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. 18. NEW YORK, MARCH 18, 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.

Several comrades in different Cities are co-operating in twos, threes and fours for the purpose of taking 50c or $1 worth of each issue of SOLIDARITY for gratuitous distribution. This is real help for effective propaganda. The ideas are spread and many regular subscribers are thus secured. A number of individual friends are doing likewise. We should like very much to see this method more generally adopted. By this means trades unions, public meetings, etc., can be practically pamphleted. J. R.

NOTICE.

We had intended to issue a Supplement with this number of SOLIDARITY *containing a declaration of the principles of Anarchist-Socialism. Owing to pressure of other work we are compelled to postpone the matter until our next issue.*

THE MASK OF ANARCHY.

BY SHELLEY.

XXXIX.

What is freedom? Ye can tell
That which slavery is too well.
For its name has grown
To an echo of your own.

XL.

'Tis to work and have such pay
As just keeps life from day to day
In your limbs, as in a cell
For the tyrants' use to dwell.

XLI.

So that ye for them are made,
Loom, and plough, and sword, and spade;
With or without your own will, bent
To their defence and nourishment.

XLII.

'Tis to see your children weak
With their mothers pine and peak,
When the winter winds are bleak:—
They are dying whilst I speak.

XLIII.

'Tis to hunger for such diet,
As the rich man in his riot
Casts to the fat dogs that lie
Surfeiting beneath his eye.

XLIV.

'Tis to let the Ghost of Gold
Take from toil a thousand fold,
More than ever its substance could
In the tyrannies of old:

XLV.

Paper coin—that forgery
Of the title deeds, which ye
Hold, to something of the worth
Of the inheritance of earth.

XLVI.

'Tis to be a slave in soul
And to hold no strong control
Over your own wills, but be
All that others make of ye.

XLVII.

And at length when ye complain,
With a murmur weak and vain,
'Tis to see the tyrant's crew
Ride over your wives and you:—
Blood is on the grass like dew.

XLVIII.

THE COMMUNE.

The New York Anarchists will celebrate the anniversary of the Paris Commune at Clarendon Hall, 114-116 East 13th Street, on Saturday, March 18, at 8 P. M. Let all attend. Of all historic tragedies none offers us more important lessons. The Third Empire had perished less from the assaults of the Germans than from its own inherent rottenness. The people of Paris found themselves without a Government—and they essayed to manage their own affairs. Paris for once in its history was a well-behaved and virtuous Commune, and the good trustful people thought they could make their peace with the ruling classes—the capitalists, bureaucrats and churchmen—who under whatever name happens to suit their purpose have so long ruled—that is plundered—France. So little did the people understand the ruling classes that they neglected their own defense, believing to the last in a peaceful settlement. They carried their mistaken policy of conciliation so far that even while the bourgeois Government made war on them they did not touch the treasure in the Bank of France nor in the vaults of the Rothschilds. Their moderation was their ruin. Thiers and Galiffet murdered them by the tens of thousands when they had conquered; tens of thousands were imprisoned, exiled, transported. No mercy was shown them. And why did the masses so calmly accept defeat? Just because the leaders tried to make peace with the bourgeois; because they did not make a bonfire of the Bank of France and all its evidence of indebtedness; because they did not proclaim the abolition of rent interest and profits and invite the workmen of Paris to enter into the enjoyment of their own city.

If they had done so the masses of Paris would have defended their city as the peasants of France defended their lands a hundred years ago when the foreign invaders attempted to reduce them to the slavery they had just escaped from.

All honor to the lofty idealists, the noble spirits who set up the standard of the Commune. But when it is again unfurled, let there be no "moderation," no compromise with the present.

Vive la Commune, and Death to its Enemies.

BAUER AND NOLD.

Comrades Bauer and Nold have just been condemned to an imprisonment of nine years—ostensibly for inciting to riot—by distributing an anarchist address at Homestead, *after* the battle with the Pinkertons, and for conspiring with Berkman to kill Frick. On the first charge every one expected a conviction—for there was no question as to the participation of the men in the printing and distribution of the leaflet. But as there was not a particle of legal evidence to sustain the second charge, the local press, and even a number of anarchists, expressed the opinion that the prosecution would fail. But it didn't. Evidence is not needed to convict an anarchist of a minor crime, once he admits that he is an anarchist.

The defenders of our present society know that they are living over a mine filled with explosive material enough to blow them into oblivion; and their instinct of self-preservation warns them to deal summarily with people whose professed purpose it is to apply a torch to the mass. Of course, I sympathize with the comrades—and I hope that prompt and effective work will be done to provide for their families. But it seems to me, that the time has come for us to realize that we cannot at once carry on a professed revolutionary propaganda; and at the same time expect the protection of the law. What has the written law to do with trials of revolutionists anyway? A celebrated American judge declared that 90 per cent. of our law was made by judges, and only 10 per [illegible]

and Nold in spite of the "Law,"—and these precedents will be amplified and strengthened with each succeeding trial.

The services of lawyers in the defence of anarchists are of no service to the prisoners and can only tend to befog the real issues. Berkman adopted the sensible and dignified course in refusing to be "defended"—we, may as well follow his example. It is a war of extermination; either Bourgeois society must cease to exist; or anarchy and anarchists must be exterminated; compromise is impossible. Let us boldly proclaim our principles. —A serious crisis in the labor movement is upon us. The example of the men of Homestead will be followed and improved upon; and the day is close at hand when the American workingman will listen to our voices. J. H. E.

LETTERS FROM ENGLAND.

London, Feb. 26, 1893.

The inanity of parliamentary action has never appear so striking as at the present time, and in the English House of Commons. Here you have, as they say, two members of the Cabinet who call themselves socialists, (Mr. Asquith and I do not now remember who is the other): you have, at least, two official and prominent Socialist agitators in the House, Burns and Keir Hardie, besides the old Trade Unions representatives; and you have a lot of Fabians, in town councils into Parliament, in fact speaks very much for [illegible] has been [illegible] ideas in England, a wonderful writers, was in think that only ten years ago there were very few Socialists in the country. But what have these prominent Socialists in office done for the unemployed? Nay, what have they *said* for them? It is not a "negligeable quantity," the unemployed, in England. They muster in tens of thousands not only in London; but in all the large towns of England. Our socialists surely cannot ignore them. Well, we have had a single speech on the question. Mr. Keir Hardie has called, incidentally in the discussion of the Address, the attention of the House of Commons to the existence of an army of starving men, in "merry England"; and has conclusively shown that they, the large majority at least, are not out of work for any fault of their own.

How, however, about the remedy? Keir Hardie was bound to propose something, but if you go through his very moderate speech, you will see that he did not know what. He cannot say what he would have done, "if he were the House of Commons and the government itself." Now, he says he does not want protection. This is what he does not want. Yet he wants, that people from Bavaria and other places ought not to find employment in England. What is that, if not protection? Yet, he wants to reduce the hours of labor in the Government's workshops. That proposal does not go very far towards solving the problem of the millions of unemployed. And that is all.

Of course, the Conservatives have used the speech of Keir Hardie, against the Liberals, the Liberals have thrown back the remarks of the Conservatives against Mr. Keir Hardie, whom they have accused of being used as a catspaw, etc. Here the whole affair has stopped, and the unemployed have been left to themselves. Mr. Burns, who is quickly learning the art of a politician, has not uttered a word on their behalf.

No, the social question will not, cannot be solved in a Congress, and in such rotten Congresses as we have. The signs of the times indicate that the remedy will come from below—from the masses themselves. In Italy another revolt of peasants has broken forth in Caltagirone (Sicily). The same tendencies have shown themselves here as in Xéres a year ago, and everywhere the people attack the municipality, try to open prisons, and either ask for bread or work, which they do not get if they do not take it, or actually take [illegible]

necessity of a Revolution expropriating the capitalists and giving opportunity to the masses to take possession of the land, factories and other means of production is right. We only put in abstract words the practical tendencies of the masses. The only fault with the agrarian movements in Europe is that they are partial—limited to a village. The revolted peasants get the best of the local troops and then wait; and what comes after is more troops, assassination, arrestations and persecutions. Large movements of workers, organized or not, take place only in the industrial field. In this respect, the Congress of the unemployed of the different districts of Belgium (Liège, Centre, La Louvière, etc.), which has taken place in the last days in Brussels, is quite an event. Suppose the unemployed of the United States meeting together in Chicago at the time of the Exhibition; and claiming their right to live and work. The spirit of the Congress has been quite revolutionary and anarchistic. Our Brussels paper, *La Débâcle*, comments very satisfactorily about it. This fact, you will admit, is more important than Keir Hardie's maiden speech at the House of Commons. You see the masses moving, and you feel that their next move will be a Revolution. And even the peasants will be no longer satisfied with local revolts, and show that they are capable of general movements, as they have already done in past centuries.

The agrarian movement, in Holland, has taken a very serious turn during the last two months, and there has been in that country a real *Jacquerie*. The insurgent peasants have fought with the regular troops at the following places:

At Harlingen, Franeker, Leeuwarden, Bergumerheide, Wolvega, Buitenpost, Dokkum and Appelscha, in the province of Frisia.

At Hoogezand, Sappemeer, Pekela, Stadskanaal, Finsterwolde, Nieuwolde, Midwolde, Beerba, Bellingwolde, Winschoten, Termunterzijl and Noordbroek, in the province of Groningen.

At Arnhem, Dæsberg and Wageningen, in the province of Gueldre and at Amsterdam.

In Spain, agrarian revolts are too much a matter of course to need to be mentioned.

The Twenty-Second Anniversary of the Paris Commune.

bourgeois and grandes, leader to etc., and the Coeurs another anniversary promises of reform. London, March 7.

Paris Commune, and the Anarchists in London, as in all the cities of England and indeed of the world, will commemorate the event with public meetings.

It is a noteworthy fact—indeed one of the most significant in the labor movement—that the Commune of Paris has been commemorated by Anarchists much more than by other sections of the Socialist party. Anarchists are not supposed to be in sympathy with a chance insurrection, which respected banks, allowed but a few cents per day to the combatants, and instead of carrying on a wholesale expropriation of the capitalists, confined its revolutionary activity to some nice manifestoes, like the one addressed to the peasants.

But Anarchists saw in the Paris Commune, an *idea*, from which a new social system must come—the idea of the "free Commune." This idea, not elaborated by any school, but born spontaneously from the masses, has been taken by Anarchists, who have made it their own. The characteristic of the Anarchistic programme is precisely this, that they do not invent, but only interpret the wishes and aspirations of the masses.

The idea of "free Communities" offers the only practical solution of the social problem. People do not revolt any longer against a King, nor do they know what to do after having fought the soldiers. Their object will be the Commune. Therein the expropriation of the capitalists will take place; therein labor will be organized; therein equality and solidarity will be established as the foundation of the future commonwealth.

Also, the Paris Commune has bequeathed to us another idea. The bloody tragedy, by which it ended, opened a gulf between the Bourgeoisie and the Proletariat. The separation had been proclaimed by the International Workingmen Associations; but the Commune of Paris rendered it irrevocable. Thirty thousands corpses of workmen slaughtered in one week, within the walls of Paris, stand now between us and our enemies.

A very significant commemoration has taken place on the anniversary of the execution of the four Xères Anarchists, in Xères itself. The celebration was carried on in defiance of the police, who were present but dared not interfere. The whole population of the town was present.

Here in London, the dread of the Anarchistic [illegible] saloon keeper from whom the hall had been hired, and intimated him that his license would be withdrawn if he would let the hall to Anarchists again. Just like in the United States.

The inefficiency and costliness of the parliamentary system even at its best (*i. e.*, in England) is shown in the most striking manner, in the matter of so-called Private Bills—bills promoted sometimes by municipal and other local authorities and dealing with sanitation and other important matters. Now these bills are never dealt with by the House, but are committed to a committee of nine members, who decide almost without appeal. Yet in the last six years, town councils, local improvement commissioners and local boards in England and Wales have spent £475,000 (nearly $2,000,000) in promoting and opposing Bills, exclusive of Railway Bills.

I do not care to resent the indecent attacks of such consummate sophists and intolerant libertarians as Messrs. Tucker and Yarros. But I wish to point out to *bonafide* Individualists, that the main issue between us seems to be, whether we shall advocate an organized, systematic co-operation, or a hap-hazard, a half-and-half one. "Give us liberty," the Individualist says, "and co-operation is sure to come." Well, I say, the history of the United States disproves the assertion. *The people there started in many cases from liberty, nay from a condition of equality or equal liberty—and see the consequences!*

S. M.

THE CONFERENCE.

I should have written some time since with reference to the holding of an Anarchist Congress in this city during the World's Fair, but was desirous of ascertaining, through the columns of SOLIDARITY, what are the views of interested comrades in different parts of the country before expressing my own. Of course, we, in Chicago, favor the idea, but it would hardly be fair to assume that the wishes of Chicago comrades alone should be taken as an indication of the general sentiment. We are on the ground; the inconvenience and expense we would be subject to would be slight as compared with the difficulties to be met by comrades residing at a distance. Would it not be a good idea for SOLIDARITY to devote a portion of its space for a few weeks to a symposium, embodying the views of active and interested comrades upon this question? In discussing the *advisability* of holding such a Congress, I would suggest the following questions:

First.—The benefit to the movement at large of such a Congress.

Second.—The expense of the undertaking.

Third.—The number of comrades who could attend.

Fourth.—Means of accommodation, etc., while in attendance.

Fifth.—Number of days the Congress should convene.

Sixth.—Whether it should be a national or international affair.

In view of this last proposition I would suggest that comrades in other countries should at once be communicated with, and their views also be briefly stated in the columns of SOLIDARITY.

Matters of detail pertaining to the Congress itself, such as what questions may be discussed, etc., can be settled and agreed upon after we have determined to hold a Congress.

WM. HOLMES.
Chicago, Ill.

La Révolte says in answer to a call for a conference at Chicago:

"If the conference is not called upon to elaborate a programme to which all Anarchists are to confirm; if it is to be only a meeting of comrades who will express their own desires and opinions and listen to those of their brothers from other places; then it would be desirable that Anarchists should convene in the largest possible number—and our Chicago comrades are right in working to bring such a conviction about."

We desire nothing else. We never wished to establish an authoritative programme. Whatever may be said or agreed upon at Chicago, will not bind anybody but those who freely consent to it. We don't propose to build up a centralized authority of any sort whatever. On the contrary we wish, by putting an end to the present confused and inorganic condition, to bring an end to self-constituted rulers and dictators—(for why should we disguise the fact that we now have such rulership). Further we wish to show the millions of people who will visit the [illegible] that Anti-

upon the immense wealth they have extorted from the workers—the cry of protest from their victims must be raised; and we, the advanced guard of the proletarian army, should meet and renew our pledge of unrelenting warfare against the system of legalized piracy that the World's Fair is intended to glorify.

And finally, we wish to improve the opportunity to give a new impulse to the propaganda. We intend meeting in Chicago to take up again the work interrupted seven years ago by the hangman.

THE ANARCHISTIC COMMONWEALTH.

(*Continuation.*)

As to the share which each member of association may take both in the work and in its products, opinions are divided, some Socialists maintaining that *the share of the individual in the products will be proportionate to work done* (*Collectivism*); *others that it will be proportionate to needs* (*Communism.*)

The first solution is open to the objection that it is not possible to measure the part which each individual worker has had in the final product of different labors, and that, were it possible to strictly estimate the value of individual work, it would not be socially desirable to give to the strong more than to the weak, and to the educated more than to the uneducated. On the other hand, it is likewise impossible to proportion the share of the individual worker to his *needs*, nay, even to estimate his needs, as it is impossible to aver what amount of work he is able to perform.

Thus, society would have to rely on the fairness of the individual, that he would neither indulge in excessive consumption, nor refuse his fair share of work; and certainly in the course of time, as people become aware of the advantages of living in a community, such a mutual confidence will grow among them, that no danger will be apprehended from the practice of Communism. In the immediate future (for which we now care) there might be people who, either from long habit, or in imitation of the present idle classes, would try to live as parasites on their good-natured fellows, and very likely employ their leisure to make new plans of domination. Hence it is of great importance that all men should perform their fair share of work, and none claim a better treatment than his fellows, or at least none be allowed to use whatever advantages which he might possess, to accumulate wealth and enslave his fellow-workers.

So far, we have pointed out the only possible solution of questions concerning the organization of labor inside each branch or association; and that is *free agreement of the members of the branch or association.*

The agreement will be arrived at in the usual way of general assemblies, discussions and deliberations, or in any other way which might seem more convenient.

Obviously, the associations could not remain isolated from each other. In order that each individual group might know what is the kind of work which it may perform with the greatest benefit for society, what quantity of products is required, and what kind, quality and quantity of products, others than its own, they may expect from other associations, it is necessary to come to a *general understanding*, to have statistics compiled, to organize exchanges, to set up a more or less complicated plan, and to stick to it for the time agreed upon.

In coming together, the associations will forbear from taking advantage either of a more favorable situation or of a fortuitous event (as a good harvest) or of an invention, the opening of a road, or even of their own greater industry and skill or thrift, in order to dictate terms to their less fortunate neighbors.

No association will be allowed either to monopolize its products (as in the case of minerals), or to destroy sources of wealth (wood, fisheries, etc.)

We do not presume to state here what the arrangements may be in different cases; but we maintain that it will not be difficult for the associations of each locality, and even of different localities, to federate together and overcome the difficulties, the necessity for such federation being undeniable.

We also maintain that such questions as we have pointed out, cannot be solved by the "Ayes" and "Noes" of a Parliament, nor settled by any amount of red-tapism. It is no use shirking the difficulty, and throwing it off on the shoulders of a "National Government"? How is a Government to organize labor? how is it to [illegible] equality between the worke[illegible]

Philadelphia

etc., to various associations? Should it estimate the various works according to labor expended or according to the social need of them? Should it fix the price or value of the various commodities?

These and other questions admit of no sweeping solutions by law. They must be solved differently in different places, and by the people concerned. If you try to enforce a general law on the subject, you will only provoke anger, laziness, egotism, discord and confusion. Sometimes the arrangement made must be changed at once in consequence of some economic change. The machinery of the State is too heavy, and too costly, to serve economic interests. Besides, a Government entrusted with the organization of labor would be such a huge tyranny that no man could live under it.

"WHY GOVERNMENT AT ALL?"

When the famine years of half a century ago aroused the attention of the reformers on both sides of the Atlantic, a galaxy of men, whose genius still illumines the intellectual world, set to work to investigate cause and effect. The result was that with Karl Marx, Herbert Spencer, Bacunine, Stewart Mills, Evans, Ingalls, Molyneux, Thomas Ange Devere, and others more or less prominent, a new light was thrown on pestilential visitations. While these men differed in opinion, they all agreed that "God was not reponsible," but that economic conditions were the real causes of the miseries visited upon mankind. At the head of this wonderful group of intellectual giants stands Bacunine, Marx, Spencer and Ingalls.

The causes that gave birth to those men and turned their thoughts into new channels of investigation were precisely the same that revealed to their generation a George, Bellamy, Groundlon and now a Van Ormun, whose great work entitled "Why Government at all?" published by Charles H. Kerr and Company, 175 Dearborn street, Chicago, Illinois, we will attempt to give a synopsis of.

Mr. Van Ornum leaps with one bound into the forefront of the political, social and economic writers of the day, and indeed captures their laurels. His book reveals to us at once that he has been a close student of past and present philosophers, and at the same time astonishes us with his innate genius and the originality of his conceptions.

He is certainly the boldest writer of his time, and equals in recklessness the fearless Bacunine. Beginning as a single-taxer, a pupil of Mr. George, he left his teacher at least half a century in his rear. In his preface he tells us that:

In "1890" he "became impressed with the difficulties to be overcome in winning adherence to the single-tax," and goes on to say: that "the moment I began to look at it from the standpoint of a critic, instead of that of an advocate, the aspect changed." His thoughts were "still directed to devising some scheme of agitation which would force the whole social question to the front," but how to "reconcile the Socialists with the Single-taxers, the Anarchists with the Socialists; or the farmers with the trade-unionists" was the perplexing question. He "understood the essential weakness of compromises," but concluded that "somewhere would be found a common standing ground which would require no compromise, unless truth proved inconsistent with itself." In this the author has certainly succeeded, for in part four of the book he shows us in a new and not unpleasant way how to depose the octopus. We certainly cannot see why all schools of reform cannot unite on the lines laid down. To this, however, we will refer later on.

In his introduction the author asserts that ninety-seven per cent. of the people who start in business fail, that "the professions are all over-crowded; and yet the scholastic institutions, the training, business, medical and law schools are turning out young men constantly who are fitted to fill important positions in every possible profession and calling, a large proportion of which are not wanted.

"The farmers are just as badly off. They are being crowded out too. One by one they are being sold out by the sheriff; their mortgages foreclosed; and if they remain at all it is like the merchant, as a subordinate or a renter.

"Among artisans it is the same. There are too many men. There are not places enough to go round. So unions are formed to determine who shall get the places, and to prevent wages falling below living prices.

"The same thing is true of politics. The party is only another kind of union to determine who shall get the places. Everywhere the man who is out confronts the one who is in, the man who is not [illegible] of whatever [illegible]

absurdities and contradictions" are attacked in this way. After quoting from Mr. George's defence of interest in "Progress and Poverty."

"Again, all through Mr. George's works, he speaks of the inequalities of fortunes as "the unequal distribution of wealth." But is it true? Is there really any such thing as a distribution of wealth which produces inequalities? At the moment when wealth is produced—when labor is impressed upon the material, and it takes on the form which we call wealth, then it *is* distributed; and equitably so, for it is in the hands of its producers. There is a *circulation* of wealth, and if that circulation is free, the distribution will remain unchanged, because the producer will insist upon getting an equivalent before he will part with it. The thing that does take place is a concentration; and it begins at the moment when the product passes from the hands of the laborer to the employer. The laborer is not free. He has been compelled to enter into a contract of employment by which he must give up his product for a stipulated price, which is inadequate. The concentration begins there. The circulation is not free. The inequalities here set up are further increased by every law or regulation which interferes with the freedom of that circulation. Is this too nice a distinction? I think not. To speak of the distribution of wealth, when we mean a concentration, is to lay the foundation for serious errors. From this come all the arbitrary schemes for effecting an enforced equality of distribution, instead of simply clearing away the obstructions to the freedom of that circulation."

The single tax doctrine is disposed of in the following forcible language:

"But is it any consolation to the farmer with a mortgage hanging over him that he cannot pay, and with the prospect of eviction confronting him, to tell him that in the dim and uncertain future, when a majority of men have been converted to the single tax, when usurers and landlords have been abolished, and when politician have all become honest, that he can get another home merely by paying the amount of the annual rental value, which really won't amount to much anyway? What hope is there in all this for the business man whose goods are unsold, collections slow, paper at the bank nearly due, and who sees nothing but bankruptcy staring him in the face? And the tenant, behind with his rent, out of work, out of bread, served with five days' notice of eviction—is there anything in the single tax which offers him relief? To the workingmen on strike against reduction of wages, or unreasonable hours of work and unjust regulations, surrounded by special police and Pinkerton detectives, or confronting the militia, armed with Gatling guns, does the single tax give any help or safety? Well, yes! To all these it holds out the same kind of relief that the church does to the starving—that if they are only virtuous here, when they die they will go to heaven. If they will only vote for the single tax, when the single tax party gets a majority it will pass a law (provided the single tax politicians are all honest levying all taxes on land values, which will scare the landlords so that they will give up their monopoly, and the single tax politicians will make everything lovely. Bah! Out upon such trumpery! What men want is relief—present positive relief. Not in a fabulous and unknown future, when all the good and all the bad stand up in a row to be divided off into two flocks for reward and punishment, but now and here. You might as well tell a man who is sitting on a hot griddle that, if he will only be patient, after a while the weather will change."

In his criticism of the socialistic method of reforming abuses and destroying competition by obtaining control of the machinery of the law he says:

"Pleased with this fiction of self-government, men have been blinded to the fact that they have only substituted one set of politicians for another; that they have set up the political boss, surrounded by his dependents, upon the throne formerly occupied by the king, and his courtiers. This tendency which we find in men to appeal to the state to right every wrong, and correct every abuse, is only a continuation of the same veneration that was formerly accorded to the king, and has precisely the same reason in it, and no more, than in the claim that the king governed by Divine right, and therefore, that he could do no wrong."

When the author attacks Marx he appears more strained and vague than he does when assailing single taxism and state socialism. Hear him:

"But Mr. Marx makes more serious mistakes than what may be called economic slips. He has missed the essential character of man himself. Observing the men's wants can only be supplied by labor, noting the increased power of production that comes from association, and without stopping [illegible] what the essential [illegible]

portant thing; and he would bring about an enforced association, and that without complying with the pre-requisites upon which all association must rest."

Speaking of present conditions of industry, he says:

"In manufacture, in order to make the collective laborer, and through him capital, rich in social productive power, each laborer must be made poor in individual productive powers. Ignorance is the mother of industry as well as superstition. Reflection and fancy are subject to err; but a habit of moving the hand or foot is independent of either. Manufacturers, accordingly, prosper most where the mind is least consulted, and where the workshop may be considered as an engine, the parts of which are men."

"It would hardly be possible to crowd into the same space a greater number of gross absurdities than are contained in this short paragraph. In the very first sentence there are two distinct statements, or inferences, neither of which are true; first, that capital seeks labor which is poor in individual productive power; and second, that there is a social productive power apart from individual productive power. If the first were true, then those who become incapacitated individually: that is, become "poor in individual productive powers," would be the ones most sought for by capital, and of course, would command best wages. This is his proposition stated in plain terms, the absurdity of which is self-evident."

Mr. Bellamy's "Looking Backward" he disposes of in this fashion:

"There is not an analysis of a single principle which throws new light upon the subject, or a proposition put forward that offers even a rational solution of any difficulty. But, on the other hand, the whole tendency of Mr. Bellamy's book is to hush the popular protest against the growing power of monopoly with promises which can never be fulfilled. To accept his solution of the social problem is to abandon the struggle for liberty, to give up to the enemy every position, and submit to be bound hand and foot while the chains of industrial slavery are riveted the tighter."

In chapter VIII his intellectual lance passes clean through the philosophy of Mr. Proudhon:

"One of the most serious mistakes into which Mr. Proudhon fell, but one which has been [illegible] to most, if not all previous social writers, was in discussing social questions without first obtaining a clear knowledge of man himself, in his individual character. Thus we see Mr. Proudhon at one time contending for liberty, and at another advocating the most obnoxious doctrines of state socialism; now denouncing the crime of property, and again defending it; sometimes condemning communism, and then contending for the principles upon which it is founded; and at other times, wandering off until he loses himself among a multitude of contradictory economic absurdities. This I attribute to a want of a proper analysis, followed by a definite method of development, while keeping close to the cardinal principles of man's nature."

In chapter IX, under the head of "Social Palliatives" he makes manifest the fallacy of all "popular reform projects" such as "free trade, prohibition, restriction of immigration (one form of protection), arbitration, eight hours laws, trades unionism, woman's suffrage, co-operation, profit sharing, civil service reform, election of good men to office, ballot reform, referendum, education, government control of public franchises, all of which partake of the nature of state socialism, and must be condemned with that misleading panacea."

Can this arraignment of government in chapter X be refuted?

"In a previous chapter I spoke of government as a corporation, the stockholders of which are monopolies, with office holders as its hired men, and the politicians as its would-be employees. That was no mere figure of speech. It is a real palpable fact. The principal stockholders, that is the largest monopolies, are the ones who dictate the policy of the corporation; and that without regard to who are its servants. If they want a law passed, they get it, whether it is by deceit, by strategy, by flattery, or by bribery; and when it is passed they insist upon its enforcement because it is law. They own the press, and the pulpit, and play upon the fears and prejudices of the people as a musician will play upon the keys of a piano. Thus they make public sentiment, and always in their own favor. Farmers and workingmen can no more hope to change the nature and policy of that corporation by ordinary political party methods than the consumers of kerosene oil can hope to change the nature and policy of the Standard Oil Company."

In chapter I, part 2 of the book is raised one of the two questions which will [illegible] and Judge Kelly have [illegible] obtuse and [illegible]

"selfishness" is the impelling force of all human action, but to this term he gives on entirely new definition—a definition so broad and general as to embrace a Jay Gould and a Peter Cooper. One the representative of all that is crafty and devouring and the other the personification of what is meek and benevolent in our natures. He insists that all that's done by man is done to satisfy the feelings, desires or ambitions of the particular person. And if we except this definition we cannot see a quarrel ahead, at least between ourselves and Mr. Van Ornum. It is true that Solidarity is, and has been looked upon as the extreme of selfishness, but there is no longer any cause for this if what he says be true, and for ourselves we fully agree with him. If a man takes off his shirt and puts it upon the back of his shirtless fellow creature, he certainly satisfies his feelings and is in this respect selfish. If on the other hand he forcibly takes from his neighbor that which he has no claim on, he is also selfish. If he should fight for his country, or against it, and follows the dictates of his feelings in either case, he is selfish. Had he built an institution for the advancement of his kind as Peter Cooper did, or if he is given to plundering railroad stockholders as Jay Gould was, he is selfish in both instances, for there is no doubt that both men satisfied their feelings in the pursuit of their different ambitions. The only question we think is: do men do that which they do to satisfy themselves? For our part we are in full accord with the author for the very reason that if a man did not feel like doing a thing he would not do it. There can be much hair splitting on this point, but life is a little too short to engage in it

In Chapter II., Part II., he says:

"The problem of human life is the development of the human animal to the highest degree of perfection of body and mind that it is capable of reaching. The condition of that development is the absolute freedom of that animal, both in mind and body, from external restraint. The power to work out such a growth lies wholly within each man for himself; and given the necessary conditions, he can no more help growing in all those graces which adorn and beautify his person and character than a plant can help growing to the best of its capabilities, when surrounded with all the conditions of its growth."

(To be continued.) TIMOTHY QUINN.

EXTRACTS FROM AN ADDRESS

Delivered at K. of L. Hall, 66 3d Ave., Pittsburgh, January 29, By HENRY BOWERS.

The most of the Anarchists were, at one time, strong advocates of mild ameliorative measures, but having learned, by close investigation and bitter experience, that it is impossible to reform or improve a system of society and of production upon the robbery of labor, they were soon convinced that is was absolutely necessary to strike at the root of the evil that the system itself is wrong and false, and must be abolished.

The Anarchists point to the utter futility of strikes, boycots and arbitration and similar ineffectual peaceful means; they point to the fact that it is in the very nature of the capitalistic system of production for the workers to be defeated in their attempts to patch up this rapidly decaying system. They point to the fact that it is *this system that causes* poverty, misery, prostitution, crime, general wretchedness and corruption in society, and that as long as the system lasts these evils will remain,

We also claim that if the working people are to be rescued from still further poverty, misery and degradation, they will soon have to resolutely approach the ruling propertied robber class, and say: "We workers have long enough permitted you to live in luxury and idleness from the produce of our labor; we are tired of this unjust state of affairs; we now demand that you immediately quit robbing and tyrannizing us, and give us back the wealth you have stolen from us; if you dont give it peaceably, we will take it forcibly."

The working class, especially the organized portion of them, are engaged in a fierce contest with the propertied exploiting class which lives from their labor. If the producers do not yet consciously know, they *do* instinctively feel that they are deprived of the just fruits of their toil. They know that, as producers of wealth, they are entitled to a better condition of life, to better food, clothing and shelter and to more of the comforts of life generally. But they do not thoroughly understand the numerous unjust, inhuman and unnatural means and machinations which keep them, as a class, in the degraded condition that they are in, and which prevent their elevation. And that [illegible] labor has been and is still [illegible]

This base, cruel and murderous system of private property in the means of life enables the propertied class to shape and control all public institutions in society to suit their own selfish, thievish ends. By means of their plundered wealth they bribe, control and intimidate the majority of the leaders of our numerically strong labor Unions; they buy the various legislative bodies, and thus make sure that no laws will be made directly in favor of the exploited, or if they permit such laws to be made, they do so only to hoodwink and content the dissatisfied army of labor; but if such laws are a real menace to them or their interests, they always find ways and means to render them ineffective, and make them remain dead letters.

The working people pretty generally suspect the politicians of dishonesty. Especially in the United States, the name politician is associated with all that is vile, deceitful, fraudulent and corrupt. Scarcely any workingman that has his five senses would expect anything from a politician in favor of the plundered working class, unless it is for the especial purpose of capturing their votes at the next election. We all know that before election the politicians, in order to get votes, promise all good things imaginable to the needy and discontented workers, but when they have their votes and are elected to office, you hear nothing of them, except, probably, that they are passing some measures in aid of rich corporations and institutions.

The politicians look upon the working people as a horde of voting cattle.

In fact, politics are such a dirty, filthy business that no honest man can go into them without becoming tainted and corrupt. The atmospheric miasma of our legislative halls is such that it poisons all that remain in contact with it a short time.

Before each and every election you can hear the office-seekers, both labor and professional, declaiming to the working people over the whole land that labor has many bitter wrongs to bear, and most vividly do these politicians picture to the downtrodden proletariat the wrongs and injustices they suffer, and they tell them that redress must be sought in special legislative measures, and that, if elected, they will work for the required redress.

This howl of legal help for the working people has been going on for over a half a century in the United States; and during all this time the so-called free American workingmen have been exercizing their political liberty, the ballot, *i. e.*, they have been voting, but in the name of common sense, what benefit have they derived from it? None, absolutely none. On the contrary, our condition has been getting from bad to worse every year. And would the workers not defend themselves on the economic battle field, they would long since have been reduced to the condition of the Huns.

Some labor organizations have been cajoled and used as tools for the selfish aims of labor politicians, so that to-day many labor Unions entirely exclude all politics and all political discussions. Such societies are wise in so doing. Some workingmen who are sadly ignorant of the real facts in the case, however, believe that we ought to elect a sufficient number of honest, "good and true" labor representatives to Congress, and then we may expect redress from there. An unrealizable dream, nevertheless.

The ruling capitalist class, having millions of dollars plundered from the producers, can defeat all such efforts of the disinherited. They control the daily public press, this *mighty* weapon of modern times; an institution that enables them to make the purest and noblest man living appear criminal and dishonest in the eyes of the public, especially in the eyes of the working people, because so many of them swear by what they read in these papers.

The influence of these papers is such that they make the working people believe their best friends are their worst enemies, as they have succeeded in doing with the Anarchists. They have caused the oppressed toilers to believe the Anarchists are nothing but a set of ignorant, lazy loafers and cutthroats, and that their sole aim is robbery, bloodshed and murder.

Thus do the capitalists systematically disseminate lies and misrepresentation, and succeed in confusing the minds of the unwary workers, and misleading them so that they are always ready to persecute and crucify their best friends, when the robber class has interest from their doing so.

(*To be continued.*)

NOT WORDS, BUT WORK.

One of the main causes of the little success which we have had in the propaganda of our principles, is, in our estimation, the excessive importance given to public speeches; and the neglect of that steady work of organization and education, which is the backbone of every movement.

We have had too much of brass-band agitation, and it has advanced us very little.

There are people who attend any public meeting, and listen their whole lives to hundreds of speeches, without feeling prompted to have opinions of their own or to do anything.

On the other hand, the public speaker cannot go too much into the subject he deals with: he must be entertaining rather than persuasive; he must stir up the feelings of the people, not educate them. Public speeches resemble each other greatly, and the audience happens to be pretty much the same at all public meetings. After the meeting is over, everybody goes home, very seldom with any new idea in his mind, and seldom with a real, earnest determination to work for the realization of the good things of which he has heard. Of course, we do not want to deny all usefulness to public meetings. They are certainly *one* good means of propaganda, especially when they are organized in connection with some matter of actual public interest (suppose now the question of Immigration), so as to attract other people than the habitual visitors. But we contend that public meeting, when used as the *only* means of propaganda, is entirely ineffective. Behind the public agitation, there must be active men, who make it a purpose of their life to work steadily for the realization of our principles. These men will look out for the people who manifest sympathy with our principles, and attract them to their circle, and furnish them the means to better educate themselves, and the opportunity to render themselves useful.

They will also look for the opportunities to agitate, and will not allow any popular movement, strike or other event, to pass without their having taken part in it. Finally, they will maintain relations with groups or individuals engaged in the same work as themselves: and thus enliven the movement by mutual help and encouragement.

These men, working in this way, are the real *pioneers*. They are the kind of men we most need at the present time. Our agitation must not be founded on words, but on work. The movement must come *from below*.

We must learn to act together, as independent men united by a common purpose. Authority is the daughther of disorganization, not of organization.

NOTICE.

SOCIALIST-ANARCHIST MEETINGS.

The educational meetings of the Solidarity Group, at 54 Union Square, are being held regularly every Sunday evening. On Sunday next, March 19, John H. Edelmann will lecture on

"Anarchists and the Law."

All are invited, discussion is free, and the readers of "Solidarity" are especially urged to attend and take part in the debates. We need more speakers in our propaganda and we need a clearer understanding of our relations to society at large. Come and speak your mind.

THE PROPAGANDA.

Books, Pamphlets, etc., recommended by and obtainable from SOLIDARITY, for the purpose of spreading revolutionary ideas, economics and sentiment among the working people.

SPECIAL RATES FOR QUANTITY ORDERS from clubs, groups, associations or individuals. Address orders and correspondence to JEFFERSON RAY, Secretary, P. O. Box 2618, New York City.

SOLIDARITY PAMPHLET, No. 1.—Facts and Figures for Workingmen, 32 pages. Five cents per copy; $2.50 per 100 copies; $20.00 per 1,000.

WHY GOVERNMENT AT ALL?—A Philosophical Examination of Human Government, involving an Analysis of the Constituents of Society, and a Consideration of the Principles and Purposes of all Human Association, by William H. Van Ornum. Price, 50 cents.

PAMPHLETS BY [illegible] Anarchist-Communist, between Two Workingmen. Anarchy? Five cents each.