOLIDARITY,

P. O. Box 2618.

NEW YORK.

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

Make Money Orders payable to JEFFERSON RAY, Sec'ry. Postage Stamps are accepted.


Comrade S. Merlino, who has so far edited SOLIDARITY, is now on a tour throughout the States, with a view to widen the circulation of the paper and to promote the formation of groups for the propaganda of the principles it advocates among the English-speaking workmen. Any communication on the subject of his tour may be made to comrade Merlino at the address of SOLIDARITY.

NOTE.—All communications must be sent to Post Office Box 2618, New York.

The receipt of a sample copy should be regarded as an invitation to subscribe.

SOLIDARITY PHAMPHLET, No. 1. Facts and Figures for Workingmen, 32 pages. Merlino.—5 cents per copy, $2.50 per 100 copies. $20.00 per 1,000.

Quarterly subscribers are reminded to send funds for renewals to insure continued receipt of the paper.

Organize SOLIDARITY Groups in your vicinity and help spread its circulation.

New York Solidarity Group will meet Thursday, September 29, 8:30 P. M., at 26 Delancey St.

Comrades in adjoining cities and everyone interested in the continuance of this publication are invited to attend.

Send subscribtions for the defense fund of Henry Bauer and Karl Nold to B. Kupfenberg, 711 Carson St., Pittsburg, Pa.

## CHICAGO LETTER.

Once in a while revolts like those of the East Tennessee and Idaho miners emphasize the growing discontent of the wage slaves of this country, and make us think that intelligent, concerted, determined action will ere long succeed present inactivity and apathy. "The masses are realizing their degraded condition; they are waking up," we hopefully explain, on reading of some incipient revolt, and the bare thought causes our pulses to beat faster and rekindles our enthusiasm.

But when we see a vast body of organized, self-styled intelligent workingmen, representing the brawn and skill of a city of a million and a half of people, deliberately elect to humble themselves before a picked gang of tricky politicians, some of whom bearing names and reputations rotten with corruption, when we see those workingmen piling honors upon the very worst of the ill-favored gang, then a reaction of doubt, disappointment and disgust follows, our cynicism is apt to return with increased bitterness, and we feel impelled to give up in despair.

"We are not slaves," dramatically cries a would be labor leader at a committee meeting called to invite the above mentioned notoriously unclean gang. "Let any man dare to insult or slight our invited guests and he will be invited to the nearest lamppost," he roars, and thirty-five thousand "free men" affirmatively respond. Thirty-five thousand hard fisted sons of toil parade their shame and their stupid cupidity before a lot of pot-bellied, diamond bedecked fine workers of the republican and democratic parties; thirty-five thousand voters (we are nearing election day) listened gratefully to the blandishments and blarney of a score of orators chosen from the leaders of the said parties. Did these orators tell them they are slaves? Not much! Did they inform their delighted audiences that labor is robbed of five-eighths of its earnings? Did these politicians tell the workingman that rent, interest and profit are forms of robbery? No. But then these workingmen did not want to hear such unpalatable truths. They wanted their speakers to tell them they were fine looking; that they were the main-stay of the great city; that they lived in the freest and best country on earth; that they were infinitely better off than the pauper laborers of Europe; that agitators who told them they were slaves were a menace to the country, *and they got just what they wanted.* Such was labor day in this city, "the cradle of the revolution" has it not been called.

One notable exception to all this subserviency should be mentioned. The Central Labor Union, comprising many locals, had about four thousand men in line in the parade. These men—nearly all radicals of the various schools—left the procession before it reached the reviewing stand, and held a picnic of their own in another part of the city, devoting the proceeds of their entertainement to the monument fund. They rightly refused to be reviewed and "orated" to by a lot of notorious political workers.

The telegraph will already have spread the news which at present is exciting the good, bad and indifferent people of this burg. Our dapper little mayor has made serious charges, under oath, of bribery and corruption against our pious chief of police. Our pious chief, also under oath, says the dude mayor lies. Our pious chief is threatened with charges of conspiracy, bribery, perjury and murder to be preferred against him! It is a pretty "kettle of fish," and startling statements are promised soon.

WM. HOLMES.

## FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES.

COMRADES,—I do not wish to discuss with DYER D. LUM the distinction between Militancy and Industrialism, which belongs to the Spencerian philosophy, whose ultimate consequence is the full justification of the capitalistic system. But I cannot pass unnoticed the concluding remarks of the article on "Fundamental Principles."

"Not for us to demand *restitution* but *abolition.* Our watchword should be *Freedom.*

"Freedom in the interchange of products, without burdening some to subsidize others.

"Freedom in *the capitalization* of our own resources, without *forced* tribute to the money lords (of course the italics are mine).

"Freedom to organize exchange upon an industrial basis to meet mutual interests.

"Freedom to the resources of life, without which toil becomes a badge of servitude.

"In a word—Abolition."

—Freedom in my opinion, is but a negation—negation of authority, political and economical, of the employer and of the Ruler—still, a negation. We cannot build a theory of a new society on a negation. When the employer and the ruler will be abolished, how will we organize production, exchange, consumption, all our relations? DYER D. LUM himself gives us the answer: "by trade organization, by the union of the workers." If so, we are agreed; but then trade organization and federation are more than mere freedom.—I insist upon this point, because our paper is written for workmen, and ought in my opinion to speak a language that they can understand.

S. MERLINO.

## THE ANARCHISTS PROPOSAL TO REMEDY STRIKES.

A leaflet bearing this title has been largely distributed by our Buffalo comrades to the strikers. It reads so:—

"Fellow Workmen,

"You have often heard the Anarchists spoken of, not seldom with much abuse; but hard words are not argument, and will not prevent opinion from spreading when it is reasonable. Therefore we ask you to read quietly a few plain words about what the Anarchists want, and when you have read them, to think about them.

"You ask, 'How can strikes be remedied?'

"To know the remedy you must know something of the causes of the disease. Read on a little, therefore.

"Whatever force or skill a man has in his own body and mind, he cannot use them unless he has raw material on which to use them and tools to aid him; and if a man cannot live without working, he must die; and if he can only have the use of them by paying a heavy price for them, he must pay that price, whatever it is.

"Therefore if persons are allowed to become proprietors of these necessities of labor, and to grant the use of them on their own terms to those who must labor to live, such proprietors can force the workers to give to them everything they make except a bare subsistence. That is, they can force them to live in any way unfit for human beings.

"And it is precisely this which takes place. This is the disease.

"The rich, under the names of landowners, financiers, manufacturers, speculators, shareholders, and the like, are allowed to become proprietors of the raw material and tools of labor of the country, and force the workers to labor two hours for them and one for themselves out of every three they labor.

"That is the price which they force the workman to pay for the use of the things without which he cannot begin to work, although they have not made the things they sell, nor in any way added to their value.

"This, then, is the means by which the people, the useful class, is disinherited. This is the cause.

"Workingmen! since we have told you the causes of disease, you can understand the remedy we propose. It is that private persons should no longer be allowed to appropriate the land, and the stored up labor of the country, in the form of machinery, factories, means of

transit, and wealth accumulated for production. For the private persons who appropriate them cannot use but only abuse them.

"These necessities of labor must become the property of the working people organized for production, to be freely used by those who alone can use them—that is, the workers.

"If this were done, while no man who could and would work would be unprovided with useful work, no able-bodied man could live without working; and since all could work, none could be over-worked.

"Thus none would be able to live on other people's labor, as the rich classes now do.

"People are now either robbed or robbers; they would then be all honest men and free men.

"We claim that all wealth is produced by labor of head or hand, applied to natural resources. Therefore, all wealth belongs to labor. Machinery, which is supposed to lessen labor, does, under the present system, in reality, lessen wages; and it lessens also our chances of employment, and is continually putting us out—which causes a great deal of what is wrongly called over-population. Although only ten men may be employed in making a machine, hundreds are displaced by it. We learn from this that the workers must get possession of all the inventions that are made, improved and perfected by man, and use them for the benefit of all.

"Unite! Cast away all petty jealousies of nationality or trade! Join hands with the workmen of all lands, who are oppressed as you are.

"Learn to understand your position! It is only by keeping you ignorant of it that those who live on your labor can hold their position. When you once understand how you are robbed, the very sense of your enlightenment will sweep away the present system of robbery.

"*Workingman, refuse to be ignorant! Do not listen to* what the enemies of the Anarchists say of those to whom they will not give a hearing, but listen to the Anarchists themselves. Come to their lectures, read their pamphlets, their literature generally.

"Anarchism is the only remedy!"

## THE AFFAIR OF JULES MOINEAU.

In No. 6 of SOLIDARITY I have given a sketch of the life of Jules Moineau, lately condemned at Liege to twenty-five years hard labor for first being an anarchist of conviction, and second for having taken dynamite from where he knew he could get it, and having exploded a minute quantity on the step of the house of a judge.

The most remarkable feature of this drama is the plea for the defense made by Mr. Royer.

As will be seen, he tries to define his position before the Court, as being that of a defender of Moineau the Anarchist, but *not* that of a defender of anarchism. Yet once launched in the labyrinth of present social iniquities, he became so involved in the entangled meshes of that system which Society calls Order, but which, in reality, is but an infernal pandemonium,—that as he glances towards Anarchism, great and resplendent with the aureola of *liberty*,—his lucid mind and glowing imagination carries him beyond his intended limit.

With a fervor worthy of a sincere anarchist, he exclaims to his judicial audience:

"No! gentleman, anarchy does not mean disorder.... It is the honor of anarchy that, as says the poet, it "bends neither its neck nor its wing, and has for all riches but one word—*liberty!*"

Besides his valuable tribute, Mr. Royer handles the relative position of collectivism and anarchism with a masterly hand seldom found in one who is not a libertarian.

Were the efforts of Jules Moineau to result in nothing but the magnificent speech of Mr. Royer, the cause of anarchy has been greatly benefited.

Now let us listen to the talented advocate:

"Gentlemen of the Court and the Jury.

"Regarding Moineau whom I am proud of defending and who has sacrificed everything for his anarchistic convictions, you are requested to find a verdict against him in virtue of the laws which our tribunals apply daily to professional thieves.

"To Mr. *le Procureur Général*, Moineau is a common malefactor, and, his opinion, I must concede, is shared by the majority of his co-citizens.

"The reason is that the idea of Anarchy is totally unknown to the Bourgeoisie.

"Though in latter years, it has made rapid progress, the idea of anarchy still finds inveterate adversaries among the working classes. With us, the workingmen's Party, and especially their leaders, are very anxious to be known as not adhering to Anarchism.

"Whilst anarchists are members of the great socialistic family, as I mean to demonstrate to you anon, we have seen them lately excluded from a workingmen's Congress.

"It is therefore incumbent on me, to tell you briefly what anarchy is, for, as you see in Moineau, either a dangerous malefactor, a frantic madman, or an altruist intelligent and reasonable,—so will your verdict be given in consequence.

"Believe not, however, that I intend to waste your time listening to a political speech or a socialistic address.

"No, I wear the gown and mean to strictly remain in my role of advocate.

"Two months and a half ago, on the day following his arrest, Moineau wrote asking me to take up his defense, we communicated by letter; for I was ill and unable to come to Liege and see the prisoner in person.

"Sir,—he wrote to me—it is not a defender I wish to have in you, it is a collaborator—let not that word offend you—to take up the indictment of the *Bourgoisie*. I beg you will ask nothing for me personally, for I intend to present myself before the jury such as I am, such as I have stood before the Grand Jury,—a *convinced anarchist*, a partisan of the propaganda by *physical force*. You see then what I propose to you more the defense of Anarchy than my own."

"To this letter, I replied: "I am not an anarchist, I am a lawyer. This implies that if you honor me by calling me to the Court at Liege, I will go with the object of defending an anarchist, even anarchists in general, but not to make an anarchist propaganda."

"I beg of you, then, gentlemen of the jury, to understand well the spirit with which I am going to briefly explain the anarchist theory.

"You are called to judge a *will* which is declared guilty;—you must necessarily know the motive which has impelled that *will*. I do not hope to convert you to Anarchism, but I do not wish that on leaving this Court you may be able to say:—We have dealt justice to a brigand. Neither do I wish you to say:—We have just fulfilled a painful duty by condemning to a silent living grave a good and honest man, but his folly has become dangerous to Society.

"No, gentlemen, whatever your verdict may be, you must know that an intelligent and rational man may embrace the anarchistic faith and hope for the realization of the anarchist ideas, in a more or less distant future.

"Gentlemen, as I have said, Anarchists belong to the great socialistic family. The fundamental revolutionary idea of Anarchists, like that of Collectivists, is the necessity to modify the present distribution of wealth, by abolishing in a more or less complete manner, individual property. Individual property is the base of our economic regime, and it is to protect that property our political regime is established.

"To Collectivists and Anarchists therefore, private property is the great cause of the iniquities and the misery we find in our society. Collectivists and Anarchists, then, arrived at the same conclusion, viz., *the necessity of expropriation.*

"But while the Collectivists demand that the State take possession of all the wealth,—Anarchists proclaim the principal *that all belongs to all*, and that it is the Community which must be in free possession of all wealth.

We will anon revert to the differences which exist between the Anarchist and the Collectivist principles.

"With conservatives, property is the sacro-holy which no one must touch. Those who so speak, forget the origin of private property such as it exists in our time. They forget that its origin dates from the Revolution of 1789, which was, according to the correct definition of the historian-critic, Taine, *but a translation of property.*

"The Revolution of 1789 expropriated the landed aristocracy, which had ceased to be useful to the country,—it expropriated monasteries and convents.

"Our present revolutionist who demands expropriation to the profit of all, demands a thing more just than that which the Revolution has accomplished by taking the property from the aristocracy and clergy, to hand it over to another class;—the *Bourgeoisie.*

Yet we glorify 1789! Even those who find it so monstrous to think of abolishing private property, fall in ecstasy at the thought of the night of the 4th, when feudal rights were abolished. But think well of it, gentlemen, previous to 1789, feudal credences seemed as legitimate as those of our landlords of to-day.

"Let us throw aside our prejudices, and, if private property is inequitable and injurious to all, as the Socialists represent it to be, let us then unite to abolish it, and replace it by conditions more equitable and favorable to the interests of all.

"There are no two ways to justify private property. Every one they say, must safely enjoy the product of his labor. But it is precisely *on* that principle of justice that Socialists base their demands when they claim that all things should belong to all men, that the wealth of the entire world is the common patrimony of all,—the legacy from the past to the present generations.

One or two examples will illustrate my meaning;—Here is an engineer who discovers an arrangement of machinery by which he may produce articles more perfect and at more advantageous conditions than heretofore. That inventor is going to make a fortune. Among you, gentlemen, there are manufacturers, and they know that a Belgian inventor, exploiting himself his own invention, makes actually 10,000 dollars per week. "It is just!"—it will be said,—the inventor has rendered considerable services to consumers, to humanity, and the fortune thus realized is the price of his services.

"We forget, gentlemen, that this inventor is indebted for his invention to all those who preceded him on the road of which he has found the outlet;—to the workers who have collaborated in the construction of the first machinery in the line of his own. For his invention, he is indebted in him who discovered the motive power of steam;—to the inventor of printing, thanks to which he has been *enabled to assimilate the knowledge of the labor of* past generations.

"Here is in Paris, a merchant who makes a colossal fortune. Think, if you please, of the directors of the firm of the *Louvre* and *Le Bon Marché*. Is that fortune the product of the labor of a single man? Certainly not, gentlemen, that tradesman is indebted for his fortune to all the generations of artists, *literati*, scientists, who have made of Paris the unique intellectual centre, which, in our time, it is;—he is indebted to all those who have built Paris;—to those who made all the roads to which Paris is a terminus;—to the invention of railroads, to the thousands of workmen who built the railways which enable us to reach Paris in a few hours. Once more I say;—that fortune is the product of the labor of a whole people and of several generations.

"One hundred years ago, people might still have believed that a fortune is the product of the labor of one individual, but to-day, we see wealth more concentrated in the hands of a few;—we see immense fortunes which spring from robbery and speculation,—from that monstrous thing, that crime against the masses which our repressive laws are inadequate to reach,—that which is called *un coup de Bourse.*

"My illustrious colleague, Mr. Edmond Picard, in his late work on *Antisemitism* instances,—after Mr. de Ravigny,—the origin of the most celebrated fortune in Europe,—that of the Rothchild's."

Here Mr. Royer read a passage in that volume where Rothchild is seen following the English army at Waterloo, staking then, with certainty and realizing in one day, in one hour, *the enormous profit of* 25,000,000 *francs.*

Mr. Royer resumes:—

"Mr. Edmond Picard, relating the occurence adds:—

"Here is that guess stroke which is the *coup de main* of a master trickster, having glanced at the last card of the pack and played a sure game. Since that time, he has been the gospel of high financialism,—his feat has been repeated thousands of times. He has inspired all the parasites. He ruined myriads of unfortunates;—he is the symbol of exalted swindling!—

"And these fortunes so begun in swindling,"—continues Mr. Royer,—"afterwards are squandered in debauch and idleness by sons who have learned how to despise work. And they want us to respect individual property, *that* individual property which has permitted modern society to reproduce slavery under a new form:—*wage labor.*

"Are they anything else but slaves, those unfortunate workmen who toil at a stupid work, in factories, during twelve or fourteen hours a day.

"Are they anything else but slaves, those wretches who, for a meagre pittance, work to enrich the idle, without hope of amelioration in their own condition? Even that meagre pittance is not secured to them. For the worker, progress in machinery, means progress in misery. Each new

invention, which as I have demonstrated, is the product of the labor of all, and which ought to benefit all, means the enrichment of a few among the *Bourgeoisie*,—it means, for the working classes, thousands of arms without work,—thousands of mouths without bread. It is so much iniquity, so much misery, that the Socialists seek to remedy.

MARIE LOUISE.

*(To be Continued.)*

## WHAT IS GOVERNMENT?

"But why do you anarchists object so to government in the abstract? There can be no order or regulation without government of some kind, and the thing to be sought after is good government—*good* laws instead of bad laws." These are the usual questions asked by the persons who will consent to discuss the subject at all. We ask in return: What *is* government? What are its functions?

The answers to "what is government?" given by the people of successive ages, is the guage of their civilization. Under a Xerxes, who possessed and commanded the greatest army ever raised, who could order a number of his choicest young men and maidens to be buried alive as a sacrifice, the people would have answered, "Government is the will of the king."

In the tribal period the answer would have been, "The will of the Chief," and as all the tribe was related to him, his government was usually a lenient one. Under the feudal system, while the common people might have had a hazy idea of a national government, situated wherever the king and his courtiers might be, government to them meant the will of their barons—loyalty, fealty to his interests.

In later days, when the absolute rulership of one human being over a million others began, to the growing intelligence of mankind, to look absurd, government assumed a more complex form; while the common people obeyed as faithfully as ever, the power of the king was hedged about and defined; his rulership was limited; other men shared his powers and his glory. The constitution, the two houses supposed to have the affairs of the people in charge, came into existence.

To-day, not one out of ten among the masses can tell clearly what government is. Generally they labor under the impression that it is an arrangement by which their rights are preserved. They have outgrown the idea that the figure-head called a monarch is a necessity, but there must be *something*; it must be absolute, all-powerful, a last resort beyond which there is no appeal. As of old, the government of to-day displays a personage to represent its head; he or she is really of very little moment except as a convenient fiction to which to refer in every dominating act. The real machinery is just as complex, just as absolute and as powerful, whether the expensive fiction is in its place or not.

A government is the forcible control of all persons living within certain boundary lines under one system, be it monarchy, empire, republic, or aristocracy. Subjects are not affected by the *form* government assumes, their duty in either case is to pay taxes and obey.

It is a machine by the use of which shrewd and ambitious men possess themselves of privileges. *Privilege* lies at the bottom of all the wrongs, all the injustice, all the vast accumulations of wealth, all the sickening poverty in the world.

LIZZIE M. HOLMES.

## GOVERNMENTAL JUSTICE.

Berkman has been sentenced to twenty-two years imprisonment.

The news comes too late to comment upon it in this issue, but in our next we shall give full expression to our views on this affair.

## SOCIALIST LEAGUE NOTES.

Miss Ida M. Van Etten lectured at the last regular Sunday evening meeting of the Socialist League, at 54 Union Square, on "Politics and Socialism."

Among other things she said: "Politics have so long been identical with the craft of priest and king, of wily statesman and scheming place seeker that the best and truest reformers of the world have held aloof from them.....

In this country we find socialists divided into two camps, those who believe in political action as the most potent means of attaining their end—the destruction of the present social order and the establishment of a co-operative commonwealth—and those who only hope to accomplish the end by revolutionary methods. These respective beliefs, that seemingly divide us, are not necessarily a sign of weakness, but rather of an over-intensity of life. It means that we have rallied to our standard men of differing temperaments, convictions and ideas, but animated by one dominant thought—the abolition of the established social order.

For my own part, I am a revolutionist by natural temperament as well as intellectual conviction, but I am ready to give any help in my power to those who believe in agitation by means of political methods. In short, I am ready to help in agitation of any kind, provided that it is *truly* agitating, that it is calculated to make men either think or act.....

I hold, that in no country in the world is the use of the political method, as a means of agitation, attended with so many difficulties as in America. There are no restrictions upon manhood suffrage, and in no country is there less inclination among the masses to turn to political action as a remedy for the evils of their industrial condition. Largely because Americans, from their youth up, have been accustomed to have politics spoken of as synonymous with corruptions, bribery and intrigue of all kinds.

Geo. William Curtis, s[illegible]g of the Abolition movement, said, 'Politics [illegible]e founded in compromise and expediency, and if the Abolition leaders had paused to parley with prejudice, and interest, and personal ambition, in order to smooth, conciliate and persuade, its duty had been undone. When the alarm bell at night has brought the aroused citizens into the street, they will organize for action. But the ringer of the bell betrays his trust when he ceases to startle.' So it seems to me this function of "the ringer of the bell" that shall startle the average stolid citizen, is prominently the work of the socialist agitator at this stage of the movement—to tell them that this highly respectable social order means murder, prostitution, theft, and all manner of uncleanliness and iniquity, and that justice demands its immediate and unconditional abolition."

Gen. Wager Swayne will deliver the lecture at the Wednesday evening meeting of the League, at Cooper Union, on September 28, on "Homestead." As Gen. Swayne is a well known military man it will be interesting to hear his views on the affair of Homestead.

The Socialist League will, if a sufficient number of subscribers can be found among radical people to help defray the expenses, open a headquarters and club room at 54 Union Square, about Nov. 1. If this is done, SOLIDARITY will be sent out from this place, which will be greatly to the advantage and convenience of the paper. All who are supporters of the paper, and who recognize and appreciate the liberality of the League towards all radicals, are most earnestly requested to join in this undertaking and send their names and addresses to either John S. Steele, Sec. of Soc. League, 54 East 9th St., or to the editor of SOLIDARITY. The membership fees are one dollar per month. This entitles the member to the use of the club and reading rooms which will be open every evening. We urge all who are interested to send name and first month's fee at once.

## ENGLAND.

The London socialists are going to try to recapture Trafalgar Square. It will be remembered that meetings were broken up and prohibited there by the Tory government. The people have waited until now to see what the Liberals would do in the matter, and as they have done nothing, have determined to take it by force if necessary.

Mr. H. G. Wilshire, a member of the Socialist League, lectured in London at the home of William Morris on Sunday, September 4, on the coming American revolution. Among other things he said that "there was no softening influence in America to prevent a revolution, which would be much more harsh than any that could occur in England." He also said that the American workingmen were "unconscious socialists," that there was going to be a row about the ownership of the wealth now enjoyed by the capitalists, and what was more natural than that it should be owned by the people in their collective capacity.

## ITALY.

We learn from *La Revolte* that the congress of the Italian Labor Party has just been held at Genoa. The anarchist-socialists were in a large majority and outvoted the social-democrats who then withdrew from the congress and held another of their own in a neighboring town. At the *bona fide* congress it was decided to retain the name of the "Labor Party." The principal plank in their platform was the expropriation of the capitalist and the common ownership of the means of production. As to means, it was decided that the party should take no part in political action whatsoever.

In the meantime the social-democrats had organized their congress under the same name, and demanded the books, papers, etc., which the regular congress absolutely refused to give up. After this several of their best men withdrew in disgust, and the congress adjourned without accomplishing anything.

## TO SWITCHMEN AND THEIR FRIENDS.

The following address was distributed in Buffalo after several ineffectual attempts had been made to hire a hall:

WORKMEN!

We have called you repeatedly to a meeting for the consideration of the causes of your defeat. We have been, however, prevented from speaking to you, not indeed by the ordinary uniformed police, but by the secret police of your masters—who *are afraid of the truth we had to say.*

Twice, in the space of a few days, we rented a hall; but, at the last moment, we were refused access to it. And we are now obliged to tell you in writing what we would have said by word of mouth. However, we will not give up the struggle, and *in a few days you will be called to a new meeting*, WHICH WILL BE HELD, in spite of the shameful system of obstruction pursued by *our and your enemies.*

We are workmen, and we defend the interests of Labor as against Capital. We do not agitate for any political party; we do not ask for your votes. Some people buy your votes, others contrive to get them free by cheating you. We do not meddle in the dirty work of elections. We hate all these politicians who fatten on us, all this governmental machinery which grinds us. We have no faith in Congress nor in Law; both have been used to rob us, and even to murder us—and ever will be so used, so long as they exist. The time when we could trust the Republicans or the Democrats, and expect our salvation from the good will of our masters, is long past. Now we have learned, by bitter experience, to rely on ourselves, and *only* on ourselves.

Were we only united! Had we but learned to stick together and fight as one man! Had we realized the folly of splitting in different sections and each pursuing its own petty interests!

The men strike in Buffalo, they are locked-out at Homestead, and revolt in Tennessee. No attempt is made to bring about unity in their action. Each party ventilates its own grievances. The switchmen of the New York Central demand a reduction of their hours of toil. The Tennessee miners want to get rid of the competition of convict labor. The Homestead people vindicate their right to steady employment, at fair wages, in the place where they have built their homes and brought up their children.

Those workmen do not even suspect that there is a grievance common to them all—*a fundamental wrong* to be redressed: that wrong being that they *have been robbed of the instruments of production, and being reduced to poverty have to work for a monopolist, for a heartless, insatiable profit-monger, who makes money out of the very blood of his employees.*

If the workmen understood this, they would all claim the right to work and the right to the full produce of their labor. If they would realize that they will never be allowed to live a human existence under the present system; that some may get better wages, but many more may be kept at the verge of starvation; that many who now enjoy the privilege of working will lose their employment in consequence either of new machinery, or of strikes, or of their own advanced age, or purely and simply at the will and pleasure of the capitalist; that their children will fare worse than themselves; if they would consider this, they would unite and fight for the abolition of the capitalistic system. The la-

borers and the farmers would not ask for a temporary relief to their indebtedness, but for the right *not to pay rent, i. e.*, the right to use land free; the miners would not struggle for the maintenance of their present wages, nor even for the increase of such wages, but for the possession of the mines; and the railroad men would fight for the possession of the railroads, not for a mitigation of their hard labor. Nay, these workmen would *not ask for these things*, BUT TAKE THEM. Then, instead of a series of unsuccessful strikes, we would have in this country a Revolution, the effect of which would be to do away with the cursed system of monopolies and robberies under which we groan, and to open a new era—an era of real liberty and prosperity for the people of America.

Some people shrink from the idea of a Revolution. They say that ours is a free country where all progress must be accomplished through legislation. You have seen what Congress has done for you, or for the Tennessee people, or for those of Homestead. You see of what avail is the ten hours law in this State, or the law prohibiting convict labor in Tennessee. You have seen what our vaunted liberty amounts to: the liberty to be shot down by our own brothern clothed in the uniform of militiamen, or the liberty of the militiamen to get punished if they refuse to shoot us down. In your struggle against Capital you have seen all the authorities of the State arrayed against you. At election time the people who solicit your vote give you to understand that the Government is got up in your interest, for the defense of the equal rights of all citizen. As soon, however, as you come in conflict with your employers, the county magistrates, the judges, the governor, the Federal Government throw off their mask and appear in their real aspect, as the executive power of the capitalists.

Do not let yourselves be deceived into awaiting your emancipation from the generosity of a party or of a Government—whatever it might be. Be persuaded that, in order that you may get rid of your masters, you must fight and destroy the Government.

The task is not so difficult, after all. The Tennessee miners, the Homestead mill workers and yourselves could have swept away the magistrates, governors, etc., if you had only acted at once and not given time to the authorities to gather an overwhelming force, drawn from the very rank and file of the workmen's army. And if your revolt had found a response from the workmen of all trades throughout the country, the Government would have become absolutely powerless, and the Revolution could have been accomplished perhaps with less bloodshed than a strike.

This is what we want you to do.

Persuaded as we are that there is *no possibility of solving the question by legal means*, that you will never be able to down the capitalists by partial strikes; and any success, you might score, *will bring to you no lasting benefit.* (The capitalists may again reduce after a while your wages, or turn you out on the world, or increase the prices of the commodities you consume.)

Persuaded that the question to be solved is not so much, how much shall be paid to you for a day's work, nor how many hours you may have to toil every day, but whether you have a right to work and to enjoy the full produce of your labor; whether you have a right to be free, and to use the means which nature and the labor of past generations, as well as of yourselves, have provided for the production of the various commodities.

We advocate *a general uprising of the working classes against their exploiters*, in order to break down the governmental machinery by which Capitalism is protected.

We advise you to take possession of the land, of the railroads, of the mines, of the factories, of the machines, etc., which the capitalists have seized; to keep them in common possession as things *to be used, not to be appropriated any more by anybody;* and to organize cooperative production and mutual exchanges.

To attain this end, we must change our tactics. There is no use of concealing the truth, that in this country the workmen are more divided than in any other. We have big Trade organizations, mostly divided by petty rivalries, and entirely dependent on the will of one man—not above corruption or bribery. Not only each trade, but almost each man wants to better his own condition, without regard to his neighbor, if not at the latter's expense. Workmen who have got a "job" do not think of the sufferings of the unemployed, and sometimes fight them to the bitter end. All this is sheer folly. The war between workmen and workmen is a terrible mistake. The talk about the "grievances of the switchmen being no concern" of the firemen, trainmen and others, is blasphemy. To-morrow the grievances of the trainmen and firemen will be deemed by the switchmen as of no concern to themselves; so the Companies will get the best of switchmen, firemen, trainmen, etc., and beat them all in succession.

We must combine, as the capitalists do; and, when we are ready, *strike all at one time.* We must have *a general strike of all the trades.* Then it will no more be possible for the Government to call out the militia and arm workmen to fight workmen. All militiamen will be strikers—and the capitalists will have to do their own fighting.

WORKMEN! This is what we, Socialist-Anarcists, have to tell to you. We have no interest in cheating you. Your enemies are our own enemies. To them no means seem too violent, nor too arbitrary, nor too mean, in order to stiffle our voice, and to prevent the truths we proclaim from being known to you.

This ought to move [illegible] to take our advice, which is:

*Unite, revolt, shake off the yoke of Capitalism and of Government.*

## "SOCIETY" LIFE.

In the *North American Review* for May, Lady Jeune gives a microscopic sketch of a certain section of London society, the "smartest set," which she denounces as creating a condition of things that respectable English opinion considers a reproach and a danger to the country. The only passport needed to gain admission to the "smartest set" is wealth, it seems, as its members are summed up as being idle, vicious and vulgar. Some of their other characteristics are "to have a good cook, to be the smartest dressed woman, to give entertainments, when a fortune is spent on flowers and decorations, to be the last favored guest of royalty, or to have sailed as near to the wind of social disaster as is compatible with not being shipwrecked." In this set the old nobility and even royalty may be found, at least as guest at the magnificent entertainments, but the members are for the most part the "new rich," *i. e.*, the latest successful gamblers on the Stock Exchange or those who have profited only too well by the sweat of the workers. It is good for the workers to learn through the pen of one who has rubbed shoulders with these leaders of fashion and entertainers of royalty how the fruit of their labor is spent. Lady Jeune says, "Luxury, Ease and Comfort," are the watchword of this section of London society, to which those who have created the means that enable the "smartest set" to have its fling must answer with the cry of "Hunger, Poverty, Dirt."

One charge of Lady Jeune against these smart folk is that they are spoiling the marriage market for the aristocratic spinster. A season in London is no longer a happy hunting-ground where wealthy and titled husband may be captured by manœuvring mammas with marriageable daughters. The standard of luxury raised by the smart set is beyond the reach of the marrying young man, and we are given a picture of the fashionable ballroom, where "patient rows of sleepy chaperons and anxious girls await the arrival of the young Adonis, who, after surveying the serried ranks scornfully through his eyeglass from the end of the ballroom, retires below to partake of the hospitality provided by his thoughtful host; and having thus done his duty goes back to his club." So the universal cry is "The men won't marry," and why should they, when in the "smartest set" a man can get all the pleasures and none of the anxieties of matrimony, if he be so minded. The young married women have become as formidable rivals to girls on their promotion as they are also said to be "to another and an entirely different class of female society," so Lady Jeune politely puts it. Men who marry on small means "suddenly find their whole surroundings changed by the addition of horses and carriages, French cooks, and all the modern luxuries," but they open their mouths and shut their eyes, and accept the miracles without enquiring who wrought them. Lady Jeune predicts that, "unless some unforeseen event occurs which will change the direction in which society is moving, public opinion will insist on its reconstruction on a firmer and entirely different basis; and the lines of demarcation which now divide society will become more clearly defined." It may be that Lady Jeune's vision of a new society does not correspond in every point with our ideal, but we concur with her in thinking that public opinion every day more loudly expresses dissatisfaction with things as they are, and we furthermore think the event which could bring about a change is not altogether unforeseen. It must always be borne in mind that the scum floats on the top, and in the refining process of progressive civilisation the scum of society must be from time to time cleared off.—*London Freedom.*

## THE FUTURE COMMONWEALTH.

A FICTION BY ALBERT CHAVANNES.

New York, 1892.

A moderate nationalism limited by an admixture of private property and commercialism is the remedy which Mr. CHAVANNES advocates for the evils of the present society.

"For the present,—he says speaking for the year 1950,—the Commonwealth controls the wholesale Trade, the Transportation of Letters, Parcels, Merchandise and Persons, the Telegraph and Telephone, the Banks, the Life and Fire Insurances, the Street Railways, the Supply of Lights and Waters, the Working of the Mines and a portion of the Manufactures. Other businesses are left to private competition. Laborers are hired and young men serve a term of six years apprenticeship, all goods must be prepaid, stamps being used for that purpose. No Presidents, nor Governors, their functions being filled by the Chairmen of Executive Committees.

Here and there the author rises to a higher conception of social relations, where he says that "we try to govern ourselves with as little intervention of delegates as possible"; and "we do not entrust our advisers with the execution of the measures they recommend, because it would give them more power than any man, or set of men, should have." Vain precaution! The separation of the Legislature from the Executive, which appeared to our fathers to be the great safeguard of public liberties, has proved futile. Power cannot be divided in small portions and apportioned to different sets of men. It concentrates always in the same hands. Either the Advisory Committees of the future commonwealth would have the means to force the Executive to carry out their own decisions, or the executive would have the power to take the law in their own hands. The only alternative to this would be the abolition of government.

The author says some excellent things on Solidarity and on Education. Undoubtedly the solution of all difficulties lies in the growth of the spirit of solidarity, and in the education of the young to that principle. But then would the people inclined to solidarity act towards each other as businessmen? Would they go on paying for everything—using stamps at every moment and for every act of their lives? Or will there be free means of travelling, free means of production, free means of subsistance to all members of the society, *i. e.*, to all those who will agree to work together and enjoy together the fruits of their labor? Will the members of the future society, embued as they will be with the principle of solidarity, care for some little differences there may be in the respective exertions or consumption? Will the society be nothing more nor else than "a business firm, following the same course that a practical business-man would take under the same circumstances?"

It is a result of our education under the present system and of the teaching of the "dismal science", that we do not realize how much is done now by the individual even in economic concerns, without any regard to self-interest. We do not make allusion to political work, which though something apparently gratuitous, is not so in reality. But we remember the rapacious usurer in Zola's "Money", who would have given for his poor brother all the money he had extorted from his thousand victims; and we maintain that even the most egoistic man works the greatest part of his life for others rather than for himself.

The future Commonwealth will not be run, in our opinion, on commercial lines; it will not be worked according to the code of merits and rewards now in vogue. It must be inspired by an higher morality, by a higher conception of social relations than the present ones, *i. e.*, by the spirit of Solidarity—or it will be a poor imitation and reproduction of the living model. S. M.