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. 15. NEW YORK, JANUARY 21, 1893. 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.

Written for Solidarity.

Far back and down the lapse of time,
I ranged my vision and I saw
The efforts of all men to lead the rest
To think as they think, act as they act,
And use their various methods of persuasion

I saw old Superstition plan the rack,
Invent his thumbscrews, and apply the torch
To man and woman, and command:
"Think as I think, act as I act;
This is *my* method of persuasion."

I saw old Kingcraft on his throne of state,
"I think and act for pomp and power," said King;
The dungeon, keep, the gibbet, all is mine;
This is *my* method of persuasion."

I saw the Soldier's fratricidal sword,
Pierce manly heart and woman's breast;
"I fight for plunder and I fight for king;
"Think as I think, act as I act;
This is *my* method of persuasion."

I saw old Fossil, with his Code of Law,
Chicanery and lying and deceit,
Prevail upon the world to worship sophistry:
"Think as I think, act as I act;
This is *my* method of persuasion."

So Priest-craft, King-craft, War-craft, Law-craft, all
Have used deceit of force, to rob the many,
We say "be free"—"Think freely for yourselves;"
This is *our* method of persuasion.

B. H.

THE WORKING OF THE YEAST

France to-day offers us an object-lesson in "Republican government," that radicals should utilize to the utmost. According to all orthodox theories, the Deputies, Senators, Ministers and the President represent the people. They occupy their exalted stations solely as guardians of the public weal."

The bankers, contractors and capitalists generally are trustees. Their functions are wholly beneficial to society, according to bourgeois philosophy and the Press. Why the Press is the Palladium of our liberties—exposing all evil designs, public questions, educating public opinion, holding all the other trustees to a strict accountability before the whole people, so far the theory, the theory accepted religiously by the vast majority, and forming to-day the foundation of our whole society. Destroy this belief in the beneficence of our governmental institutions and the whole fabric will crumble and disappear.

The Panama canal project was inaugurated by the Count de Lesseps. A billion francs, 200 millions of dollars was subscribed by the small farmers, the shop-keepers and artisans of France in the hope of securing an income. Thrift is the great bourgeois virtue, and enterprises like this are national blessings we are told, for they encourage and reward self-denial and toil. The project was lauded by the press of France. De Lesseps was a national hero. The Government lent its aid. Every old stocking in France was emptied into the treasury of the Company. Honest men, including eminent engineers, builders, and economists, who declared the project a physical and financial impossibility, honest writers who exposed the annual extravagance of the management were denounced, but at last the inevitable collapse came. The money was gone and the deluded investors had practically nothing for their money, but a lot of waste paper. The projectors, contractors and bankers rolled in wealth. At last the Government was forced by the clamor of the receiver—investors, aided and directed by the Royalist Pretenders, the partisans of the Bonapartes and politicians who hoped to supplant the present rulers—into investigating the scandals. When this became inevitable Reinach, the great banker, committed suicide. At first they tried to discredit their accusers as enemies of the republic. But the facts as they disclose themselves have forced the Government into discarding a number of eminent defenders of the social order—Rouvier, Floquet.

Freycinet and Baihut are no longer ministers. Yesterday they were patriots, statesmen; to-day they await their trials as criminals — with De Lesseps, Fontane, Cottu, Eiffel, and a host of others yet to come — and for what. For being found out. The great projectors stand revealed by their own testimony as swindlers. The great bankers and contractors, participants and blackmailers. The Government is revealed as a part of the criminal organization.

"I gave Baihut (the Minister of Commerce) the money he demanded, as one gives up ones wallet to a highwayman," said Chas. De Lesseps to the examining magistrate. All France to-day awaits the news that Carnot, the President shall be proven to have shared the plunder. He is accused already. And the press stands revealed in its true character as a loathsome parasite on the exploiting, swindling pirates who to-day rule and rob the masses—clamorous for a share in the booty, ready for any vile service so long as a small share of the booty is doled out to the journalists. The hope of the monarchists to restore the ancient regime is a vain one. People are forgetful, but they remember that in the days of the most christian king — the kings mistresses, relatives, courtiers and lackeys took bribes as shamelessy as the Republicans of to-day.

The ancient regime belongs to history. The monarchists can render good service only in exposing the rottenness of the present order. As for the Empire — Zola finished that. The "Debacle" is its final epitaph. The socialists and anarchists have now their opportunity, let us hope they will improve it. We are sure they are doing so. In England thrift has also been encouraged in true bourgeois fashion. The Liberator Building Society has collapsed and 3500 millions of dollars have disappeared. It may yet occur to the ruined shareholders to ask the Hon. Mr. Balfour, late of her Majesty's Government and present M. P. and the Hon. directors where it has gone to. The Social Democratic Federation is carrying on the "unemployed agitation," and, altogether, the position of the Liberal Government is not comfortable. In Germany the social policy of the Emperor has received a severe check. The coal miners of the Saar district, whom he had taken into his special charge, have revolted against a proposed reduction of wages. Socialist and anarchist agitators have been busy; and most hopeful of all, the women are reported as being the most determined rebels, urging on their husbands and brothers. The Emperor has of course announced that no mercy will be shown, and that, if necessary, a whole army corps would be used to restore "Order." The Social Democrats disclaimed all responsibility for the hopeless strikes. But the yeast is working nevertheless. In this country only the strife of the Populists to control the legislatures of several Western States is of interest. But even here the social question will not down. Every magazine has several articles. The last Forum had no less than four, including one from Prof. Geffken on German socialism, which makes the most astounding admissions in regard to economic and political conditions in Germany. We are entering upon a year that will be a momentous one, let us take courage and do our share of work. EDELMANN.

SPEECH OF P. KROPOTKINE.

We cannot better commemorate the death of our brethren of Chicago than by casting a glance on the progress of the ideas for which they lived and died, after having been so cruelly tortured for 18 months by the American land and money grabbers.

The beginnings of the Anarchist party were very modest. It was born from a protest, which soon became a fierce struggle against the authority constituted within the International Working Men's Association. This modest beginning, concealed, however, a great principle—that of negation of authority altogether, in all relations between the members of a Society, and a high ideal—that of a Society based upon the full liberty of the individual, and the free grouping of free individuals, free groups, and free federations of groups.

The party found support for its ideas from many quarters. It proved to be in accordance with the great work, the criticism of authority, which was going on in the depths of the toiling classes. And it proved to be in accordance with the thought which has been of late occupying a more and more prominent position in the writings of modern philosophers.

The idea grew; it found support in both philosophy and science; it developed. And however few the numbers of Anarchists were, the Anarchist idea was so much in accordance with the modern progress of thought that at this moment, we say, that it has already deeply modified the current conceptions upon many vital questions connected with the great strife for the emancipation of man.

The conceptions as to the relative parts played by Evolution and Revolution in the progress of mankind have totally changed of late. No intelligent man can now oppose Evolution to Revolution,—it being evident that both are only two aspects of the same progress. Checked Evolution calls

forth a Revolution, and the principles proclaimed by a Revolution are applied to life by subsequent Evolution. Even some prominent Darwinians recognize now that revolutions have been necessary parts of past organic evolution. The more so in human life Revolution is a necessary part of human Evolution.

The conceptions upon authority have also immensly changed. Confidence in it is being rapidly lost. While twenty years ago the adversaries of authority were treated by Social Democrats as fools, these same Social Democrats are brought to bend before the disrespect for authority which is felt in their own ranks. The State Socialists are now compelled to repudiate State Socialism—at least in their programs—and they are compelled every day to part with the authority which they formerly considered as a necessary condition of Socialist success. The Social Democratic groups claim freedom for each one of themselves, and the formerly autocratic leaders are bound to recognize this autonomy of groups. The old argument as to the autonomous groups going to annihilate each other by their struggles would simply appear laughable, if it were unearthed from the Social Democratic papers of twenty years ago and brought on the platforms of to-day.

You all remember the unhappy imaginary Commune of the authoritarian's argument, which Commune was refused any independence on the ground that it would—our adversaries said—oppose any progress of the remainder of the nation. How often did we hear of this bogus Commune in our discussions! The argument would now appear simply ridiculous. The most authoritarian Socialists are bound to inscribe the municipalization of property in their programs, and to recognize the free Commune as a necessary basis of a free nation.

In Economics the idea of an entire reconstruction of the whole system of production has become generally accepted. He who would now maintain that the Social Revolution must simply consist in every worker returning to his workshop and there sharing his part of the surplus value—he who would now repeat this formula of old Marxism—would simply appear a ghost of times past. The evil, we all know, is not in an unfair distribution of surplus value, it is not in low wages, nor in long hours,—but in the wage-system itself, in a wrong direction given to production under the wage-system, in the very possibility and existence of such a thing as what has been improperly named surplus value. And in proportion as these ideas spread, the Communist ideal gains ground, and no thinking man would shudder now at the idea of Communist Communes and communistically producing groups entering into free agreements for carrying on such matters as require the agreement of many groups or many Communes. Yet twenty years ago such ideas were simply looked upon as foolish.

At the same time, the impossibility of representative government is being clearly demonstrated even within the Socialist party itself, not to mention larger groups such as cities, nations, and federation of nations; the necessity of taking out of the hands of the State the functions which it has appropriated to itself, according as power fell more and more into the hands of the middle-class, becomes more and more evident. Not "limitation of power" but "abolition of power" becomes now a common watchword even outside our circles.

Another point—the free initiative of group and of individual—also becomes more and more understood, even amidst the workers grouped under authoritarian programs. It becomes evident that initiative is the only condition of progress within the Socialist party itself, and that in proportion as it is checked, regress in the party becomes inevitable. We Anarchists understand, and a number of others begin to understand as well, that it is a thousand times better that the workers, and the younger revolutionists altogether, commit the worst mistakes, or even faults, than to have the individual always guided, always directed, always obeying and never acting under his own free impulse and responsibility. All revolutions have been moments of free play of the individual, not moments of submission of the individual to an authority which may think itself very wise—but always represents only the average mediocrity of the past.

Anarchy was born as an expression of the deeply felt necessity of a thorough revising—not only of the present laws or economical relations and their principles, but also of the very forms and habits of daily life. This work is going on rapidly and extends to ever wider spheres. The moral ideals of old are submitted to a thorough revision; the sanction which they formerly received from religion, metaphysical philosophy, or custom, is attacked at its root; and the very anti-social theories which from time to time prevail in our own ranks are, for us, simply tokens of a great work of thought which is going on in all classes of society, and especially among the workers. The cowards are afraid of this work. They would gladly reintroduce the whip of the State and the stake of the Church for fear that such theories might sap the foundations of moral feelings in human society. We are not afraid of these kind of opponents, however far they would go. The moral bases of society—and each society, human or animal, has such bases—are in danger, not from those of the working classes who throw overboard the old teachings, in order to find new, higher and sounder bases for public morality, but from those who hypocritically maintain that they respect the old bases and yet undermine public morality by the acts of their false lives. The anti-social views which we now have developed among ourselves are a protest against this hypocrisy. They are a work of epuration of the stiffling atmosphere of lies and sophisms which surround us, and they are the best proofs that society, as a whole, is thirsting for greater justice, for grander ideals, for more human relations among us.

In Science, in Literature, in Art, and in Philosophy, we now see going on a great movement of thought which gives further and wider support to the bases of that grand idea, Anarchy, which certainly will be the leading idea of the Evolution already spreading in the civilized world.

European thought, in all its branches, proves the correctness of the principles which were laid down by our predecessors in the Anarchist branch of the International Workingmen's Association. It proves that they had struck the right key, and had inscribed on their banner such principles as really have become the basis of further Evolution among mankind. But what is to be done now in the practical field for a further development of our ideas? The results hitherto achieved are grand. But much remains to be done, and what is the next task before us?

To tell my thoughts in a few words, I should say that the chief point to be achieved now, is to make the Anarchist ideas permeate the great labor movement which is so rapidly growing in Europe and America; and to do so by all those means, and only by such means, which are in strict accordance with our own principles—without any concession to the present authoritarian or narrow tendencies of the movement. To be in the movement, BUT YET ALWAYS REMAIN OURSELVES, without making any of those concessions which often seem to be expedient, but in the long run always prove to be an abandonment of true principles for a mere shadow of momentary success.

No one can underrate the importance of this labor movement for the coming revolution. It will be those agglomerations of wealth producers which will have to reorganize production on new social bases, they will have to organize the life of the nation and the use which it will make of the hitherto accumulated riches and means of production. They—the laborers, grouped together—not the politicians.

The importance of the movement is so well felt that you see now, especially in this country, how all parties court it, in order to take possession of it.

By all means,—let us NOT join in this struggle for supremacy. We cannot, we must not nourish any such ideas as that of taking possession of the movement. We should cease to be ourselves the day that any such plan would be born in our minds. We do not want to take possession of anything, just as we ourselves will surrender to none. And the more we keep aloof from any such dreams of ruling, the more ascendency our ideas will have in the movement.

But to bring our ideas into that movement, to spread them, by all means, among those masses which hold in their hands the future issue of the revolution, is our duty—a duty which we have not yet taken sufficiently to heart.

After having had our period of isolation—during which period we have elaborated and strengthened our principles—let us now enter the "wide, wide world" and propagate among the masses the ideas which we consider as the bases of the coming development. If we had no choice between either to cease to be ourselves or to remain isolated, we most certainly should choose the latter, and lay our hopes on the mere infiltration of right ideas which always succeed in the long run. But great obstacles always yield before the firm will of resolute men, and the obstacles which we now meet in our way will yield to us, being resolved. The collective intelligence, the individual initiative, and a firm will must break the walls which are now skillfully erected by political intriguers between the toiling masses and the teachers of Anarchist ideas. But these walls will be broken just as the walls which formerly separated us from the Social Democratic masses have been broken! And it is only in the great working masses—supported by their energies, applied by them to real life—that our ideas will attain their full development. And the more we remain ourselves, the less we let ourselves be influenced by the surroundings, the purer we keep the grand ideas which humanity has always endeavored to realize and which we, having learned them from the unspoken ideal of the masses, now strive to bring to life within the masses—the purer we keep these ideas, the greater will be their effect.

Our aim is very grand, and the very obstacles must stimulate the energy to realise it. History show us that the Anarchists have now remained the sole bearers of the Socialist ideal which inspired the great movement of the International twenty years ago. All parties have deserted the red flag, in proportion as they felt themselves nearer to power. This red flag—the hope of the toiling and suffering masses—is now our inheritance. Let us keep if firm, unstained, and let us live for it and, if necessary, die for it as our brethren of Chicago did.

WINDING UP A CONTROVERSY.

As long as Mr. Tucker and his followers demanded the abolition of Government, law, police, taxation and the machinery politic, they were entitled to call themselves Anarchists. As now they only want to substitute "voluntary Government" for compulsory Government, voluntary taxation for compulsory taxation and so on, they may claim to be Individualists, but they have lost any claim to being Anarchists, just as they cannot advocate the wage system and yet pretend to be Socialists. H. Spencer is certainly not an Anarchist: Auberon Herbert, who maintains, and quite logically from the Individualistic standpoint, that private property is an essential derivation of liberty, does not call himself an Anarchist. And we fail to see in what important respect the actual views of Yarros and Tucker differ from those of Auberon Herbert and Spencer.

It seems pretty radical to speak of "voluntary Government, voluntary taxation" and the like. Yet, when the landowners or other owners consent to pay a tax, they naturally think of shifting the burden on those who are dependent on themselves for the supply of the materials of production. The same holds for Government. It may be quite voluntary for the people who form it, but it has to coerce somebody else. Besides, the consent given by a man to a Government virtually is withdrawn the moment that the force of this Government is used against him.

Liberty, we have said, is no solution. Individual liberty, "free will," is a metaphysical conception which modern science has discarded, man being the creature of circumstances. Men are social beings, live a social life and must needs organize their social relations for the common advantage, or else some will be victims of others. Spencer himself says: "The well-being of each is involved with the well-being of all in sundry . . . ways. Whatever conduces to their vigor concerns him; for it diminishes the cost of everything he buys. Whatever conduces to their freedom from disease concerns him; for it diminishes his own liability to disease. Whatever raises their intelligence concerns him; for inconveniences are daily entailed on him by others' ignorance and folly. Whatever raises their moral characters concerns him, for at every turn he suffers from the average unconscientiousness." He might have added that whatever increases their happiness concerns him, for he actually suffers from the sight of their misery.

and shares in their enjoyments. The life of the individual is made of numberless influences from the surrounding joys and sorrows, knowledges and prejudices, accumulated wealth, habits and feelings. How these principles may be reconciliated with the "atomistic" view taken of society by Individualists is a puzzle to us.

The Individualist's only standard of conduct is "absence of coercion." Provided an individual consents to do something, that thing is right. Now a man's consent may be got by indirect coercion. Auberon Herbert says indirect coercion is unavoidable and therefore legitimate. "Acquiescence on the part of the victim takes out the character of offense" from the capitalistic exploitation. "He who uses direct force to combat indirect force indefinitely delays the development of those moral influences to which we can alone look as the solvent of that temper that makes men use hardly the indirect power resting in their hands." Fine talk, which proves as well against indirect as against direct force. The consequence would be to strengthen indirect force by our forbearing to use that kind of force (direct) which alone may be opposed to it.

The individualist's idea of giving to anybody "free access" to the land, and then leaving the occupant free to hoard or trade in its products, is wrong on the face of it. It is the interest of society that everybody should find opportunity to work and produce; provided, however, that one does not wish to work and produce for his exclusive benefit, accumulate and take advantage of other people's needs in the exchanges, or even compel or induce them to become his servants.

How can "free access to land" be secured to all, except by a system of common ownership? If a few individuals or groups are allowed to take possession of the best situated land, the most productive mines, the streets of a city and the highroads of a country, will it not be done with "the free access to land" — so far as that country is concerned?

"Free banking" is no remedy. In a community of wealthy and poor people, the former only would be able to issue money, or, what is the same, their money alone would have value and be accepted, and the money would be a supplementary means of forestalling and monopolizing the products of labor.

Another mistake of the Individualists is to suppose that equality of chances and opportunities may last under a system of competition, and that competition itself would go on indefinitely. The experience shows that people occupying the best situations, or having accumulated more wealth, will cease competing and combine to exploit others.

We cannot leave to a few individuals or groups, say, the use of the machine power of the Niagara Falls, or the disposal of the forests which command the valleys of the Ohio or Mississippi. It is an important distinction made by recent Economists of the Deytrian school that between goods ready for man's consumption and the goods instrumental in their production, the latter goods have a value measured, not by individuals, but by social needs. The individual may be left free to eat his bread as he likes; but not to monopolize land or waste natural resources. The number of goods of the second category increases with every day. We have only to look to our cities, public works, elevators, means of transportation, etc., to realize that it is impossible to limit these things to individuals, and make the welfare of the community dependent on the interests and caprices of those individuals.

The insufficiency of present arrangements made by capitalists is due to the conflict of private with general interests. Such a conflict must cease. We must all pursue the common welfare, which is after all the welfare of all the people. The ideal society is that, where each individual, having spontaneously worked at the best of his abilities, gets the fullest possible satisfaction of his needs. Our immediate aim is more modest: it is to secure to every individual the satisfaction of his ordinary needs and practical independence by a minimum amount of work performed by him in co-operation with his fellow-men. To secure this end a practical plan must be worked out, by the people concerned and particular agreements and arrangements established between those who have to cooperate in its execution; the needs and resources of society statistically estimated; a measure of equivalence between different kinds of labor agreed upon; a continual supply of the means of production to the workers and their associations secured; exchanges pre-arranged and so on.

That the liberty of the individuals must be allowed as free scope as possible, nobody disputes. But co-operation is the fundamental law of society. "Co-operation (says Metchnikoff, in *La Civilisation et les grands fleuves historiques*) is the main feature of social life. If, in the province of biology, the more or less individualized beings, from cell to man, struggle for life or for some egoistic or personal aim, in the province of sociology, on the contrary, they unite their efforts for a common interest.

CHICAGO LETTER.

Recently on a very cold day, my business carried me to the World's Fair Grounds. Thousands of men are still employed in, upon, and around the various buildings, and the work of human slaughter and mangling of workingmen never ceases. It was on Sunday morning, and already two men had been seriously injured that day. Five maimed and one killed the day before, and eight injured the day before that: from three to ten hurt and killed every day; such is the official record. Although it was Sunday and very cold, I saw several men perched upon the dome of the Illinois State building, laying on the roof.

* * *

There are people freezing to death in this beehive of industry this Christmas weather. Scarcely a day passes that the papers do not report some case of terrible destitution; but one or two "sticks full" is generally the limit of space accorded to the tale; on the other hand the descriptions of the flowers, dresses and jewelry at the Hebrew Charity Ball filled several columns. Oh charity, what crimes are committed in thy name!

* * *

I expected my article on "Methods of Propaganda" would call forth comment, possibly criticism, from some of the readers of "Solidarity," I did not think, however, that it would create such a "bad impression" upon the editorial staff as to subject me to misrepresentation and ridicule. I simply gave my individual opinion upon a subject admittedly needing ventilation. As "Solidarity" reaches many German, French and Italian comrades, as well as English speaking readers, I chose it as the medium for my communication. I do not like to be misrepresented by any individual, and I most seriously object to it when that individual, concealing his name, assumes to speak for others under the mask of an editorial "we."

I must say that the use of the word in this connection is not anarchistic; it savors too much of the State.

I am made to infer, because I advise against attacking individuals, that I regard Gould, Vanderbilt and Carnegie as "good, honorable men." But I never inferred anything of the kind. My anonymous critic also says: "Comrade H. recommends bowing to authorities, proclaiming Jay Gould and Mr. Frick great patriots and philanthropists and speaking of them in the most obliging terms; shaking hands with the police, the judges, the ruffians who have murdered our best comrades," etc., etc. I submit this is not fair, because it is not true. I never recommended any of these things. It seems that we must not use "cunning dissimulation and other trickeries in vogue among politicians" to outwit our enemies, but it is allowable to misrepresent, sneer at, and attempt to bring into ridicule by "trickeries in vogue among politicians" the advice of a comrade.

The tenor of the article criticising my letter is unmistakably plain. The natural inference is that in the opinion of "Solidarity's" editors (if not of all its supportors) good clothes, good breeding, education, well lighted, furnished and comfortable assembly halls are incompatible with the teachings of anarchy; that we must look for converts and apostles only among the poor, the ignorant, the degraded, amid dirt and foul stenches. Alas for the future of the race if this be so!

WM. HOLMES.

AS TO METHODS.

I am not going to read "Solidarity" a lecture on what may seem its spirit of prejudice in treating of the very thoughtful and temperate article of Bro. Holmes, because I am too good an Anarchist to deny any man the right to express himself in any way he may see fit, on any subject whatever. I may disagree with a brother; may even consider him narrow, foolish and prejudiced; and yet, I must concede him the same right of expression as I claim for myself. I will not even call his motives in question, because they are his own; and with them I have no right to meddle. Nor will I fling epithets at him which are calculated to discredit him in the eyes of others. Anarchists seek a universal brotherhood; but they will scarcely find it in unbrotherly acts. I confess I was pained to see an earnest, intelligent and zealous brother alluded to as a "kid-gloved anarchist" (1) merely because of a difference of opinion as to the best methods to pursue in our propaganda. Not that there is anything discreditable, or disreputable in kid gloves: or even in an Anarchist doing that. I only wish every Anarchist was not only able to wear kid gloves, but every other thing that might chance to please his or her fancy. If there is any person in this world who is worthy to wear kid gloves it is a thoroughly consistent Anarchist. But, if I read it aright, the intention was to excite the jealousy of those among us who cannot indulge in this luxury, and who are ignorant enough to be swayed by such appeals, against those whom you sneer at as "learned" and "respectable."

While you have a perfect right to take this position, or any other, is it wise? Let us see! You say: "We want no aristocratic, no armchair, no drawing-room anarchism. Our battle must be fought by workmen against parasites, by illiterate against learned people, by the uneducated masses against "respectability." Let those of the upper class, who really want to work for our great cause come in our midst, live our life, make personal acquaintance with our sorrows and our feelings."

This is like pitting a lot of savages, armed with bows and arrows, against an organized army supplied with Gatling guns. I think you will find that in every case where ignorance is pitted against intelligence—for that is just what this means—intelligence wins. Your "uneducated masses" would be like grass before a prairie fire. We need all the intelligence we can get right in our own ranks; and we cannot win the intelligent by stirring up hatred against them.

What does it mean when you ask those whom you call the "upper class, to come in our midst, live our life," etc? A man's misery consists of the difference between want and satisfaction. One who has been trained in a certain sphere in life acquires certain wants, and for him to forego satisfaction, because others who have aims in common with him are unable to enjoy the same degree of satisfaction, especially as they have never been taught their need, would be but to make himself miserable without benefitting them. I make no plea for inequality in condition. I only recognize that it *now* exists; and while it exists it would only increase the misery of your "upper class" philanthropists who should ignore its existence, without alleviating that of the poor one whit. What must be done is to destroy the thing that sets up those inequalities in condition, which, is the law.

You speak of what you regard as "the most powerful and the most human" means for realizing anarchy; and on looking further we find that it is in physical violence—dynamite—according to your idea (2) To me this appears the very weakest instead of the most powerful. There are methods which can be adopted, which are as much more forceful than physical violence as the human mind is stronger than the unaided power of the human arm. Let a man set out on a journey. If he is an ignorant one he may rely upon physical effort and walk, in which case the utmost limit of his attainment will soon be reached. He can walk but a few miles in a day. But if he is an intelligent man—"learned," as you say, he may bring to his

(1) We do not say that Comrade Holmes is a kid-gloved Anarchist. We only maintain that he is advocating, no doubt unintentionally, "kid-gloved" Anarchism.

(2) Comrade O. is mistaken. We wish to educate the masses, or rather we wish the workmen to think over the matter and educate themselves. Our motto is the old one: thought and action.

aid the forces of nature, the steam, or electricity, in which case he may travel hundreds of miles in a day. It is only the application of intelligence which has enabled men to realize the larger results. The same principle applies in the struggles of mankind against the restrictions imposed by their fellow-men, as against those imposed by nature. We have need for all the learning and ability we can get; and I can think of nothing more unwise than to discredit it with sneers and appeals to prejudice.

No! Let Bro. Holmes give us all the light he can on the subject of methods; and let every one else do the same from every other possible standpoint. (3) Then let us weigh carefully all proposed methods, exercising the greatest degree of wisdom and intelligence we are capable of; and the chances are that we shall realize far better results.

W. H. VAN ORNUM.

Chicago, Dec. 24. 1892.

Another Chicago correspondent writes on the same subject.

"Comrades are very much pleased with your answer to H. H. Of course, it would not hurt, if he would work among aristocrats and clergymen. If he succeeds in converting them to Anarchism, they will not stay in the drawing-rooms and in the churches, but will come to the smoky dens of the poor.

R. G.

WAYS AND MEANS.

We give space to-day to two letters from Chicago objecting to Comrade Merlinos criticism of Com. Holmes proposed change of propoganda methods. Merlino disclaims any intentional slight or discourtesy to Bro. Holmes, and I am sure he intended none. The subject is worthy of thorough discussion. The conversion of the well educated and the prosperous to the cause of economic and political emancipation is of course a most desirable end, to spread our doctrines is always our duty. I would preach anarchist socialism from an orthodox pulpit, if I got the chance, lecture to college professors, and make speeches in the Stock Exchange if I were invited. Nor is it altogether useless to look for recruits in such places. Karl Marx, Lasalle, Engels, Bakounin, Hyndman, Wm. Morris, Caffiero, Malatesta, Merlino, Kropotkine and hundred of others who have worked for the good cause of emancipation came from the ranks of the well-to-do. But one swallow does not make a summer. There were individual slave-owners in our Southern States, who freed their slaves. But as a class they fought for their privileges to the last post and yielded only to irresistible force. It will be so with our present slave-owners.

For the force that will compel a change in our present social order we must rely on the desinherited. And those of the well-to-do, who wish to bring about a change must ally themselves with the masses against the classes. Nor will this involve a reliance on iguorance. We "educated" people are too apt to imagine that we monopolize intelligence. It is not so. I thought so in my younger years, and I blush with shame when I recollect how well I illustrated Bakounin's saying: "There is no arrogance like that of the cultivated intellect." Contact with workingmen in many walks of life have taught me that real intellectual power is the property of no class, and that education, that is the education of the schools, changes the methods of expression but does not create the power of thought, the ability to see things as they are, and to arrive at sensible conclusions from facts observed. There is another point which Bros. Holmes and Van Ornum should consider. Our doctrines are revolutionary and involve a complete condemnation of the present system. Now, in addressing "respectable" audiences, this difficulty confronts the anarchist socialist if he gives a true statement of our beliefs and intentions in such plain words that they can't be misunderstood. Even though he refrains entirely from personal denunciation the audience will almost always either refuse to listen or will take care never to give him another opportunity to address them. The temptation is almost irresistible to soften, to modify, to palliate.

Abstractions are dangerous things to the propagandists. There are a lot of good people now who are willing to do justice to future generations, who even pride themselves on their radical views as to social "Evolution." It is only when realities are discussed, when Evolution becomes Revolution and the present substituted for the future that these people take fright, and then they become more dangerous than Conservatives, for they have a glimpse of the terrible forces that are being slowly mustered against the existing society. Therefore, brethren, make your propaganda your own way. One of two things will happen. You will become disgusted with your "respectable" audience and become more revolutionary than ever, or you will become "respectable" yourselves, and cease to regard us as comrades. At least that is my belief. In the meantime Solidarity is open to you and if I am wrong in my views I am at least open to conviction.

JOHN H. EDELMANN.

(3) Just so—and let, we add, everybody act according to his own views, and do his best.

JUSTICE.

There are scholars who tell us that but for slavery in the old world, civilization would not have reached the proportions that it did; some being set aside to do the necessary labor of the community, others were given the leisure that was required for science, art, and the higher interests of man. So there are those who tell us in the face of the social problems of to-day, that the great mass of men must work with their hands, and live in some discomfort, in order that the rest of the world may be comfortable. This is a convenient philosophy, but it seems to me totally unethical. Men may *use* their chances for self-development or not as they choose; but in justice everyone ought to have the chances. The welfare of man means the welfare of *men*; at the bottom, everyone has the same claim to be considered as every other. The slaves in ancient Athens had essentially the same rights to self-development, that a Plato or a Pericles had; they might not have used their chances, but that was no excuse for depriving them of them; a man's use of his chances is his own affair. So everyone of our factory population to-day ought, at least to have the chance of living a truly human life; it is as much his right as that of any more favored or fortunate person; and society ought to be so organized as to give every one that chance; however practically difficult it may be, that should be the aim. There ought not to be a single human being who has not the leisure to think, to enjoy what is beautiful, to acquire knowledge and culture, to fulfil in some measure the spiritual ends for which he exists; and if to this end some who have much leisure now must have less, let them be willing to have less, let there be some proportion in the oportunities that are given to men, let there be something like equality—for that is what justice means. Civilization, culture, science, art—these are great ends, but they are somehow tainted when they are accessible to a few only, not to all; when the many (not by choice, but by necessity of their situation) are shut out from participation in them; they seem to have the seeds of corruption in them, as indeed the pages of history show us one great civilized people after another rising and flourishing and then disintegrating and passing away. Civilization must be general, pervasive—it must be different from the civilization of a London, a Philadelphia, a Chicago, as truly as from that of an Athens or a Rome; it must be founded on justice, and then we may believe it may not pass away, as every partial, one-sided civilization must and should.

And as justice means equal regard for all the members of a single community or people, so it means equal regard for all the different races of mankind. A people may secure its welfare by injuring, crippling, or even wiping out another people; and this is often justified. Many are those who justify our treatment of the Indians, because it was necessary they hold, that this great and powerful nation, which we call the United States, should be built up here; but if we give unqualified assent to such an argument, with all that it implies, we might as well dismiss the thought of justice, once and for all, from our minds. If simply to make way for a higher race, an inferior one may be rooted out, then there is nothing wrong in any man's doing violence to another man, who is inferior in any way to himself; then the idea of human rights, as such, is an illusion, and the notion that a man's person and property are, if anything, only the more sacred, because he cannot defend them himself, is a piece of folly. Better acknowledge, that as a nation, we have committed a great sin, and are still committing it, than take a position which logically undermines some of the fairest and sanest of man's moral convictions.—*Wm. M. Salter in Open Court.*

GRAND INTERNATIONAL

Concert and Ball

UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE

SOLIDARITY GROUP

Will be held at

WEBSTER HALL

On Monday Evening, February 27th, 1893

TICKETS, Admitting Gentleman and Ladies, - 25 Cents.

Proceeds to be devoted to the Propaganda.

Come and bring your friends. Here is an excellent opportunity for radicals to help the good cause. Surely we are entitled to a pleasant evening now and then—and Solidarity will be benefited not only by the money made, but by the better acquaintance of its friends with each other

SLAVERY IN THE UNITED STATES.

Negro slavery has been abolished, but we still have the slavery of Italians, Slavs and other, "pauper" laborers. And we have convict-slavery, the most atrocious slavery in the world. The negro cost money; the wage-slave may strike, the convict costs nothing and has no rights. As an illustation the following:

The testimony of a guard at the Coal Creek prison in Tennessee shows that prisoners, black and dirty from their work in the mines, were put into their rooms in the stockades without an opportunity to change their clothing or sufficient opportunity for cleanliness. Convicts were whipped, a man standing at the head and another at the feet, while a third applied the lash with both hands. Men who failed to perform their task of mining from two to four tons of coal per day were fastened to planks by the feet, then bent over a barrel and fastened by the hands on the other side, stripped and beaten with a strap. Out of the fifty convicts that worked in the mine from one to eight were whipped per day in this manner. There was scarcely a day, according to the testimony of the witness, James Frazier, in which one or more were not flogged in this manner for failure to perform their day's task. The work in the mines was difficult, and the air sometimes so bad the men fell insensible and had to be hauled out. Their beds he describes as "dirty, black, and nasty looking." They slept in the same clothes they worked in and got a change but once in two weeks. One of the convicts testifying as to the kind of food given them, said that the pea soup was made from peas containing weevils, and added. "I have got a spoonful of weevils off of one cup of soup."

In many cases convicts were forced to work in water six inches deep for weeks at a time, getting out coal with one-fourth of the air necessary for a healthy man to live in, forced to drink water from stagnant pools when mountain streams were just outside the stockade, and the reports of the prison officials show large numbers killed in attempting to escape.

CIRCULAR.

Dear Comrades:—As you are aware, the continuance of "SOLIDARITY" depends on the *persistent* efforts of friends from issue to issue. At the request of Comrade Merlino, I have undertaken the management of its finances for the present, and hope to receive all the assistance that has been promised to him, besides recruiting additional efforts in its behalf from old and new friends. The prospect for the future is bright. The expenses up to the present time have been all paid, and it only remains for our friends to keep up the good work so well done in the past, and we shall soon have an *established* medium of English propaganda. Make money orders, checks and drafts payable as heretofore to

Yours sincerely,

JEFFERSON RAY,
P. O. Box 2618,
NEW YORK CITY.