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. 20. NEW YORK, MAY 24, 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.

SHAKESPEARE ON ANARCHY.

KING LEAR.

Act. 4. — *Scene* 6.

LEAR.—A man may see how the world goes, with no eyes. Look with thine ears: See how yon' justice rails upon yon' simple thief. Hark in thine ear. Change places: and handy-dandy, which is the justice, and which is the thief?—Thou hast seen a farmer's dog bark at a beggar?

GLOSTER.—Ay, Sir.

LEAR.—And the creature run from the cur? There tho' might'st behold the great image of authority: A dog's obeyed in office.

KROPOTKINE.

Comrade Kropotkine having consented to deliver a series of lectures in the United States in behalf of the Anarchist Propaganda, a special meeting of the friends of SOLIDARITY was held at 11 Pike St., on Saturday evening, to consider the question of providing ways and means. All of the comrades were enthusiastic and all agreed that comrade Kropotkine could do the most signal service to the cause at present. It was thought that 500 dollars would be sufficient as a guarantee fund to start a series of meetings throughout the country. 100 dollars were pledged by one of the comrades, and all present pledged themselves to help. Subscription-lists will be circulated at once, and in our next issue we hope to be able to announce that the tour is an assured success; in the meantime we ask the comrades throughout the country to consider the matter at once. Of course we shall raise the necessary money, but it will take an earnest effort.

Comrade Brerman proposes that we hold our 11th of November meeting at Madison Square Garden, which will hold 20,000 people. It is a bold project, but by no means an impossible one.

KROPOTKINE FUND SUBSCRIBED.

H. Horenburg, $25; Harry Wallack, $1; N. Kamaw, $1; I. Standard, $1; E. Standard, 50 cents; I. K., $100.

THE CONFERENCE.

In our next issue we hope to publish a call for the Chicago Conference, with definite information as to the time of meeting, etc.

"Money is the Root of all Evil" says Holy Writ, but we, Anarchists, are more inclined to regard the absence of money as the thing to be deplored. Certainly the editors of SOLIDARITY, with visions of a weekly paper and a library of proganda literature constantly in mind—are sure to be always crying for more and more of this alleged "root." Systems of wealth may be specifically broken—

responded nobly, not only is the present issue paid for and the debt slightly reduced, but there is enough on hand to insure the prompt appearance of the next number. Send your contributions, comrades, and we will try to prove ourselves good stewards.

THE WORKING OF THE YEAST.

We received a letter to-day, May 15, from comrade Merlino, in which he says:—"If a Commune is established in Belgium we will all go there"—and on April 4th a revolution in Belgium was a possibility. The working people had quitted work en masse and the movement for universal suffrage threatened to pass beyond the control of the politicians who had planned it. Armed conflicts had taken the place of a peaceful demonstration and the troops showed decided symptoms of "unreliability." It is more than doubtful that they would have slaughtered their fathers and mothers to uphold law and order... The terrified Bourgeoisie hastened to offer the people a fragment of the political equality they demanded, and the Radical leaders, the moderate sensible Socialists, the law and order reformers, hastened to accept the compromise, because the spirit of revolt they had aroused threatened to escape their control. Well, so be it. People can learn only in the school of experience, and the people of Belgium, the common working people, will soon find that the only benefit they have gained is the doubtful one of increasing the number of their masters. In the meantime they have learned what a terrible weapon the universal strike is, and not only they, but the working people of other countries will profit by the lesson.

In Germany, the Socialists are in a state of exaltation somewhat amusing, somewhat saddening. The half-insane boy who represents God for the German people, rejected the compromises, and bargains which his man Caprivi was trying to arrange in the matter of the army bill. The German parliament was given the choice of accepting or rejecting the army bill just as Billy wanted it, and as the bill demanded many more men and millions more of money, the Parliament actually rejected it by a handsome majority. The Socialists, who now hold some 36 seats, hope to increase their membership to at least 50, which will make them considering their cohesion and discipline the most formidable party of the baker's dozen of parties, groups or fractions, into which the Reichstag is split. At present it seems most likely that a majority pledged to vote against the bill will be elected to the new Reichstag. The servant of God the Emperor, in view of this outlook, has announced to a meeting of officers, that he would not be deterred by a hostile Parliament, should one be elected, from carrying into effect a measure which he considers essential to the protection of "His Country." Does he mean a "Coup d'Etat?" The Socialists think so or profess to think so, and Bebel has replied in advance that a "Revolution from above would be met by a revolution from below." Does he mean it? Let us hope so, for a revolution would not be managed by an Executive Committee, whose chief organ denounced the Berlin proletariat as worthless vagabonds, because they demanded bread instead of electing social democrats to office. Whatever be the immediate outcome, government itself is on trial, and the people of Germany will learn a valuable lesson.

In France the Panamites and the Meliniters have a breathing spell The great "Stateman" Constans, secure in the engagement of the "swag" he stole in Tonquin, has not yet been entrusted with the task of forming a strong and "honest" government altho' he has succeeded in killing off nearly all of his rivals. The Catholics, obedient to the ordres of the Pope, seem tolerably certain to transfer their allegiance from the Count of Paris to the Republic. The Count of Mun urged them at a recent conference [illegible] also may be found, artizans and laborers from al-

rulership of the Pope, and really the scheme is not so crazy as it seems. If the Pope by a mere order can transform the French Catholics from Royalists to Republicans, why should he not transform them once more to Socialists, especially Christian Socialists, and surely it would be a fine job for Prelates and Pope, and incidently for the old Catholic Nobility. But as the *New York Sun* says:—"It would be necessary to convert the workmen to Christianity first, since they are all atheists."

In the meantime, the peasants—the conservative, stupid peasants—whom socialists and capitalists alike despise, are doing just what they did a hundred years ago, beginning the Revolution that others are talking about; in Holland, in Belgium, in Spain, and in Italy, the revolts of the peasants against their landlords and other oppressors, are constantly recurring; suppressed in one spot, they break out in another. Fortunately the dull, stupid people who never read Karl Marx or Kropotkine are just intelligent enough to demand the use of the Earth and to believe that people who rob them of the land are thieves, no matter what the lawyers and priests may say.

In England, the dreary Home-Rule squabble seems to occupy all minds,—true, there is a big strike on at Hull,—and some half hearted efforts are being made in favor of the eight hour day. But with true Peckniffian respectability, John Burns, Keir-Hardy, and the rest of the leaders, are bowing the knee to the powers that be the fiery agitators of a few years ago are now "sensible, able men," and how have attained the respect of the ruling classes. Still the Anarchists are carrying on an educational propaganda that appears to have taken root; in Scotland especially a crop of Anarchists seems to be springing from the soil. England and Germany are the least hopsful of all European countries, but even England and Germany cannot escape that social fermentation which it is our mission to increase in all possible ways.

In these United States, which with unconscious irony we are wont to call our own country, the reaction is in full swing. We have had a Naval Parade in which the various governments of Europe and South America vied with each other in exhibiting their murder machines, and the people stood out in the rain and rejoiced. The Chicago Exhibition has been opened and the papers are full of of its magnificence. Nothing is said of the thousands of lives of workingmen that have been sacrificed in its completion. Here, too, the people rejoice at our "Progress."

The strike of the Railroad Engineers is dormant, and the Lawyers will fatten on the union, until the Supreme Court decides whether Judge Ricks has correctly guessed at the law. In the meantime Ricks' decision is the law. The agitation against the Extradition Treaty is still proceeding in a very decorous fashion, and the local Russian leaders are exerting themselves to explain to the American Bourgeois that Russian patriots are neither "Revolutionists" or "Anarchists," and to the Radicals that this course is perfectly consistent and should not cause them to become lukewarm in the cause.

Poor Devils!

The farmers' movement is wallowing in the filth of politics; about the most irksome duty of the editor is the reading of our exchanges of the people's party, and yet when one has accomplished the task, it is impossible to avoid feeling that an immense change has been effected in the opinions of the farmers' Socialistic views and sentiments are spreading, and many are bold enough to advocate doctrines that, to say the least, are fully as radical as the program of the Fabian Socialists, when I recall that ten years ago it was almost impossible to find a man in the Western States who would even discuss such mild remedies as nationalizing of railroads, I realize that the yeast is working; and even in the organs of organized labor, the faint streaks of the coming daylight of reason can be discerned. Judge Billing and Judge Ricks have forced many of the [illegible] will be glad [illegible] suggestions from comrades and friends of the movement.

H. GEORGE'S LATEST BOOK.

Mr. H. George is very angry with H. Spencer and has written a book to convict him of "intellectual prostitution," because he (Spencer) has recanted his old views on the land question. Mr. George once more reprints the famous chapter from "Social Statics," where Spencer declared so emphatically for land nationalisation; then he reprints two letters from Spencer, to the *St. James Gazette* and the *Times* respectively, where Spencer said his opinion was but a *tentative* one, his language very guarded, full of *its* and *buts*, and it *seems* and *it is doubtful*, and *it is possible*, and that his real aim and purpose was "to find a valid basis for the right of property, the basis assigned by Locke appearing invalid." His view of land ownership, Mr. Spencer was eager to say, was congrous with existing legal theory and practice, and it was expressed "in the belief that the questions raised were not likely to come to the front in our time or for many generations!"

What a pity that Mr. Spencer for once was mistaken! The question, not only of land ownership and of the whole capitalistic system has come to the front, and Mr. Spencer who had simply contemplated in some dim and distant future a different system of land tenure different from the present one with full regard to vested rights, found himself in the dilemma either to extend his views on land ownership to every kind of ownership, or to recall them back. He chose the latter course, in consequence, probably, of his personal acquaintance with or sympathy for "his Grace and sir John," and admiration for the Land and Property. Defence League, "on which sit several peers and two judges."—In his latest work, *Justice*, Spencer has justified private property in land, as in everything else.

"Shame!" cries Mr. George, "Spencer is a traitor, a traitor to the masses of landless, a traitor to himself, to his philosophy, to the truth, to the cause of Justice and Progress." The lesson, he adds very truly, ought to teach people intellectual self-reliance. "It is not merely the authority of Mr. Spencer as a teacher on social subjects that I would discredit; but the blind reliance upon authority. For, on such subjects, the masses of men cannot trust authority." On such subjects! But if authority cannot be trusted in matters of science, it is hard to believe that it can be trusted in any matter at all. Mr. George is teaching Anarchism. Beware!

Yet, we entertain a suspicion; and, were it only for the purpose of enforcing that lesson of intellectual self-reliance so eloquently taught by Mr. Spencer, we wish to communicate it to our readers. The suspicion is that, just as Mr. Spencer is guilty of "philosophical legerdemain" in defending his new view on the land question, Mr. George is trying, by very much the same method to conceal from our eyes the unrighteousness of the capitalistic system.

To begin with a cognate question, George admits that "as a matter of strict justice" no compensation should be given to the land-owners for the value of their (*sic!*) improvements," for, says he, "much of things other than the land itself, which existing land-owners now possess, they have obtained by their unjust appropriation of land. But *we* (here the philosopher ceases to speak and begin the single-taxer, the leader of a political party) we wish to be within our right (*sic!*) and to let bygones be bygones, and so all that we propose is... the resumption of equal rights in land, leaving to existing land-owners, *without question as to how it was obtained, the whole value of their improvements in or on land, and all their other property.*"

Generous Mr. George! He very likely believes he has been entrusted with full powers by the landless of the world to transact and compromise their claims against the land-owners. And he agrees on full compensation notwithstanding the fact that were the landowners to receive full compensation for *their* improvements, they would get the full market value of the land or even a greater amount, and the workmen would be obliged to toil to pay them, no more the rent on land, but, what amounts to the same the interests on the capital of their improvements! Of course, George maintains that notwithstanding so much generosity towards the land-owners, there would remain an immense balance every year from the production, in the hands of the government, and that this balance would be employed to relieve the people from present burdens and provide them with the means to work. This is so extraordinary "a feat of intellectual legerdemain, equivalent not to swallowing a sword, but to swallowing himself," as might be performed by Mr. Spencer himself [illegible] about land, not is not the land itself, which is disputed, but the fruits of the labor expended on land whether they must belong to the laborer or to somebody else (the landlord, the capitalist, the merchant, the tax-collector, the politician, etc.) The market value of land is but the capitalization of the extortions which the landlord is able to practise on the farmer and laborers, and indirectly on all the workmen of a country, just as the value of a manufacturing business is the capitalization of the profits extorted from the workmen—and may be indirectly from the farmers and laborers. One thing is as legitimate as the others, and any discrimination between them, any selection of a special kind of property and of a class for confiscation or taxation, is not unjust and uneffectual, but unpracticable.

Mr. George shuts his eyes to this side of the question. He is even angry with Mr. Spencer, because the latter admits that "a complete ethical "justification for the right of property (in other "things than land) is involved in the same difficul-"ties as the ethical justification for the right to "the use of the earth."

Yet, a moment's reflection on his own arguments would have persuaded him that the distinction is illogical. The very same arguments which he brings against private property in land hold as against private property in other instruments of production.

We would reproduce whole pages of "A Perplexed Philosopher," containing George's strictures against private property in land, and by merely changing the word "land" into "capital" (or instruments of production), the argument would hold equally. In the following passage, for instance, Mr. George refers to land-ownership exclusively; but it is impossible in reading it not to think of other kinds of property.

"Does *it* (private property in land) not openly, notoriously, flagrantly, deny to men the equal use of natural opportunity to live their lives, develop their powers, and reap the rewards of their conduct? Does it not give the idle, the stupid, the profligate, the vicious, through the accidents of birth or luck, or successful forestalling, the natural rewards of industry, energy, temperance and thrift? Does it not proportionately (for it involves enormous wastes) deny these rewards to those who have really earned them? Does *it* not give wealth, honor, the command of everything that labor in a high civilization can produce, to idlers, idiots, gamesters, profligates? Does *it* not, on the other hand, condemn toil to poverty, and honest labor to contempt and grinding want? Does *it* not, wherever our civilization extends, make the mere opportunity to work a boon? keep men in idleness whose strongest desire is to earn a living? fill prisons and almshouses? condemn to ignorance minds that might enlighten and bless mankind? rob little children of the grace and glory of life and force them before their time out of a world in which monopoly denies them room?"

Yes, it does—but what? Private property in capital as well as in land.

S. Merlino.

London, April 10.

Comrade A. Cipriani having come over from Paris to spend a few days with us, we had a meeting in Grafton Hall, which was crowded, altho' we had not time to print our handbills. Comrade C. spoke about the trial at Rome. He said the whole affair arose out of the Anarchist congress, held in Capolago, Switzerland, December, 1890. After that Congress, he made a tour in Italy. The Government forbade him to appear at public meetings, but he succeeded in addressing crowds in many places in spite of the polices.

The indescribable misercry of the workingmen and peasant impress ed him deeply, and less their evident readiness to revolt. The question confronting the Anarchists, at that time, was a programm for the 1st of May.

His own opinion was and is that no given date can be selected for an insurrection, that the 1st of May must necessarily be merely one of formal demonstration. The Government is prepared, the troops mobilized and a large number of comrades imprisoned beforehand. In Rome, on May 1st, 1891, there were 25,000 soldiers in Santa Croce Square and thereabouts; it would have been madness to provoke a fight under such conditions. He, Cipriani, spoke to that effect. Unfortunately the police took advantage of a few words of Comrade Palla to provoke what nearly became a massacre. A policeman shot as a workingman, and a trumpet call promptly ordered the military to attack the unarmed people. The scene that ensued baffles description: men, women and children running in all directions only to meet the charging troops who cut off all avenues of escape. Hand-to-hand fights [illegible] priani, and would doubtless have killed him, if an unknown had not struck the agent dead. Cipriani was knocked down and trampled on by the charging cavalry, and finally taken to the home of a friend seriously wounded. During the next few days 500 arrests were made; two batches of prisoners were tried successively. Cipriani was in the second batch. The whole evidence of the prosecution was manufactured at the police headquarters. A police inspector admitted that every morning the witnesses of the day were rehearsed, and that the weapons produced as having been found in the square of Santa Croce had been put there by the police. The trial turned against the Government, and was brought to an end in the absence of the prisoners and their counsel. Cipriani and his friends—Anarchists almost to a man—were sentenced as "common associated criminals." He has returned to the outer world to find that the number of anarchists has greatly increased in spite of the persecutions of the Government, perhaps in consequence of them. To make a Revolution in Italy would be easy if the people were united. Unfortunately there are labor leaders who only see in their followers voting cattle. These leaders we must fight not for personal reasons, but because they are the chief obstacle to social revolution.

S. Merlino.

McMillan, Wis., Feb. 15, 1893.

Jefferson Ray, Esq.

Dear Comrade,

I have intended during some time past to drop you a few lines on a subject on which I have been thinking: Isn't it possible for us Anarchists to establish a Colony somewhere? The Belamites have tried it and failed. Can't we succeed?

I was a member of Kaweah.

Something should be done in this direction. Can't we put our heads together and put our ideas into practice?

Your fraternally, H. J. Hughes.

GOVERNMENT ANALYSED.

"If the persons who have been trying again this winter to get the Legislature to pass a bill of some kind regulating the telephone business in some way, knew how completely they are wasting their time and what a direct boon their efforts art to the legislative strikers, they would save themselves all their time and expense. The same advice might be given to the persons who are seeking the passage of a bill to exclude trucks from Fifth Avenue. The lawmakers at Albany this winter divide the bills that come before them into two classes—public and private bills. The fate of the former is decided by the dictation of the bosses, as was instanced in the case of the Croton water-shed bill; all the influence of the medical profession and of enlightened lay opinion in this city was powerless to change that measure when Tammany ordered it to go through. The fate of the private bills is decided by money. In other words, if they are not distasteful to the bosses, they can be passed if those interested in them are willing to pay enough members to vote for them; otherwise they will die. This is no mere assertion, but a statement that could be proved to the satisfaction of any court if the persons who have tried to pass private bills at Albany this winter would give their testimony as to their experience. All such bills as the telephone regulation bill are looked on as blessings by the big powers that govern the city, because they give those powers a chance to prove their 'usefulness' to rich corporations. It takes even more money than the taxpayers contribute directly to keep up elegant private establishments and make half-million-dollar investments. Many old ways of making up the deficiency, such as Tweed and the Aldermen of the Broadway Railway days employed, have been found out and now prove dangerous. It is much easier and safer to be 'useful' to a wealthy corporation, and when there are a good many such corporations in search of the 'useful,' the new system becomes a great success."

The above extract is not as might be supposed from a revolutionary journal, but from the highly "respectable *Evening Post*. We have other equally valuable evidence from similiar sources that goes to show that as to fact there is no disagreement between the intelligent upholders of government and ourselves. It is only when we come to remedies that we differ, but is it not passing strange that a men who sees the actual workings of a government based on universal suffrage should not lose faith in government itself. As a matter of fact the *Evening Post* is one of those mugwump journals that would like to see government made the prerogative of the wealthy and cultured classes. These people see as clearly as we do that [illegible] the [illegible] carried in the United States [illegible]

"WHY GOVERNMENT AT ALL?"

(Continued.)

"That plan of action is simply the withholding of taxes; not the refusal at first to *pay* taxes, but the refusal to *appropriate* them. Appropriation bills, like all other legislative acts, require the concurrence of both houses of the legislature and the governor. An appropriation for national expenditures must pass both houses of congress and be approved by the president. If it fail of *one house*, it can go no further. In municipal affairs, money must be appropriated by the city council, and the bill be approved by the mayor, before the officers can get their pay. Even town and county boards in country places hold the grip upon the purse strings if they choose to use it. Taxes to the government machine are like steam to an engine. Without them the machine is powerless. All that is necessary is to combine, and elect a majority of *one house, to do nothing.* It is not necessary to repeal a law, or to amend a law; simply refuse to pass *any* law. Elect men to one house only, absolutely pledged to do nothing, except to be present at every meeting, and vote 'no' on every proposition, except motions for adjournment. Without appropriations the militia cannot be called out to put down a strike, a court cannot enforce a single process, a mortgage cannot be foreclosed, a tenant cannot be evicted, a tax cannot be collected, the police must quit, and every office holder must go home about his business.

"In municipal, or town, or country affairs, let people who are not interested in monopoly combine to elect a majority of the city council, or the town or county boards, and the thing is done. They have only to see that those whom they elect perform precisely the duties they were elected to perform, and no other.

"Such an agitation cannot long be carried on along these lines without attracting the attention of every man to its merits, or before a majority of the national house of representatives can be elected. When that is done the whole governing machine must stop. Freedom will have been achieved. Free production and free trade will have become an accomplished fact, because there will be no one capable of interfering with trade or production. The whole system of internal revenue will be wiped out at one stroke; men will become emancipated from the bondage of government debts and taxes of all kinds. Monopoly cannot then enforce a single one of its demands. The land becomes free to whoever will use it, for there will be none who are able to keep any one off it. All this can be done by only getting control of one of the three co-ordinate branches of government. To amend the law requires all three.

"No tax is better than one tax, or many taxes. It is easier for men to understand, easier to attain, and easier to pay; and then, as already seen, it will give far better results. It reaches the full realization of liberty; that is, a condition where mankind is without restriction. It emancipates men from the bondage of public debts, and every other form of privilege. It takes away the club which the landlord, and the lendlord, and every other kind of a lord, wields over mankind to compel submission.

"This plan of work does not violate in the slightest particular the fundamental objection of anarchists to political action. It is not a political move in the ordinary sense, but rather a co-operative one of mutual defense. It is purely defensive. It merely seeks to pack one house of the legislature with men pledged to refuse any appropriations for the execution of law; and by doing so it is a perfect check upon all action by the other house and the executive. By electing men for this purpose we are not setting them up in authority over us, because they can exercise no authority. We need not elect, or even nominate any other officers than members of one house of congress, of the legislature, of city councils, and of county and town boards. This is a very different thing from present political methods, where two houses and an executive must be elected, and then to proceed to change the law by amendment or re-enactment in the face of active and powerful opposing interests, skilled in all the arts of intrigue and corruption.

"At the last meeting of the Kansas legislature the farmers had a clear majority in the house of representatives. Had they taken the stand of refusing to appropriate a dollar to pay the expenses of the state government, instead of wasting their energies in a long struggle to elect one man to a useless office, one where, for a long time to come at least, that officer is powerless to help them even if he wished to, they would have sounded a note which would have been heard around the world: [illegible] would have [illegible] it [illegible] are requested [illegible] killed or duly [illegible] Sympathizers [illegible] spoken [illegible] nets of web [illegible] speedily broken!

courage to the oppressed of every land under the sun. In our own country the farmer's party, long before this, would have been the producer's party against the idlers and monopolists. The republican and democratic parties would have been forced to coalesce and make common cause against it. The farmers of Kansas would have found practically the whole farming community of this country behind them; and not only them, but all other classes of wealth producers also.

"Until this issue is made, both the old parties will stand, one as the representative of conservatism, and the other of liberalism, according to the bias of the person who considers them, while they both practically represent the same thing. The difference between them is not enough to quarrel about. When there comes a real danger to the interests they stand for, they will permanently unite, as they did temporarily in Kansas, in the face of the farmers. While they remain apart it is a certain indication that they see no danger. But when they join hands, we may know that the end is near.

"After a most careful survey of the whole situation I am convinced that this issue, of "no taxation," is the true line of attack. It is the most vulnerable point in the whole position of monopoly. It is the one most easily assailed, and most difficult to defend. From the moment this issue is made, government itself is put upon the defensive. It will, and inevitably must try, at least, to show what good it does; by what right it exists,—what it does to justify that existence, which it cannot do. When it undertakes it, it is lost, as I have abundantly shown throughout this whole work. Thus, the contest must be carried on along lines, the mere discussion of which will bring out the essential principles of liberty and show the utter hollowness of the pretensions of government."

Chapter VIII., Part II., is in our opinion the best chapter in this wonderful book, and we cannot do better than submit it in whole for the consideration of the reader:

"If our analyses in the previous chapters are correct, then every restriction imposed by some men upon the actions of other men, either through religion, or the law, is precisely of the same nature as the restriction imposed by the master over his chattel slave. The difference is wholly in the degree to which the restriction is carried. And more than that, it has the same object in view, the living of some men off the earnings of other men.

"If it is the restraints of religion, it has for its object the support of the church, which means, the authorities of the church. If they preach submission to God they mean, in all cases, submission to his representatives, the priests. The means used to effect those restraints have been sometimes legal enactements, sometimes promises of happiness in a supposed world to come, sometimes threats of torments after death, with anathemas and punishments before, and always by appeals to their superstitious reverence for something supposed to lie outside of, or beyond human sense, and therefore not easily disproved by those who are disposed to cavil at their pretensions. That their object has been well attained, let the wealthy church dignitaries and the magnificent church establishments attest, in every country where religion has held sway; and let the poverty, ignorance, superstition, misery, and servile, truckling spirit of the people bear witness to the extent of the robbery perpetrated, and their degradation under it, which is only equalled by the cringing servility of the chattel slave.

"Where those restraints have been imposed by the secular law, they had their origin in the supposed 'divine right of kings to govern,' the present veneration for law under a republican form of government being only a substitution of the political boss for the king, and the investing of his acts with the same sanctions as those which were formerly accorded to the sovereign, under the mistaken idea that it is the people who do the governing. Those restraints too have been to establish and perpetuate inequalities; to enable idlers to live luxuriously off the earnings of the industrious; to build up a rich class at the expense of a poor class, and to protect the rich in the possession and enjoyment of their wealth. The means primarily employed have been the conferring upon property of special rights and immunities not its by nature, thus giving those who have most property the most rights; and secondly, the granting of special privileges whereby the land, the money, the transportation facilities, manufacturing privileges, public debts, and in fact the whole resources of the country are parcelled out to a horde of monopolists, mostly who never did an honest day's work in their lives, but whose work has consisted in scheming to get the wealth that others produce. How well they have succeeded in their scheming, by the aid of the law, which is their principal instrument, let the [illegible] art and in science are here. Here also may be found artizans and laborers from al-

[illegible] published [illegible]

that is necessary for a man to live well or even to get rich is, to obtain a few shares in some profitable monopoly, buy a government or corporate bond, invest in some mortgage security, get hold of some tract of land, just as men used to invest their money in niggers, and thereafter the slaves, that is, those who buy goods of the monopoly, who pay taxes to the government, do business with the corporation, buy or rent the land, or work to pay off the mortgage, will support him in idleness. He does not have to work any more. The slaves (the people) do that for him.

"Has the slave a right to run away? Whether he has or not, he sometimes does it. The master formerly regarded such a slave, or one who was suspected of a desire to run away, just as we are taught to-day to regard the man who fails to pay his debts, or the tenant who tries to beat his landlord. The press, mainly owned by, and in the pay of, monopoly hold up such an one as an awful example of human depravity. Shylock always insists upon his right to his pound of flesh; the master upon the baseness of the slave who runs away; the creditor that it is dishonorable to fail; and the landlord condemns the tenant who avoids pay nent. These are all only different statements of the same thing

"The social question to-day is precisely the same question as presented itself thirty to fifty years ago in this country: it is the question of liberty against slavery. It is the same one that has met humanity at every step of its progress from barbarism; and it will continue to confront it in some form, so long as one man, or one set of men, for any purpose whatever, or in any way, are allowed to control the actions or thoughts of other men.

"Do not understand me as bringing a railing accusation against the monopolists, the landlords, the bondholders, the money loaners, or even the priests. They too are men, actuated by the same motives, pursuing the same end, and using the same means, that is, whatever they find ready to their hands. If the people are kept poor and miserable, it is because they have left the means for their own impoverishment in the other's hands. That they have done it ignorantly is no excuse. The child that ignorantly places its hand on a hot stove, and is burned, has no cause to blame the stove. The child can only correct its own ignorance, and not do so any more. The monopolists are no worse than the other men; in fact, they are personally often very estimable people, except where their ignorance, combined with their self-love, produces arrogance. The slave masters, too were generally intelligent, high-minded, and courteous gentlemen in their intercourse with their social equals; but that did not prevent them from being haughty, over-bearing, and arrogant to their slaves. The people who ignorantly vote to tax themselves to support a court, and court officers whose sworn duty is to enforce the claims of monopoly, can find no fault if these officers do their duty and evict them when they default in their payments on their mortgages. The surprising thing is, that the farmers, the merchants, and the laborers do not say to the money loaners, the landlords, the bondholders and monopolists in general, "Here! you fellows have had this thing all your own way long enough. We have paid the bills, and you have received the benefits. Suppose you pay your own bills for awhile. If you want courts to enforce claims against us, it is only fair that you pay their expenses. If you want police to protect your wealth, just pay their salaries out of your own pockets. It is not fair to ask those who have no wealth to pay for the protection of those who have. If you want militia to call on to defeat us when we strike, you must foot the bills." When the workingmen, the farmers, and the merchants will talk to the monopolists of this country like that, and mean it and do their voting to that end, and that only, they will be very near their own emancipation. The slaves will have freedom in sight."

The first question raised by the writer of the book, on which we anticipate any serious difference fo opinion among radicals of the no government school, is the definition given the term selfishness, and the next is the remedy he suggests, but we don't think that the author has any cause to worry over the result. In our opinion there can be but one result and that an endorsement of his scheme.

What Mr. Van Ornum aims at in the book, what he has evidently written the book for, it to arouse an agitation on the lines laid down. He does not fear the outcome, and he has no cause to. Two years ago we started a club in this city, with precisely the same object in view—the ultimate abolition of the law. We were more politic, more conservative; that is to say more cowardly than Mr. Van Ornum, for our plan was to agitate for the repeal of the laws, and in affect we think will be [illegible] live, and of social and industrial reform.

The Committee will be glad to receive suggestions from comrades and friends of the movement.

masses away from legal remedies for their wrongs must necessarily turn their thoughts in another direction. Let legal enactments be once investigated by the plundered toilers of the land, and their infamies will immediately become apparent. When that hour comes, farewell to the laws, and the thieves and hypocrites who manufacture them.

The book should be read by every farmer, mechanic, laborer and professional man in the land. No member of the "Farmers' Alliance," "Knights of Labor," "Federation of Labor," or any other member of a reform body should be without a copy. It is, in our opinion, by far the ablest book ever written on the social, political and economic questions that have attracted the attention of this, or any other age. He deals with every phase of these questions and treats them as they have never been treated before. He is clear, forcible and logical and is bound to be recognized as the brightest and most suggestive mind of this wonderful decade of intellectual activity, when mental forces are clashing as they have never clashed before.

Lay your hobbies aside, stop quibling, be honest, and you will find that "Why Government at all?" meets every demand you make. We only know of one class that it should not suit and that is the parisitical class.

We believe that mutualism must take the place of commercial competition and the wage system, and we also believe that the revolution must be forcible, but we have found nothing in Mr. Van Ornum's book that will prevent us from marching side by side with him. On the contrary, he is the best possible aid to our cause, and the surest guide to the accomplishment of our object—the working out of our ideal. TIMOTHY QUINN.

IN MEMORIAM.

Peter Haack, of Creighton Township, Kent Co, Nebraska, was a farmer whom personal prosperity did not satisfy—he wished also the prosperity of his fellow men, and the study of the causes of the poverty and misery about him, made him an Anarchist. For six years he has been an active and zealous propagandist. On the 21th of March he met with an accident that caused his death.

COMRADE FAREWELL.

AMERICAN CIVILISATION.

It is the custom in Tennessee to arrest men who are out of work, and then to hire them out to contractors. This practice has now spread into Virginia, as is proved by the following notice, published in a Norfolk paper by the Chief of Police.

"This is to give notice to all fishermen, lumbermers, and farmers, that the Chief of Police of Norfolk will furnish them with vagrants, hiring these out for three months work, if necessary with ball and chain. Said vagrants can also be hired by the managers of Public Works in this City, to work for three months with ball and chain. I further direct all police officers in accordance with the law, to arrest all workingmen without visible means of existence, and if the supply of these vagrants proves greater than the demand, they shall be sent to prison for three months, to be there fed on bread and water. This order is issued by direction of the Board of Health, as a sanitary precaution, and under the powers given me by Article 885 of the Code of Virginia."

They are a noble class these same bourgeois! When speaking of Public Health however, they touch on the subject we have most at heart. Society is devoured by vermin who live by sucking the blood of the workers, and it is time indeed to have a thorough cleansing.

(From *Le Réveil.*)

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.

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.

FREEDOM.—A monthly journal of Anarchist-Communism.—Address: C. M. Wilson, 61 Augustine Road, Camden Town, London, N. W. Price per annum, 35 c.

PROGRESS.—A Russian radical journal, published fortnightly at 893 Milwaukee Ave., Chicago, and 183 Essex St., New York. Terms to suscribers: one

THE SMALL BOY.

HE ASKS HIS FATHER SOME PERTINENT QUESTIONS.

A Conversation Between a Remarkably Observant Child and His Fond Parent—A Number of Points Worthy of Consideration by all Wage-Earners.

Pa, what place is that?

That is a brickyard, my son.

Whose brickyard is it, pa?

It belongs to me, my son.

Do all those big piles of bricks belong to you?

Yes, my son, every brick of them.

My! How long did it take you to make them? Did you make them all alone by yourself?

No, my son; those men you see working there made them for me.

Do these men belong to you, pa?

No, my son; these men are free men. No man can own another. If he could the other would be a slave.

What is a slave, pa?

A slave is a man who has to work for another all his life, for only his board and clothes.

If a slave gets sick, who pays for the doctor, pa?

Well, his owner does. He can't afford to lose his property.

Why do these men work so hard, pa? Do they like it?

Well, no, I don't suppose they do; but they must work or starve.

Are those men rich, pa?

Not to any great extent, my son.

Do they own any houses, pa?

I rather guess not, my son.

Have they any horses and nice clothes, and do they go to the seaside when it's warm, like we do, pa?

Well, hardly. It takes them all their time to earn their living.

What is a living, pa?

Why, a living—well, for them a living is what they eat and wear.

Isn't that board and clothes, pa?

I suppose it is.

Well are they any better off than slaves?

Of course they are, you foolish boy. Why, they are free; they don't need to work for me if they don't like; they can leave whenever they choose.

And if they leave, won't they have to work, pa?

Yes, of course they will; they will have to work for some one else.

And will they get any more than a living from him?

No, I suppose not.

Well, then, how are they any better off than slaves?

Why, they have votes; they are free men.

If they get sick, do you pay the doctor, pa?

Catch me! What have I got to do with it? They must pay for their own doctor.

Can you afford to lose one of the men who work for you, pa?

Of course I can; it don't make any difference to me. I can hire another whenever I like.

Then you aren't so particular about them as if they were your slaves, are you, pa?

No, I suppose not.

Then, how is it better for them to be free?

Oh, don't ask foolish questions, boy.

What are bricks made of, pa?

Clay, my son.

Do the bricks belong to the man who makes them, pa?

No, my son, they belong to me.

Why, when they make them, pa?

Because the clay is mine.

Did you make it, pa?

No, God made it, my son.

Did he make it for you, pa?

No, I bought it.

Bought it from God?

No, from a man.

Did the man buy it from God?

No, of course not; he bought it fronm another man, I suppose.

Did the first man it was bought from buy it from God?

No, I suppose not.

How did he get it, then? How was it his any more than anybody else's?

Oh, I don't know. I suppose he just claimed it.

Then, if these men should claim it now, would it be theirs?

Oh, don't bother asking such foolish questions.

Say, if you didn't own the brickyards and the clay, how would you make your living, pa?

Oh, I don't know. I suppose I would have to work.

How would you like to make bricks for your board and clothes, and let the man who claimed the brickyard have everything else?

Nobody'd care how I liked it. Poor people must work for their living.

If these men had brick yards of their own, would they work for you, pa?

Not likely; they'd work for themselves, probably.

Isn't it lucky that that man claimed this land first and that you bought it?

Why?

If he hadn't, may be somebody else would have claimed it, and then maybe one of those men would own it now, and then you'd have to work for your board and clothes.

May be you ought to be thankful to Providence for his goodness to you in giving you a father who can support you without working.

Should these men's little boys be thankful to Providence too, pa?

Well, I suppose they should.

What for, pa?

Because their pas have steady work.

Is steady work a good thing, pa?

Of course it is, my son.

Then, why don't you work, pa? Nobody could keep you from making bricks, could they?

No. I don't want to keep men out of a job. If I worked, there wouldn't be work for another man.

That's kind of you, pa. Do you think, if you was to wheel that man's barrow once, while he rested, that he would be mad about it?

Oh, pshaw! Gentlemen don't wheel barrows.

What's gentlemen, pa?

Why, gentlemen—men who don't need to work—the upper class.

I thought there wasn't any upper class in this country. I heard a man say all men were equal.

The man who said it was a socialist, or anarchist, or something; or may be it was at election time, and he was trying to catch votes.

Say, pa, my Sunday-school teacher says we are all God's children. Is she a socialist, or anarchist, or is she trying to catch votes?

Oh, no; that's the right thing to say in Sunday-schools and churches.

Well, pa—honest, now—are these men God's children just as much as we are?

Why, yes, my son; to be sure they are.

Say, pa, do you remember when you bought that dozen alleys for brother Jim and me, and I grabbed them all and made Jim give me his top before I'd let him play with them, and you called me a greedy little hog and gave me a licking?

Yes, my son, I remember.

Well, do you think you did right?

Certainly, my son; a parent does right to correct his children and keep them from acquiring bad principles. I bought the marbles for you both. Jim had as much right to them as you.

Well, pa, if these men are God's children as much as you, then you and they are brothers; and if you make them give you all the bricks they make for allowing them to use the clay which God made, isn't that the same as me making Jim give me his top for a chance to play with the marbles.

Oh, bother! Don't ask such stupid questions.

Say, pa, do you think God thinks you are a greedy little hog, and that he will punish you for grabbing that clay?

Oh, don't talk so much. Say, Mary, put this child to bed—he makes me tired!—*Inland Printer.*

FINANCIAL.

Received from No. 19, H. J. Hughes, 75 c.; R. H., $1.25; Wm. Lane, $1; Miss L., $1; A. J. P., 25 c.; per R. Goodheart, subscr. list "41," $12.65; per Miss Notkin, subsc. list "43," $4; Group New Bedford, $3; P. R. Kinget, $1; A. Press, 25 c.; D. C., David, $1.50; B'lyn Solidary Group, $3.50; J. Nydes, $1; M. Cooper, 50 c.; Chas. W—l, 25 c.; M. Js, 50 c.; Jos., M—r, 25 c.; B. S., 50 c.; French Group, for pamphlets, $3; Salvator, $1; Salvator, $1; C. Walton, $1; Robt. Mc Bratney, 25 c.; Sale at Thalia Theatre, $1.09; at Club, $1.04; Ditto, 18 c.; Math Slejshal, $1.50; R. H., $1; Clinton Loveridge, 50 c.; M. Edelman, 25 c.; M. Haas, $1; J. Barcal, $3.60.

PUBLICATION FUND.

Wm. H., 50 c.; H. J. Hughes, $1; John Sanders, $10; Unknown, $5.

SOLIDARITY CLUB OF BROOKLYN meets at Stutzman's, corner of Morrell and Varet Sts., every Sunday, from 10 to 12 A. M. Everybody is wellcome.

COMRADES, AGITATE FOR OUR PAPER.

SOLIDARITY