

# The Word.

VOL. III.

PRINCETON, MASS., MAY, 1874.

NO. 1

## THE WORD,

A MONTHLY JOURNAL OF REFORM.

Regarding the subjection of Labor, of Woman, and the prevalence of War-as-unnatural evils, induced by false claims to obedience and service; favors the Abolition of the State, of Property in Land and its kindred resources, of Speculative Income and all other means whereby Intrusion acquires wealth and power at the expense of Useful People. Since Labor is the Source of Wealth, and creates all values equitably vendible, The Word, (not by restrictive methods, but through Liberation and Reciprocity), seeks the extinction of interest, rent, dividends, and profit, except as they represent work done; the abolition of railway, telegraphic, banking, trust-union and other corporations charging more than actual cost for values furnished, and the repudiation of all so-called debts, the principal whereof has been paid, in the form of interest.

E. H. HEYWOOD, - - - EDITOR.

Contributors, correspondents, and those from whose works extracts may be printed are responsible only for their own opinions; the Editor need not be understood to approve or reject any views, not editorial, unless he says so.

Terms 75 cents annually, in advance: 5 copies \$3.30; 10 copies \$6.00; 20 copies \$11.00; 50 copies \$20.00; 100 copies \$37.50. Single copies 7 cents. Subscribers who wish to continue will please remit in time, for the paper is not sent except on payment in advance. Address

THE WORD,  
PRINCETON, MASS.

## The Opposition.

LABOR ANARCHISTS.

The fact is not to be disguised that there is a class of men in this city, who are Communists and labor disorganizers of the very worst order. The most of them are simple fools, while their leaders are idlers, big gamesters and ruffians, having tools for their followers. The great majority of both are foreigners, who show nothing more conspicuous than their unwillingness to share the privileges and immunities of a free government. New York, or any other city, would soon become a pandemonium if subjected to their rule. It is to the credit of the true workmen which they have already denounced these anarchists and enemies of social order, and utterly refused and rebuffed to do with them. Riotous assemblages are best taken care of by not permitting them to assemble at all. This nips the thing in the bud, and prevents the evil before it really exists. The police, though too late upon the ground, nobly did their duty. Their loudest howl with effect upon the sham workmen who had marshalled themselves under the red flag of mischief.

We go all lengths in the direction of charity. Yet, when workmen, or any other class of men, address to organized society menacing and peremptory demands, and enter into combinations that threaten force, unless their demands are promptly complied with, then they raise an issue which should be disposed of only by one made to them. The strong, prompt, availing arm of the bearing law, is the proper agent to such demands. Those who lawlessly resist to brute force, can be met only by force, regulated by law. Their position is that of public enemies, and they should be treated accordingly. There is always a mass of idleness, ignorance and vice, in great cities, which cares but little for any other logic than that of force; and when a crisis comes, it should have this logic and plenty of it. All good citizens, not excepting the true workmen, rejoice that, though the authorities were not as prompt as they should have been, they have, nevertheless, furnished a wholesome lesson on this subject.—N. Y. Independent.

## THE NEW PERIL.

The absence of work and the great number of unemployed who are roaming about the country has created general alarm among our citizens, who reside in suburban towns. A gang of masked men are scouring the country, visiting farm houses and isolated dwellings, gagging and binding people by day and shooting them by night, winding up by going through the houses and often setting fire to the premises. Sundays are especially days of terror. The police are powerless, owing to the fewness of their numbers, to guard our citizens. Families are leaving their homes and filling up the hotels on Broadway considering it unsafe for women and children to live out of the city. These men denounce every form of law as tyranny—openly make war on capital—sow discord among workmen, and threaten to cause blood to run down our streets if their foolish and unreasonable demands are not complied with. They refuse to work for fair wages, or to allow others to work. They have started, they say, to bring the rich down to their level, and to have an equal distribution of the wealth of the hour. They imagine that they can bear their atrocious acts from the Bois de Boulogne of Paris to the streets of the New World.

They will find little room for their principles or practice. If they lift their hands against law, order and good government, they will be moved down like grass before the scythe. A few smart taps on the City Hall bell, should the police be overawed, would bring in thirty minutes 10,000 men together armed with ball cartridges, who would make short work of the Communist rioters. Our officials are disposed to make short work with these imported desperadoes. It is well that they showed their hands early. These men had an idea that the police would fraternize with them. They were greatly astonished and chagrined when the hoists of the police broke open their heads. These loudest are genuine clubs the size of a man's wrist, three feet long turned out of seasoned hickory, with a leather strap at the end by which the police secure it. When employed to break up a mob these clubs are used double handed, after the method of Richard's sword—he of the lion heart.—Hester, *Matthew Hale Smith, N. Y. Cor. of the Boston Journal.*

## THE NEW ENGLAND COMMUNISTS.

It is an entire mistake to suppose that the internationalist, socialist, or communist is a purely European product. We have the genuine thing here in New England. We are not frightened by him, but are disposed to regard him as somewhat of a lumina. He does not wear red flags and petroleum torches in the streets, or disturb the public peace with barricades and *enrages*. On the contrary, he is a most mild and peaceable member of society. He only shows his dangerous qualities about once a year, when he gets possession of a public platform. The New England labor reform league has fallen entirely into the hands of these communists. On the first day of their annual session at Boston (Sunday) Oct. 19, W. B. Greene presiding, as we laugh to think, the most alluring communism was preached and resolved. The abolition of the state, of property in land, and of interest, was the least thing asked, a great number of persons taking part in debates of inconceivable lunacy, outside of a public asylum. Among other lights, E. M. Chamberlain, once candidate for governor of Massachusetts, came forward as champion of a scheme for the exemption of all homesteads from taxation to the value of \$3000. On Monday the affair was lifted into unmerited dignity by the presence of Vice President Wilson and Mr. Bronson Alcott. There is certainly a field for an organization to represent the real labor interests of New England,—if the state itself doesn't already represent it sufficiently.—Springfield (Mass.), Republican.

—The social evil *scandal* can not be suppressed. The volcano gives vent to fires which otherwise would rend the earth; and, perhaps, these hideous crimes of vice may play no unimportant part in the mysterious economies of society. These women of shame may be looked on with abhorrence but never with scorn. They may be the wain and haggard priestesses at a shrine which they have not built; after their own way, they may be the saviours of the rest of us, bearing the sins which, but for them we might commit.—G. B. *Fraser*.

—Financial reform, so-called, concerns the distribution of wealth already produced; labor reform concerns the better distribution of wealth in the process of its production; and all attempts to redistribute wealth already produced and distributed are unnatural, unnecessary, impossible; by which is established the proposition that financial reform is not to be considered important in discussing the poverty and progress of the laborer, and that it is interesting chiefly to a small per cent. of the people who belong to the capitalist classes.—*Ira Steward*.

—The fact that Congress is in favor of inflation is one of the strongest arguments to be adduced to prove the necessity of "compulsory education." The ignorance of the people on this subject will involve everybody in common suffering—a few speculators alone excepted. The poor will find this out when prices go up again.—F. E. *Abbott*.

—I believe free banking possible; but fraught with danger to the people, to Government, to trade and commerce. I would have the currency emitted by a country, based on the taxable property and the taxable power of Congress.—*Wm. D. Kelley, M. C.*

—I should prefer to lose one third of what I am considered to be worth to get to a specie basis rather than not have it; because then in ten years, if not in five, I would be better off than now.—A. T. *Stewart*.

—In this matter of suffrage we should, had we the power, compel every citizen, male and female, over twenty years of age to vote, and hold them to a full responsibility for their acts.—*Brick, Pomroy*.

—I will live no longer than my principles will preserve me. I will not blot my past by providing for my future. I will live by just means or not at all.—*Algernon Sidney*.

## A PLEA FOR LIBERTY.

*The strange Tendency of Woodhull and Claplin's Weekly to favor Despotism, in almost everything except Love, is discussed by protesting friends in the following articles taken from letters to the Editors of that paper:*

As I understand your system of philosophy, it implies a perpetual outcry for freedom. You are a rebel against the tyranny of law. You assert that society and its individuals are bound down under a despotism of statutes and enactments. What you demand is that these shall be taken away; that all artificial rules shall be abolished, and humanity left free to work out its own character in such acts and relations as its unfettered nature would prescribe and adopt. In this you have strong claims to have reason and right upon your side. No sane person, endowed with average perceptive faculties, can believe that humanity is not self-conservative in a state of freedom; that it needs to have its morals or its economics regulated by law and enforced by authority in order to maintain an existence. Therefore your petition, like mine, is for repeal. Take away the burdensome trammels which the past has accumulated, which were founded originally upon degrading superstitions, which had never any title to obedience, and which have only served to perpetuate the superstitions in which they originated and the ignorance which is essential to their continuance in authority.

But in curious contrast with this, is your scheme for a money system, in which you propose to endow government with the function of creating the circulating money of the country. You advise the repeal of the National Bank law which is proper, because it was originally unjust, and because its injustice has brought about this natural and just result in disaster. But you propose to prohibit, or virtually to prohibit—the establishment of a government monopoly—all individual banking, either of issue or deposit. In short, you propose to circumscribe the liberty of the citizen by saying: "Here is a branch of business, a field of occupation, a road to gain into which you shall not enter." Now, in what respect, I beg leave to enquire, is government a safer regulator of the money than it is of the social or the domestic system? This letter is written, not to argue the question of a national currency, but to protest against political limitations to natural human rights and natural activities. Freedom is right, it is justice; it always leads in the right direction. If there is any hope of human progress it is in the line of liberty. All movements for the amelioration of the condition of mankind, whether in whole or in part, that begin with "Be it enacted," end in disaster; and there never was a shackle invented, however costly the material or elegant the workmanship, that did not bite and gall and degrade and damage in the sequel.—*Matthew Walbridge*.

## STATE TYRANNY.

"Individual sovereignty" is a simple principle, and I think the *Weekly* is doing a positive evil in ranking sovereignty and State ownership in things on the same ground. The State, I care not for what purposes it may be defended, cannot, as an authority to govern, be admissible if we mean freedom. As a friend recently remarked, your excuse for the State's power, "the good of the whole," has been the excuse of every despot in history. What is to guard against any of our present evils, if the happiness of one, to say nothing of

thousands of parents, is to be swept away by the unnatural "protector" the State? Tyrants have smiled at the efforts of "communism," they will tremble only when "individualism" appears. If there has been one principle strongly laid down by the *Weekly*, it has been that of self-ownership. But I fear you are injuring, if not destroying the good seed of liberty, which was sown in earlier days. You will find further, if you press the question, that not one mother in forty would consent to deliver up her child as "State property" to be "educated," and thus made a useful citizen "for the good of the whole." This last is the unnatural thing about your free-love doctrine, and I sincerely hope you will reconsider the error you have made. If "it is impossible to form a community except upon the surrender of certain of the individual rights of the parties composing it," then you may as well bid farewell to freedom! Rights—human rights—what are they? Is not the word of itself a frown upon your inconsistency? All rights are inalienable. Were it otherwise they would not be rights, but privileges or something else; assuredly not rights.

I hope I shall never be so befogged in ignorance as to claim that I can ever be justified in striking at another's liberty because the offender strikes at mine. Two wrongs have never yet made a right and they never can. He makes a serious and deplorable blunder who undertakes to conduct the world to justice, peace and prosperity, while clinging to that relic of savagery, the so-called right of self-defense. The sooner you commence "breaking the way for future generations" on a safer track the better it will be for future generations. If we are seeking "untrammelled lives," let us take the road of justice and not that of expediency merely. The absence of that "liberty of will" which Edmund Burke called the law of savage life, shows how crude a state we have been held in. You who pretend to be radical reformers propose to adopt the same method as that of Burke—that of a still savor life—the liberty of bondage. How are men's characters to be developed if their personal responsibility be not thrown upon them?

Moreover, where is the equity (I understand that you desire equity), of the act which compels me to pay my money to support children whom I did not produce and do not own, but which are the fruit of other's loves? The parents of a child are its natural protectors and supporters until it assumes independence *i. e.*, until it is able to produce as much as it consumes. The "State's existence," for which you are so solicitous, has no reality beyond the good of the individual. When persons are taught by parents and experience to take care of themselves and respect the rights of others, as they will be in a true civilization, no one need fear to walk "the streets of Boston" or anywhere else. Freedom and equity will produce a natural and permanent peace, aggressive authority never can. Withdraw your law, and evils will die for the want of vitality, and civilization assume its true equipoise. We are not seeking for what the most enlightened countries are doing, unless they are practicing equity; and as yet I am not informed that any have switched on to that line. Taxing men and women for the support of other men and women, or for any cause whatever, without the consent of the taxpayer, is tyranny! This truth, to me, is a most vital one, and can never be overlooked with impunity by any community or nation. In short, the existence of any aggressive authority is impossible with individual sovereignty.—*Wm. B. Wright*.





