

THE COMMONWEAL

The Official Journal of the Socialist League.

VOL. 1.—No. 4.

MAY, 1885.

ONE PENNY.

SOCIALISM AND POLITICS.

SHOULD Socialists take part in Parliamentary agitations? This is a question which is now moving the minds of some of our comrades. Now Parliament implies politicians, and a politician is one versed in the art of governing, and government implies the existence of two classes of society, governors and governed, or slaves and masters: it is those who are naturally weak, the destitute and disinherited, who are governed for the benefit of the strong and cunning. A constant battle has been going on between these two classes ever since usurpation and monopoly began—the disinherited, through their ignorance of the cause of their misery, getting the worst of it, and the governors resorting to every means to maintain their monopolies and privilege, using force and fraud in the past, fraud and humbug to-day—for now their professions of friendship and wishes to legislate for the benefit of the disinherited even go so far as to take the form of finding money for the election of so-called working men to the House of Humbugs. Those who do this, however, make sure of their men beforehand, and only assist those who have sold the workers in the past, and therefore will be the tools of the monopolists in the future. They do this that they may be able to tell the workers that they can alter the state of things if they like; that they can send their own representatives to Parliament if they wish to do so, and can thereby remedy all their wrongs; knowing that money-bags will always win in a contest like this, that these tools and hirelings of theirs are only seeking place and position for themselves and their friends, and that they will always go against the true interest of the workers. So long as the workers are satisfied with this humbug, so long will it continue—so long will they be robbed of the results of their labour.

These privileged classes or governors never make any concessions, except from force or the fear of force. It is only when the working people are united and determined to take their stand on principles instead of making compromises, and are prepared to use any means to overthrow the whole commercial competitive system, they will emancipate themselves. Even in politics reform has to be forced from them. The Reform Bill of 1832 was not conceded till the country was on the verge of civil war, property being burnt and destroyed in every direction; the same with the repeal of the Corn Laws. Again, in 1867, the people showed their determination by knocking the Hyde Park railings down and breaking a few windows, and to appease them another Reform Bill was passed. In 1884 it was again a Reform Bill; the people had to meet again in their thousands and use threats of force before their demands were complied with. The very essence of politics is to collect as much taxes as possible, to protect the monopolists in their privileges and property, while they rob, fleece and oppress the workers, just keeping within the limit of driving them to open rebellion.

But Parliamentary reform will help us little or nothing. It has been going on for generations, and what is the result? Merely a perpetuation of the fleecing system. Has the condition of the disinherited been improved? Are they not more dependent for the means of life itself upon the goodwill and caprices of these monopolists than ever before? Do we not find in all parts of the world, whether under an Empire, Monarchy, or Republic, whether they have universal suffrage or are ruled by a despot, that the wealth-producers are in the same condition, always on the verge of starvation, and unable to alter it except by a complete revolution? Is not this a standing proof that the condition of the workers cannot be altered by their representatives (so called) helping the dominant classes to govern the people? There may be some excuse for Socialists taking part in politics in despotic countries when they cannot carry on their propaganda in any other way; but that is not the case in this country. And even in Germany, where a part of the Socialists have resorted to that means of propaganda, they are now getting disgusted with it, more especially after the backsliding of some of their Members of Parliament. One of these told the monopolists in their House

of Parliament that they, the Parliamentary Socialists, were the only buffer between the monopolists and Revolution. This is just the point which all Revolutionary Socialists see clearly, and since we see it we do not wish that buffer to be used in this country.

I do not mean to say we should not go to political meetings; on the contrary, I hold that we should take advantage of these and every other opportunity of spreading the doctrines of pure Socialism by circulating our literature, moving amendments, or any other means. But we ought not to take sides or try to become leaders, but always look upon ourselves as teachers; and if we do our duty in this direction we may rest assured that if the necessity arises for leaders, they will not be sought for in vain. I know that there are many earnest men who honestly think we should take part in the swindle, and get Socialists elected to Parliament. If we did, what would be the result? If we sent Socialists to Parliament we should like to send our best men, who if they were honest would not get a hearing in that House, while at the same time we should lose them as propagandists, their time being fully taken up with politics. Again, if one man turns out to be a dishonest self-seeker, one who would misrepresent the objects and aims of Socialists, he would undo the good work of a hundred propagandists outside. Some of our comrades may think that it is unimportant whether we take part or not in politics, but I hold it to be an all-important question; for the answer we give to it decides whether we are Socialists or Reformers.

We, as Revolutionary Socialists, believe that Socialism means a state of society in which all the members have equal rights without any privileges or class distinctions, and that it is our duty to preach this, and to educate the disinherited up to it, so that the revolutionary change may come from below, by and for the workers. We believe that no compromise can be made with privilege, and that we should be traitors to the cause if we attempt it. If you, reader, believe this, your place is by our side as a Revolutionary Socialist, and you are bound to assist in the noble work of education towards this end. No matter what our numbers are to-day, you may rest assured we are the party of the future, since we are the party of principle. On the other side are those who believe in Parliamentary action—who think that what they have got to do is to agitate with some catch cry that will become popular, and get them or their chiefs elected to Parliament; and that they, when there, will, by passing laws, alter the condition of the workers—in fact, that the change is to come by them and through them; that the revolution is to come from above and not from below; and that the way to effect this revolution is by introducing palliatives of the present system. Now we hold that to palliate a system is to perpetuate it; that men who are in favour of this are only Reformers or Democrats (Social or otherwise); they want to amend the system, and so, as a natural result, will prolong it. It is certain that if it had not been for the constant "reforms"—that is, palliatives of our system—the system itself would have dropped to pieces of its own rotteness, or been overthrown by revolution long ere this.

It is necessary to mention, however briefly, some of the chief palliatives advocated by the Democrats. And first, the normal working day of eight hours. We, as Socialists, of course condemn long hours, but the essential thing we condemn is the capitalist making a profit out of our labour at all. As long as this is done the hours of labour will really be regulated in the interest of the capitalist, not in that of the community. It is the whole wages system which we contend against.

Again, if the children are entitled to one free meal, they are entitled to all their meals free. We hold that they should be fed, clothed, sheltered and educated free by the community.

Once more, as to the building of Artisans' Dwellings. We hope, with the overthrow of the competitive system, that the large towns will disappear, and in their place will arise a system of free communes or associated homes.

Lastly, as to cumulative taxation on large incomes. Under a proper system of society we should have no large incomes.

It is possible that the governing classes might make a show of legislating in the direction of these palliatives; their doing so would certainly put off the revolution which we aim at. True Socialists, therefore, should not take up such catch cries. There is a broad line of demarcation between those who wish to overthrow the wages' system and those who wish to palliate it. There is no half-way house in the matter; the one view is entirely opposed to the other; therefore if there are any professing to belong to our party (the revolutionary Socialists) who believe in palliation, they had better at once join the palliators or Democrats. On the other hand, if there are any who profess to be Democrats, but who wish for the overthrow of the wages' system, competition, and monopoly—their place is with us.

JOSEPH LANE.

PEACE OR WAR?

A LITTLE while ago, it seemed as though the Russian Government, having obtained from the British Cabinet all it wanted for the present, was magnanimously about to consent to the preservation of peace. Now, however, for the moment at all events, all this is changed. Both Governments are again on the war-path. More diplomacy, conciliatory dispatches, followed by "settlement;" or rupture of negotiations, Russian seizure of Herat, followed by English declaration of war. Which is to be the line events will take within the next few days? We do not venture to prognosticate, although were we of a sportive disposition we should be inclined to "back" the former contingency. The Cossack is not the Egyptian; if he were he would assuredly have been operated upon militarily long ere this. Russian spreadeagleism, moreover, wants to complete its railway to India; and who shall say that Russian diplomatic skill will not prove effective in "hocussing" to the end, that the delay required for this may be obtained, under cover of an "arrangement." But, as we said before, we do not prognosticate one way or the other—like Sextus Empiricus, "we suspend."

For the rest, we have little to add to what we said last month on the question of possible hostilities between the two empires—the upshot is, we imagine, as uncertain as could well be. England, it is true, is isolated, but her general resources are great. Yet after all that may be said about bankruptcy, the fact remains that the military strength of Russia is also great; and, be it remembered, for wars and for railways there is always money forthcoming from somewhere. Both possess an irresistible attraction to the high-financing mind. On the other hand, though the valour of the British soldier in confronting a European foe may be an unknown quantity, the rapacity of the Russian contractor, and his abettor, the Russian superior military officer, is a fairly calculable one. Brown paper soles and mouldy bread decimate an army in the long run no less effectually than hard fighting. A severe Russian defeat would probably mean revolution in Russia. Indeed, there can be little doubt that it would. So presuming, Socialists must drink damnation to the Muscovite arms. Again, as we pointed out last month, the rout of the English forces and the invasion of India would mean the speedy setting of the sun of that Empire which was wont ne'er to set, a result which could hardly fail to gladden the heart of the true Socialist, for whom Empire is a curse. As to the alternative complications which might arise, it is impossible to foresee or even conjecture how they are likely to affect the Cause. In fine, the attitude of Socialists in the present situation must necessarily be confined to one of "expectant attention."

E. BELFORT BAX.

WHAT'S TO BE DONE?

"AGITATE! EDUCATE! ORGANISE!"

I.

If you wish the Revolution of Society to evolve apace, *Agitate!* For the lion's share of that work will have to be done by the people, who are as yet alike indifferent to their duty and unaware of their power.

Agitate! Although in this you will be most fiercely met by the protestations of the would-be respectable, *Agitate!* Although you will be told by some that matters, though surely bad at present, are by themselves inevitably tending towards improvement; that it is dangerous to rouse the passions of the lowly placed, and that "charity" and "education" alone can raise them in the social scale, *Agitate!* Although by people in authority you will be told that you must not do it, lest the spectres thus conjured up should never be got rid of.

Agitate! For it is not true that anything moves, or tends to move, by itself—that is, by its inert qualities and capacities. Things move only in the measure in which they come into contact

with, and are influenced by, other things; they assert themselves or are subdued only to the extent in which they LIVE. Things, human beings, and human institutions may seem lifeless or unable to live whilst they are merely borne down and overwhelmed by circumstances stronger than themselves. If the overbearing forces be shifted or weakened, those hitherto overborne will expand, and by degrees become able to rise and overthrow their oppressors.

Agitate! For Giant Labour is not merely slumbering the sleep of the wearied, from which he would awake refreshed and invigorated: he lies dazed and crippled in a state of deathlike senselessness. To wake him from his torpor, to make him alive to the causes and effects of his condition, you must rouse him with words so burning as to touch him to the quick through the rind of habitual indifference he has acquired in the atmosphere of wage-serfdom.

Agitate! Although you may run the risk of being misunderstood and considered an enemy by those very men and women whom your love for humanity prompts you to address; for the toilers have become so used to the bearing of the chains themselves have been forced to forge, that they no longer resent their weight, but wear them as they would wear ornaments. The competition for bread means to the workers a race for the favour of being allowed to serve; it has become so keen and all-absorbing among them that they have little or no chance of developing a desire for the rational pleasures of life, but feel at ease whenever their most pressing needs are satisfied. To a man who has worked through the longer part of the day in the silent gloom of the death-harboured mine, or in the midst of the rattling, clashing and thundering noise of steam machinery, or in the atmosphere of chemical works charged with organic poisons and germs of disease, until he feels giddy and benumbed with weariness; to such a man a stomachful of food, however coarse, a few hearty draughts of drink, something like a smoke near a "fireside" in a "home" where he may be master in his turn,—are all he requires, are all he has learnt to aspire to. If, in addition to these goods, he boast the possession of a sober wife, able to get him up a meal and keep herself and children tolerably clean, he will lie down on his straw sack with a feeling of pride and satisfaction, akin to that of the Lord Chancellor when taking his seat on the wool-sack among the spoilers of the nation.

Agitate! Mind not the honest wrath you may encounter by telling such a man he is a slave, but tell it him, and repeat it to him, whenever you can get his ear, with all the emphasis of your compassion and all the force of your understanding. For do not the hireling writers of capitalism assure him every day that he is "free and independent," that there is dignity not only in labour (which nobody will deny), but that there is "dignity" also in poverty and even in servitude? Do not the professors of godliness and commercial economy din into his patient ears, from all the stumps and platforms of the realm, that he has no right nor reason to complain, seeing, as he ought, that he is allowed to live in a society so much more civilised than that of the Zulu-Caffirs and that of the Eskimos; seeing, as he ought, that he is better paid than the wage-workers of fifty years ago; seeing that his master's lot—who, in his turn, has to compete with other slave-drivers to the maddening tune of his steam-engines—is not a happy one; and seeing, finally, that for a British worker nothing can be sweeter and more dignified than quiet contentment and subordination?

Agitate! Tell those who toil and vegetate in the bondage of capitalism that their "freedom" is as palpable a lie as their "independence" is a cruel mockery; that they are "independent" only in so far as they are being tossed about from post to pillar without encumbrances, without the vestige even of some property; light and burdenless, stripped clean and "independent" of everything valuable, except their skins, which must be left them, lest they should fall to pieces before capital has wholly done with them. Tell your fellow-slaves that whatever the Zulus may lack in civilisation, they are at least not cursed with pauperism or with prostitution; that the British workers of fifty years ago, if their wages were lower than they are to-day, broke forth in open rebellion; that their masters, since they cherish it, deserve to perish by their competition; and, finally, that contentment and subordination are the virtues of slaves whilst freemen ever strive towards the advancement to perfection of their race by cheerful co-ordination and co-operation with their brethren.

Agitate! Tell the victims of competition to rise against the monstrous "order" that has crippled them and put them down. Show them how all the privileged classes, whatever petty quarrels they may have among themselves, are towards the workers but one amalgamated, reactionary mass. Tell them how vain it is, in consequence, to ask for "Justice" or for "Charity"; that they have nothing to beg for, but only to take possession of what is their own by the only valid title to human enjoyment—human labour! Tell them that slavery is but a symptom of weakness; that freedom means power, which they must and will obtain as soon as they feel as one and act together concertedly. Why

should they waste their strength for others and subsist on alms, whilst theirs are the land, and theirs the fruit they win from it; theirs the tools and the mechanical giants they have constructed to serve a worthless minority; theirs the houses, the temples and the palaces, as surely as they have reared them up in ceaseless, unrewarded drudgery! Tell the men that, and if they won't listen, speak to the women, the children, nay, to the very babes, before they are taught the lying language of our corrupt civilisation! Speak, shout, and spur them ceaselessly—from field to cottage, from street to market-place, always and everywhere, until the very stones will cry out against the crimes that are being patiently endured by human beings. *Agitate! Agitate! Agitate!*

ANDREAS SCHEU.

OUR CIVILISATION.

THE JERRY BUILDER.

IN utilising the space at my disposal for this paper I do not concern myself with advocacy of the abstract principles of Socialism, but prefer to exhibit the foulness, discomfort and filth which capitalism inflicts upon us in our every-day lives, and thus negatively to make Socialism understood. The utility and justification of this gospel of discontent is found in the patience with which the people bear the evils which the gushing scribes of the press assure them are inseparable from "Our Civilisation."

One, and by no means the least weighty of the counts in the indictments by which Socialists arraign the present system of production for profit, is that wherein our health and lives are directly affected, viz., the construction of our houses, owing to our infamous land system, which robs the people of their natural inheritance and forces them into towns; we have, especially in London, a vast increase of urban population. To meet this artificially-created and unnatural increase, our fields, and erewhile pleasure resorts, have been given over to the reign of the Jerry Builder, who has disfigured them with miles of hideousness. Under his sway, trees, grass and hedgerow disappear, the pleasant wayside brook becomes a noisome sewer, villages are reached, swallowed up and passed. What few characteristics of their once rural environment remain, only stand as sad mementoes of a simple past, and soon degenerate into slums. Over the poor man's common the Jerry Builder casts a greedy eye, and thereon builds his shoddy houses for the shoddy City plutocrat, who, true to his instincts of shop, designates the few starveling soot-beladen stalks which his friend the Jerry Builder has allowed to remain around his house as the "Grove," "Shrubberies," "Sylvania," etc. The poor mourn the loss of their open spaces, once within a stone's throw of their homes; the Sunday walk in the fields is now replaced by a sojourn in the sweltering gin palaces. Wages are falling, rent is rising, and the railway trip to the country is out of their reach. As the circle widens and the oxygen-giving trees and grass recede before the march of the invader, and are replaced by smoky chimnies, sulphurous brickfields, and dust-heaps, so does the atmosphere of the huge city become vitiated and enervating, the poor penned and overcrowded are literally asphyxiated, and killed by hundreds through the lung diseases set up by these causes. O glorious civilisation! how *à propos* are the burning words of Rouget De Lisle in the "Marseillaise," "They mete and vend the light and air."

The Press, actuated by the same benevolent principles toward Land Jobbers which prompts their articles in favor of colonial emigration, advise the working class to seek "fresh air" by living in the suburbs and renting those "Desirable Residences" constructed by the Jerry Builders.

The evidence given before the Commission to inquire into the Building Acts throws a clear light on the manner in which our suburbs are run up. Dr. Tripe, medical officer for Hackney, deposed that he knew whole streets and roads that were built upon foundations composed of the filth and refuse of dust-bins, the soil having been excavated to a depth of ten feet or more, and replaced with the refuse from dust-yards, and the builder commences proceedings by announcing that "Rubbish may be shot here." The houses themselves were constructed with road-drift and street-sludge mixed with inferior mortar. Anent the sludge, he explained that it contained a large amount of sewage and faecal matter. The general evidence was to the effect that the houses so constructed decrease the health, and in large numbers of cases actually cause the death, of their inmates. Many were so flagrantly bad in construction that, despite the collusion between parish officials, landlords and builders, they were condemned. Others saved this trouble by falling down from their own weakness. This has happened with detached houses; when built together, they have supported each other as two inebriates do, by leaning against each other. All this has not gone

on without some protest. Occasionally some remnant of open space, from which natural beauty is riven, is snatched from the devouring grasp of the land-jobber, and the public are made to pay handsome compensation for the exercise of their own rights.

Lovers of art like Matthew Arnold and Ruskin declaim against the rampant spoliation of Nature, and Baskin queries whether the "Greatness of the British Empire is as loosely strung in the ground as are the houses of its inhabitants." Scientists like Richardson formulate a City of Health and teach sanitary truths, but they reckon without their host. The same class which makes the filthy reeking slums of the central districts "profitable investments to capitalists and others," as per advertisement of highly respectable auctioneers, is at work in the newer quarters. Rent—that corner-stone of the whole capitalist system—packs humanity together as a source of exploitation by this form of robbery. The causes of physical and moral degradation, so rife amongst us, are fast lowering the morale and physique of the people. We are told that we are advancing on the path of civilisation. If it involves loss of health, of happiness and culture to us as workers, *Oui bono?* Time was when the homes of a people betokened their degree of culture, when art and architecture were allied, and were not the handmaidens of greedy speculators; when masonry was an honourable craft, not forced to create the hideous eccentricities which disfigure our thoroughfares to-day. The monuments of the past still with us prove this. If it is left to our posterity, when freed from the rent fiend, to develop the Socialistic ideas now leavening the mass, and to give them concrete expression in the construction of their houses and surroundings, we may gauge the feelings with which they will view the paltry remnants of our present ugliness, if any remain, of an age which fostered sanitation in its hospitals and prisons, and neglected it in its houses; gauge the ridicule they will bestow upon the brick boxes in which we exist as the *reductio ad absurdum* of individualism gone mad, of a people puzzled how to feed and house their own poor, yet striving to force Arabs to live their lives; and as they till their communal lands and enjoy their communal halls, they will bless those who now are hastening the end of the reign of Shoddy.

F. KITZ.

We have to record with deep regret the disappearance under circumstances which leave but faint hopes of his being alive of Edmund Martin Geldart, a well-known and active Socialist. Our readers will probably have already read the details of this sad case in the newspaper press. Mr. Geldart, who occupied the pulpit of a so-called "Free" (!) Church in Croydon, became converted to Socialism about a year ago. Thenceforward his one thought was to work for the cause. His own honest nature would not let him believe that any one who had the truths of Socialism once placed clearly before him could refuse their acceptance. Alas! he was soon undeceived. The clique of hypocritical money-bags who, as might be expected, dominated his "congregation," soon compelled him to resign. They wanted a smug "morality" and "charity" preached to them, and not the "abolition of their privileges." Edmund Martin Geldart, if dead he be, has died a martyr to the cause, for it was his steady refusal to sell his convictions which brought upon him the wrath of this plutocratic crew; and it was the mental depression wrought on a sensitive temperament by the worry and brow-beating ensuing that led to what, we fear we must call the final, catastrophe.

A P P E A L.

THE Socialist League has decided to found a library of books, magazines, pamphlets, periodicals and daily newspapers, treating of and propagating the Socialistic cause, for the free use and the education of its members. To this end the League appeals herewith to all members and to all friends and supporters of the great and just cause for which it fights to bestow, for this intended library, on the League as gifts such books and periodicals in their possession as treat on the Socialistic Question. All such donations received will be duly acknowledged with the sincerest thanks on behalf of the League by the delegated librarians, in the official journal of the League. The League hopes that in answer to this appeal so many books will be forthcoming that a catalogue comprising numerous works can soon be issued.

London, March 9, 1885.

C. BENSON AND R. THEODORE.

The following books and pamphlets have been received for the Library of the League:—Poems and Ballads, Nicoll; a parcel of books, Luns; Satires and Profanities, W. Ramsey; a parcel of books, W. A. English; Conventional Lies, Nicoll; a parcel of books and pamphlets, Frank Kitz; *La Femme et la Révolution*, Theodore; *The Workman*; *The City*, Lyons.

SPECIAL NOTICE.

A SUPPLEMENT of Four Pages is issued with this number.

The June number (5) will be ready on Tuesday, May 26th, and will be issued with a Supplement. Reports and notices for the Lecture List must reach the office not later than the first post on Saturday, 23rd.



All literary communications should be addressed to the Editors of THE COMMONWEAL, 27 Farringdon Street, E.C. They must be accompanied by the name and address of the writer, not necessarily for publication.

Rejected MSS. can only be returned if a stamped directed envelope is forwarded with them.

All business communications to be addressed, the Manager of the COMMONWEAL, 27 Farringdon Street, E.C. Business communications must NOT be sent to the Editors. All remittances should be made in Postal Orders or halfpenny stamps.

Subscriptions for THE COMMONWEAL, free by post: for 12 numbers, 1 copy, 1s. 6d.; 3 copies, 4s.; 4 copies, 5s. Parcels of a dozen or a quire, if for distribution, will be sent on special terms.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

A MANIFESTO by the Socialist League on the Soudan War has been issued. Copies will be sent to anyone on receipt of stamp for postage.

NOTICE TO MEMBERS.—All papers received by the Secretary have been sorted and filed at the office of the League, and are at the disposal of members.

NOTICE TO ALL SOCIALISTIC NEWSPAPERS.—The *Commonweal* will be regularly sent to all Socialistic Contemporaries, and it is hoped that they on their side will regularly provide the Socialist League with their papers as they may appear.

MANCHESTER friends can purchase this journal and other Socialist literature at the Democratic Publishing Co., 37 Travis Street.

MR. THOROLD KING, in a temperate letter, but too long for publication, finds fault with our Irish correspondent's "raking up of old bygones." He should remember, however, that the general impression in England is that our rule has been on the whole beneficial—at any rate since the Middle Ages—and that Englishmen want a little information on that point. But quite apart from that, the main fact in the question is that the English are foreigners there, and as rulers are not wanted there at all. Barbarities committed by the enslaved people prove this quite as strongly as those committed by the enslavers.

HE ALARM.—Copies of number containing reprint of the Socialist League Manifesto received by each of the Council.

RECEIVED.—*Ori du Peuple* (daily)—*New Yorker Volkszeitung* (weekly)—*Sozial Demokrat* (weekly)—*Anarchist*—*Communist*—*L'Insurgé*—*Labour Leaf*—*Der Sozialist* (weekly)—*The Alarm*—*La Revue Socialiste*—*Neue Zeit*—*La Question Sociale*—*La National Belge* (daily)—*Labour Standard*—*Freiheit* (weekly)—*Bebel's "Woman"* (Modern Press).

THE PILGRIMS OF HOPE.

III.—SENDING TO THE WAR.

It was down in our far-off village that we heard of the war begun,
But none of the neighbours were in it save the squire's thick-lipped son,

A youth and a fool and a captain, who came and went away,
And left me glad of his going. There was little for us to say
Of the war and its why and wherefore—and we said it often enough;

The papers gave us our wisdom, and we used it up in the rough.
But I held my peace and wondered; for I thought of the folly of men,

The fair lives ruined and broken, that ne'er could be mended again;
And the tale by lies bewildered, and no cause for a man to choose;
Nothing to curse or to bless—just a game to win or to lose.

But here were the streets of London—strife stalking wide in the world;

And the flag of an ancient people to the battle-breeze unfurled.
And who was helping or heeding? The gaudy shops displayed
The toys of rich men's folly, by blinded labour made;
And still from naught to nothing the bright-skinned horses drew
Dull men, and sleek-faced women with never a deed to do;
While, all about and around them the street-flood ebbed and flowed,

Worn feet, grey anxious faces, grey backs bowed 'neath the load.
Lo the sons of an ancient people! And for this they fought and fell

In the days by fame made glorious, in the tale that singers tell.

We two we stood in the street in the midst of a mighty crowd,
The sound of its mingled murmur in the heavens above was loud.
And earth was foul with its squalor—that stream of every day,
The hurrying feet of labour, the faces worn and grey,
Were a sore and grievous sight, and enough and to spare had I seen

Of hard and plucking want midst our quiet fields and green;
But all was nothing to this, the London holiday throng,
Dull and with hang-dog gait they stood or shuffled along,

While the stench from the lairs they had lain in last night went
up in the wind,

And poisoned the sun-lit spring: no story men can find
Is fit for the tale of their lives; no word that man hath made
Can tell the hue of their faces, or their rags by filth o'er-laid:
For this hath our age invented—these are the sons of the free,
Who shall bear our name triumphant o'er every land and sea.
Read ye their souls in their faces, and what shall help you there?
Joyless, hopeless, shameless, angerless, set is their stare:
This is the thing we have made, and what shall help us now,
For the field hath been laboured and tilled and the teeth of the
dragon shall grow.

But why are they gathered together? what is this crowd in the street?

This is a holiday morning, though here and there we meet
The hurrying tradesman's broadcloth, or the workman's basket of tools.

Men say that at last we are rending the snares of knaves and fools;

That a cry from the heart of the nation against the foe is hurled,
And the flag of an ancient people to the battle-breeze unfurled.
The soldiers are off to the war, we are here to see the sight,
And all our griefs shall be hidden by the thought of our country's
might.

'Tis the ordered anger of England and her hope for the good of the Earth

That we to-day are speeding, and many a gift of worth
Shall follow the brand and the bullet, and our wrath shall be no curse,

But a blessing of life to the helpless—unless we are liars and worse—

And these that we see are the senders; these are they that speed
The dread and the blessing of England to help the world at its need.

Sick unto death was my hope, and I turned and looked on my dear,

And beheld her frightened wonder, and her grief without a tear,
And knew how her thought was mine—when, hark! o'er the
hubbub and noise,

Faint and a long way off, the music's measured voice,
And the crowd was swaying and swaying, and somehow, I knew
not why,

A dream came into my heart of deliverance drawing anigh.
Then with roll and thunder of drums grew the music louder and loud,

And the whole street tumbled and surged, and cleft was the holiday crowd,
Till two walls of faces and rags lined either side of the way.

Then clamour of shouts rose upward, as bright and glittering gay
Came the voiceful brass of the band, and my heart beat fast and fast,

For the river of steel came on, and the wrath of England passed
Through the want and the woe of the town, and strange and wild
was my thought,

And my clenched hands wandered about as though a weapon they sought.

Hubbub and din was behind them, and the shuffling haggard throng,

Wandering aimless about, tangled the street for long;
But the shouts and the rhythmic noise we still heard far away,
And my dream was become a picture of the deeds of another day.

Far and far was I borne, away o'er the years to come,
And again was the ordered march, and the thunder of the drum,
And the bickering points of steel, and the horses shifting about
'Neath the flashing swords of the captains—then the silence after
the shout—

Sun and wind in the street, familiar things made clear,
Made strange by the breathless waiting for the deeds that are
drawing anear.

For woe had grown into will, and wrath was bared of its sheath,
And stark in the streets of London stood the crop of the dragon's
teeth.

Where then in my dream were the poor and the wall of faces wan?
Here and here by my side, shoulder to shoulder of man,
Hope in the simple folk, hope in the hearts of the wise,
For the happy life to follow, or death and the ending of lies.
Hope is awake in the faces angerless, now no more,
Till the new peace dawn on the world, the fruit of the people's war.

War in the world abroad a thousand leagues away,
While custom's wheel goes round and day devoureth day,
Peace at home!—what peace, while the rich man's mill is strife,
And the poor is the grist that he grindeth, and life devoureth life!

WILLIAM MORRIS.

LESSONS IN SOCIALISM.

II.—VALUE FORM OR EXCHANGE VALUE.

WE have seen what are the three kinds of value, and what is the nature of a commodity. In the study on which we now enter let us keep steadily in mind the fact that a commodity (such as we are about to consider under the processes of exchange) has use-value, and that it is also a value carrier. It possesses utility or satisfies a want. It has also embodied within it a certain amount of human labour.

Three equations will need investigation in this part of our work. Let us write them down at once, and then consider each of them carefully. (1) $x A = y B$; (2) $x A = y B = z C$, etc.; (3) $x A$ or $y B$ or $z C$, etc., $= w D$. The first of these is the expression for *simple* value-form, and represents that which takes place when exchange of commodities is rare—accidental. The second of these is the expression for the more *developed* value form, and represents that which takes place when barter is general. The third of these is the expression for *general* value form, and represents that which takes place when commodities are exchanged through the medium of a general equivalent known as money.

(1) $x A = y B$. Formula for the simple form of value. The meaning of this expression is that a certain number x of a certain commodity A are exchanged with a certain number y of another commodity B . Say one hundred matches are exchanged with two pipe-cleaners. In this particular case the x of the equation represents one hundred; the A represents matches; the y represents 2; the B represents pipe-cleaners.

The two commodities A and B (matches and pipe-cleaners, *e.g.*) play two different parts here. A expresses its value in terms of B . B serves as material for the expression of that value. A is, as it were, active; B is passive. A is the relative form; B is the equivalent form. These two forms, relative and equivalent, are the two poles of this first simple expression. If we reverse the order of the equation, and write $y B = x A$, B is now the relative form, A is the equivalent. B is now, as it were, active; A is passive. B now expresses its value in terms of A . A serves as material for the expression of that value.

In the expression $x A = y B$ we have a comparison of two quantities, x and y , of two different commodities, A and B . Such a quantitative comparison implies a qualitative unity between the commodities A and B . What is the one thing they have in common? Human labour is crystallised in them. It is this, and this alone, that makes quantitative comparison of them possible. It is not the fact that they both satisfy human wants that makes them quantitatively comparable. It is that they are both products of one and the same thing, abstract human labour.

Note one other thing before we leave this equation. The value of A is now expressed in terms of the use-value of B . The possessor of A wants to get rid of, to alienate, A . To him it has no use-value. But it has to him value. On the other hand, B , to the possessor of A , has a use-value. He wants B . To the possessor of B these values are of course reversed. His commodity B is to him value. The commodity A of the other is to him a use-value. This duality that comes out in the comparison of the two wares is in reality intrinsic to each of them. A has both value and use-value. B has both use-value and value.

To make quite clear this important relation of the equivalent form B to the relative form A , we may wisely take the illustration that Marx uses. So much sugar is balanced by a weight of iron. Now iron represents the weight only of the sugar. Nothing else. And B the equivalent form represents the value only of A , the relative form. Nothing else.

(2) $x A = y B = z C$, etc. Formula for the developed form of value. The meaning of this expression is that a certain number x of a certain commodity A are exchanged with a certain number y of a second commodity B , or with a certain number z of a third commodity C , and so on through the whole list of possible commodities. Say 100 matches are exchanged with 2 pipe-cleaners, or with 1 Pickwick cigar, etc. In this particular case x of the equation represents 100, A , matches; y represents 2, B , pipe-cleaners; z represents 1, C , Pickwicks. This is the form that is met with in ordinary barter. Any commodity can as yet be the relative form or the equivalent form. The value of a commodity, A , *e.g.*, is the same no matter with how many different equivalents, as $y B$, $z C$, etc., it may be compared, and the exchange-value evidently does not regulate the value of the commodity, but on the other hand the value of the commodity regulates at present its exchange-value. The obvious difficulty with this form is that the series is never closed. The possible list of A , B , C , etc., of commodities is an endless one. Ere long, therefore, this second form glides into the third.

(3) $x A$, or $y B$, or $z C$, etc., $= w D$. The formula for the general form of value. The meaning of this expression is that a certain number x of a certain commodity A , or a certain number y of a second commodity B , or a certain number z of a third commodity C , are

each exchanged with the same number w of a general equivalent D . Following out our illustration, let us say that 100 matches, or 2 pipe-cleaners, or 1 Pickwick, are exchanged with one piece of the general equivalent, with $\frac{1}{100}$ of the unit, for instance.

Here, then, we meet with a commodity D in terms of which the value of all other commodities is to be expressed. This commodity is the general equivalent, or money. Money, or the general equivalent, can never enter into the relative form unless we reverse equation 3 and express the relative value of D in the interminable equivalent values of an infinite series of commodities. In doing this, in fact, equation 3 becomes equation 2 again.

By excluding from the position of equivalent all commodities but one, and by excluding it from the position of relative form, the possibility of a general and uniform expression for the relative values of all other commodities is given. This general equivalent only is in the position of exchangeability with all others. As products become commodities, one commodity is set apart to denote the reciprocal value of all commodities. And this one is money.

At first the choice of the particular commodity seems to be a chance matter. But as a rule two things decide. Either an imported article (such as gold) is used that reveals the exchange-value of home commodities, or some useful article (such as cattle, *pecus*, *pecunia*) that forms the chief element of home wealth is employed. Never must we forget that money has the three values. It is not a mere sign, as we are often told. It has use-value, for it satisfies human wants. It has exchange-value, as its main use tells us; and it has value, for it is the product of human labour. It is like every commodity, an incarnation of human labour, and its value, as that of other commodities, is determined by the time necessary for its production. (This includes its distribution to any particular place.)

The functions of the general equivalent, or money, or gold let us say, are next to be considered. Thus far we have only recognised one of these functions. We have seen that as general equivalent the commodity D functions as *measure of value*. To the expression for the value of a commodity in terms of the general equivalent is given the name "price." Price is the expression in terms of gold of the value of any commodity. But out of this first function springs another. The general equivalent becomes also a *standard of price*. Again, through the medium of gold, a metamorphosis of commodities takes place. The man that has commodity A , which is only value to him, acquires commodity B , which is a use-value to him. Thus the general equivalent functions as a *means of circulation*. Yet again the general equivalent may become a *means of payment*, as when, an interval of time elapsing between the alienation, or getting rid of a commodity, and the realisation of its price, the ideas of debtor and creditor come into play, and the general equivalent plays an ideal, abstract part, payments often balancing without so much as an ounce of gold changing hands. These four functions of the general equivalent as measure of value, as standard of price, as means of circulation, as means of payment will engage us next.

- $x A = y B$ Formula for rare, accidental exchange.
- $x A = y B = z C$, etc..... Formula for barter.
- $x A$ or $y B$ or $z C$, etc. $= w D$ Formula for exchange with general equivalent.
- Money (gold) General equivalent in which the relative value of other commodities is to be expressed.
- Price Expression of the value of a commodity in terms of the general equivalent.
- Functions of the general equivalent... (1) Measure of value; (2) Standard of price; (3) Means of circulation; (4) Means of payment.

EDWARD AVELING.

An article will appear shortly in the *Nineteenth Century* that we advise all friends to read. It is an account by a Russian, J. Goldsmith, of his reasons for "leaving his country." M. Goldsmith, for the great crime of publishing scientific and educational journals, in which articles by "exiles," if he thought them good, sometimes appeared, was persecuted for years by Mr. Gladstone's hero, the noble Czar; was exiled to Archangel ("the place God created in his anger," as the Russian saying has it), and has at length been driven to seek safety in flight from Holy Russia.

THE TONKIN WAR AND SOCIALISM.

WHEN the news reached Paris that the French troops were retreating before the Chinese, and that so hurriedly that the French army had abandoned a battery, and—even graver fact for bourgeois troops—the cash-box of the regiment, Paris went mad. The Chinese, who till then had been only grotesque figures, now presented themselves to French imaginations as terrible warriors, armed with all the destructive inventions of civilisation. There was but one cry, one spontaneous cry for the “execution” of Ferry; and thus poor Ferry, who had in spite of himself been dragged into the Tonkin war, was made the scapegoat.

And such was the anger of the crowd waiting outside the Palais Bourbon, that the Minister was obliged to wait for nightfall, to send for a ladder and escape from the Chamber of Deputies, across the garden, climbing over walls like a thief.

The majority in giving up Minister Ferry to the indignation of the populace thought it had done enough, and reckoned on appointing the next Ministry. During nearly ten days they caused every combination in which they did not rule to fail. M. Clémenceau and the Radicals under his orders on this occasion gave the full measure of their weakness and political imbecility; they remained in Parliament and looked on with perfect tranquillity at all the jobbery of the late Gambetta's followers. They proved themselves infinitely inferior even to the Radicals who in England have attempted to agitate the public against the policy of the Gladstone Cabinet.

Nevertheless the Socialist parties offered to help the Radical Left in a campaign. Every night, and in almost every quarter of Paris, the Socialists organised meetings in which they voted in favour of the demands of the Extreme Left, that is to say, the cessation of war and impeachment of the Ministry. It is true they added the confiscation of the property of all deputies who had voted for the Tonkin war to cover the expenses of the war. On the initiative of the *Cri du Peuple* a meeting of delegates from the Radical journals and the Socialist groups of Paris was held, demanding a large open-air manifestation.

In England and in America open-air meetings are common enough, and easy for an influential party to organise. But this is not the case in France, and especially in Paris. Popular open-air manifestations, because they deeply move an excitable population, have till now in France ended in revolutions, or they have prepared the fall of the governments under which they took place, as for example did the funeral of Victor Noir, assassinated by Pierre Bonaparte.

Therefore the Gambettists have tried hard to make all street manifestations distasteful to the people, and to attain this end they have had recourse to the Anarchists, who, egged on by the police (which always has numbers of *agents provocateurs* in its ranks), without any preparation called meetings in the street, and this by means of posters in which there was foolish talk of slaying and burning all and sundry. Naturally these mass meetings were characterised by the absence of the masses.

And assuredly at these meetings where the people were called together no one but Parisian loafers appeared. Sightseers, French and foreign, rushed thither to see what was going to happen, and what did happen was that the police, bored at having nothing better to do, charged these sightseers. Hence at these meetings the greater number of persons arrested were newspaper reporters and good bourgeois, anything but Revolutionists, who had to be discharged the next day. These ridiculous manifestations have disgusted the mass of the people with all open-air meetings. The Socialists at the meeting called by the *Cri du Peuple*, taking into account this feeling, thought that the only way to make the people come to an open-air meeting would be by inducing the deputies of the Extreme Left to convoke it. They therefore sent a delegation of twelve members to the Chamber of Deputies to try and make the Radical deputies understand that since they were being made fools of by the majority of the Chamber, they ought, together with the Socialist groups, to appeal to the people, in order to acquire the strength in which they were wanting.

But the Radicals fear the people far more than they fear the Opportunists; so they hastened to refuse any proposal of this kind. This refusal has exasperated not only Socialists, but the groups of Radical working men, who unfortunately are numerous in Paris, and in France. The behaviour of these deputies will open their eyes, and will destroy the prestige of *messieurs les radicaux*.

Moreover, if the Radicals are not directly responsible for these international expeditions of brigandage that are called colonial wars, they are so indirectly. It is their narrow Chauvinism, their love of militarism, their desire to find new openings for commerce and French manufactures, that drives governments to launch into foreign wars, certain that they will conquer all votes if they succeed. Socialists, on the other hand, since they have denounced their agitation in France—that is to say, for the

last six or seven years—have not ceased to protest energetically against all war adventures abroad, that could distract popular attention from social questions at home, and that might give prestige to the bourgeois government. Moreover, in France Socialists have quite a special reason for holding these colonial wars in horror, for the generals in command of these expeditions act with a barbarity that even surpasses that of European wars. And in the civil wars of France, in June 1848 and in May 1871, it was from amongst these butchers that the reactionists selected the generals who pitilessly massacred the people of Paris as they had massacred the Arabs of Africa and the Mexicans of America.

No capitalist nation can pretend to be safe from colonial wars, for the great question of modern industry is not to extend production, but to increase and to open up new markets. These wars are fatal for capitalist Europe. On the one hand they create and intensify the agitation in the interior; on the other they arm barbarians and the semi-civilised on the confines of civilisation. Capitalist Europe will in the near future succumb. It will be crushed between these two contrary forces, set into movement by itself.

PAUL LAFARGUE.

PROFESSOR PEARSON ON SOCIALISM.

ONE of the most cheering signs in connexion with the Socialist movement is the number of highly-educated and intelligent men who not only advocate more or less Socialistic measures for removing the glaring evils of poverty and overcrowding, but who openly avow the fact that such measures are Socialistic, and acknowledge that no others will meet the necessities of the case. Amongst this number we are glad to welcome Professor Karl Pearson, who, in a lecture entitled “Socialism in Theory and in Practice,” has stated some of the more salient points in a very clear and able manner, so clear, indeed, that we are utterly at a loss to conceive how any man who can do so—still less how a professor of one of the exact sciences—can at the same time put forward one particular view to which we shall presently advert. Putting aside this one fallacy which will hardly mislead anyone, the pamphlet is well suited for distribution, and cannot fail to do good.

The important fact that the government of this country is in the hands of the capitalist class, and that those who work either with head or hand have very little influence in the House of Commons, is insisted on, and the natural result that all legislation is mainly in the interest of the governing class, is pointed out. The historical method of studying social questions is advocated, and the conclusion is drawn that society, to be tolerable, must be organised on the basis of labour—manual and intellectual—not on that of wealth; the general law being, in the latter case, “that the misery of the labouring classes is directly proportional to the luxury of the wealthy.” This is one of those fundamental points which cannot be too strongly insisted upon, and, fortunately, it is one which admits, not only of clear statement, but of equally clear and incontrovertible proof. All material things desirable for human existence, whether necessities, comforts, or luxuries, being produced by labour, it follows necessarily that the greater the number who live without labour, and the greater the luxury in which they live—in other words, the greater the prosperity of a country, as usually considered—the greater must be the tax on those who do labour, the greater the number of hours they have to work for others, and the fewer they are able to work for their own benefit.

Professor Pearson sees this, and has stated it very clearly; as, for instance, when he says: “We see now why the houses of the poor are deplorable—namely, because that labour which should be devoted to improving them is consumed in supplying the luxuries of the rich.” And yet, after this, he warns his readers “against Socialist teachers who talk loudly of ‘right’ and ‘justice,’” and answers the question, “Are not the labouring classes unjustly treated, and have they not a right to something better?” by saying, “I do not understand what such abstract justice or right means.” We have no fault to find with this statement; if he does not understand it he is quite right to say so; but we have some ground of complaint when he goes on to stigmatise those who do understand it, and who, accordingly, “are never weary of crying out that our present state of society is extremely unjust,” as being either ignorant, or “men who seek to win popularity from the working classes by appealing to their baser passions.” The learned professor is probably a recent convert to Socialism, and can look back to a time not far distant when he did not understand the economic side of the problem; if so he might have reflected before throwing hard names at other people that further study might enable him to understand the ethics of the question also, as we have little doubt will be the case if he will condescend to read attentively the earlier writings of even such an ignorant demagogue as Herbert Spencer. There are obviously two branches to this question. First, and most important: Is the present state of things unjust? And secondly: Is it well to say so? To the solution of the first question, Prof. Pearson contributes nothing whatever beyond saying that he does not know what abstract justice means; but he devotes a good deal of space to the second, which he answers in the negative, because, as he says, the alternative answer would only tend to forcible revolution, and such revolutions are never in the long run successful. The first question, whether human beings as such, have rights, would take too long to discuss here, but we hope Prof. Pearson will pursue his studies further in this direction, suggesting as a preliminary step that

he should consider whether murder is a crime simply because it is forbidden by law, or whether it would be so equally on some desolate island where no law existed. From that he may go on to consider slighter and more complex cases of interference with person or property, and in due time may arrive at the conclusion that there must be laws of ethics as certain as those of mathematics, though the factors in any given problem may be more complicated. On the second question, his reasoning appears to us to be as inconclusive, as it is lacking in regard to the first. We entirely agree with him that "the education of the so-called upper or wealthy classes (on this subject) is an imperative necessity;" and we ask him what more potent factor in that education can be conceived than a demonstration that those who are living on the labour of others are acting unjustly? Those amongst these classes who desire to do what is right will need no further argument, and even those who are careless of any one's interests but their own, will be inclined to listen to reason when they find that those others are awaking to the sense of their rights. Then with regard to the workers themselves, unless we are very much mistaken, they would scorn to live in comfort on the *charity* of others, and it can only be either as a matter of charity or of justice that they receive a larger share of the proceeds of their own labour. If they are not justly entitled to it, they will neither demand nor accept it; but if they are entitled, why should they not demand it? As to the evils of forcible revolutions, and their apparent failure, we believe both are generally exaggerated; or if not, the evils which led to them, and their good results are too much left out of sight. But it does not at all follow that men who are aware of their rights will always violently insist upon them. As a matter of fact many of those who are the most firmly persuaded that Socialism rests on a moral basis are also the most desirous of avoiding violence. They know there must be a revolution, but they know also that it must first be a mental one, or a physical one would be hopeless; and in proportion as the mental one is complete will all danger of a sanguinary one be averted. We hope Professor Pearson may yet do good service in aiding this mental revolution, but any efforts which do not rest on a basis of justice will have as little success now as they have had for the last 1800 years.

FRANK FAIRMAN.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

The subjoined paragraph from the Manchester *Evening News* is a fine sample of modern philanthropic Commercialism. It is a pity the Mahdi does not understand Political Economy. "If we can do anything to rescue the poor Soudanis and Arabs from the accursed rule of the Pacha and the Kourbash, and give them the blessings of English Government, we ought, on grounds of commonest humanity, to do it. The Soudan might have been a profitless possession to Egypt, but it would be profitable enough to those who would govern it wisely and humanely. If a Pacha, in the course of three years, can squeeze £60,000 out of the helpless people of Khartoum, and if 'some of the merchants who sit all day in their little stalls in the bazaar are really millionaires, and could buy up many of our London merchant princes,' there must be many opportunities for making money in the Soudan, and under English rule it would prove a valuable opening for English commerce. The money which now swells the ill-gotten gains of Pachadom would then, by the legitimate operations of trade, find its way among our English manufacturers and workmen. The Berber railway may yet repay our military sacrifices." Amen.—W. S.

The infamous Ferry is at last exposed in some measure. He has been hooted and branded as a liar. The following passage from the address of the International on the Commune of 1871 reads significantly. The Radicals of England in 1871 were righteously indignant with Marx for his pitiless denunciation of Ferry. Let them say now whether he was not in the right. "Jules Ferry, a penniless barrister before the 4th of September, contrived, as Mayor of Paris during the siege, to job a fortune out of famine. The day on which he would have to give an account of his mal-administration would be the day of his conviction."

M. Vambéry is to deliver lectures on "Herat from a Commercial and Industrial Point of View." It will go hard but the English capitalists, Shylocks in all the bad and in none of the good qualities, "will better his instruction."

The new book by Stepniak, "Russia under the Tzars," will appear about the beginning of May. Socialists who know how much Stepniak has worked for and suffered in the cause of Freedom will be eager to see a work that promises to be even more interesting than his "Underground Russia."

Some of our readers will remember the part played of late years in our "politics" by Mr. Gladstone's Egeria, Olga Novikoff. A certain cocotte, Mademoiselle Valtesse (Mademoiselle, because she had as many husbands as Solomon had wives), is, it seems, at the bottom of the shameful Tonkin expedition. It was she who suggested the idea to Gambetta. Madlle. Valtesse, surnamed "The Union of Painters," because at her house a number of painters found feeding accommodation and sleeping, prompted by certain speculators, announced *urbi et orbe* that gold could be picked up for the stooping at Tonkin. When the expedition was discussed in the Chamber, the same speculators proved that there was at Tonkin enough precious metal to make all investors millionaires. Gambetta repeated the lesson learned from Madlle. Val-

tesse, and really believed he had hit on a means of saving his fast-waning prestige. Gambetta dead, M. Ferry accepted his policy. Hence the whole shameful "war." Madme. Novikoff and Madlle. Valtesse! *Vive l'ordre et la famille!*

In delivering his charge, the Bishop of Bath and Wells said that the growth of Socialism was deeply affecting both the Church and the State. Opinions were now widely spread utterly inconsistent with notions of property, and the people were demoralised by their prevalence. Several recent Acts of the Legislature appeared to have sprung from this loosened sense of the sanctity of the rights of property, and to have prepared the way for still greater departure from ancient principles. A school of thought had arisen whose scheme for getting rid of poverty and removing all social inequalities, was for the State, by an act of confiscation and plunder, to take possession of the land, to abolish private property, and to divide the produce of the soil among the people, and this insane and iniquitous scheme actually found favour with a large number of working men, alike blind to the first principles of honesty and their own interests, and even, indeed, with some clergymen. Such a spirit was one of the most dangerous features of the present time, and if it were to spread it would be the destruction of Society.—E. A.

In declaring for Socialism another member of the "respectable" class has fallen out of the ranks, and denounces the competitive system roundly. Says Mr. Charles Rowley, jun., of Manchester, in his *Social Politics*: "Let us each decide what is just in the matter, and then give ourselves no rest until we achieve, or help to achieve, a better state. Our supineness on most of these vital social questions is simply incredible. Why do we sleep in our beds when we know that there are shipowners who send ships and men to sea for the sole purpose of being lost? The facts are incontrovertible, and yet we never hang a shipowner, or a stink maker, or an air poisoner, or a polluter of rivers, or a mill owner who fattens on a high death-rate among children. We hang a few poor and wicked wretches who are born so and who are made so by our vicious arrangements. The real criminals escape, and yet we know them and know their guilt." So we do, Mr. Rowley, and yet they escape. But be of good cheer! The time is evidently coming when we shall "suit the word to the action and the action to the word." Then a thief will be called a thief and treated accordingly. This "better state" we hope and think you will help us to achieve.—W. M.

REVIEWS AND NOTICES.

The Socialism of To-Day. By EMILE DE LAVELEYE. Translated by G. H. Orpen. Field and Tuer.—This is a translation of Laveleye's well-known work, "Le Socialisme Contemporain." The space at our disposal will not permit us to enter upon an elaborate criticism of the *bourgeois* economist's in many respects distorted exposition of the different phases of modern Socialism. Needless to say, we have all the hack apologetics of the capitalist advocate trotted out. M. de Laveleye's mild refutations of scientific economics are, however, really entertaining reading, and may serve, with those acquainted with the subject, to while away the tedium of a railway journey for half-an-hour or so. Our unconsciously ironical Belgian can have some sort of sympathy for the French Utopists, Fourier, Proudhon, etc. They are, after all, amiable visionaries, who have often denounced Jacobin atrocities, and can't do much harm. But these dry, hard, logical German chaps—no, they're not nice. M. de Laveleye finds refuge in the gospel, and concludes the chapter with a sermon extolling the ethics of inwardness and personal reformation v. the dreadfully demoralising doctrines of economic revolutionists. Turning to Mr. Orpen's share of the present work, his translation, we may observe, is worthy of a better original. The appendix, on the Socialist movement in England, shows an evident desire to be fair, though it is not always entirely accurate as to facts. It might be made fuller with advantage in a second edition.

E. B. B.

Social Politics. By CHARLES ROWLEY, JUN. John Heywood, Manchester.—There is an allusion in the "Signs of the Times" to this pamphlet, which is undoubtedly a sign of the times, and a cheering one. Mr. Rowley is by no means mealy-mouthed, and the two sentences printed on the inside of the cover show that he has grasped the essential fact of the class struggle, and knows that the worker's lot cannot really be bettered except at the expense of the exploiters. It is a pity, since this is the case, that he should have taken the word "expansion of England" into his mouth except to condemn it, and that he favours emigration as a remedy for class evils, if he really means this. If those who are most keenly stung by the evils of class domination, and at the same time have energy to resist them, leave the country which is the very forge of class domination, their desertion will surely put off the Revolution which Mr. Rowley desires, and make it more disorderly when it comes, as it must come. "The expansion of England" means the expansion of capital; that is to say, the spreading to other countries and the perpetuation in our own of those horrors, of that death in life, which Mr. Rowley so forcibly and sincerely attacks. Of course the expanded England of Professor Seeley is by no means the England which Mr. Rowley hopes for, and which will be certainly attained at some time, but by no road that goes roundabout to avoid the entire abolition of classes.—W. M.

"We have too much rather than too little labour. . . . The business world has been labouring under the effects of over-production—production which has paid the labour engaged directly upon it, but left little for rent and interest on capital."—*Trade and Finance.* Despite the economical falsehood in the last phrase, the two earlier statements are significant.



MONTHLY REPORT.

DURING the past month regular Branch meetings have been held and lectures delivered. A number of new adherents have joined at the Central Office and at the Branches. The Lessons at South Place Institute have been resumed after a suspension of two weeks; the second series will be commenced on 30th April, and continued on the six succeeding Thursday evenings. The syllabus of the second series will be:—On April 30th—Production of absolute and relative surplus-value. Changes in price of labour-power and surplus-value. Wages. Time-wage. Piece-wage. Wages in different nations. May 7th—Process of accumulation. Simple reproduction. Capitalistic process of production on a larger scale. Capital and value. Abstinence theory. Labour fund. May 14th—Increasing demand for labour-power. Over-population. Industrial reserve army. Different forms of this surplus-population. General law of capitalistic accumulation. May 21st—Illustration of the Law from English History. May 28th—Primary accumulation. Its secret. Expropriation of the English people from the land. The bloody legislation against them. Capitalistic farmers. Agriculture. Industrial Capitalists. The Colonial System. June 4th—Recapitulation. Wages, Abstinence, Over-population, Accumulation, Land, Colonisation. In future the admission to the lessons will be free. On June 11th a social evening will be held, the arrangements for which will be announced in the next issue of the *Commonweal*.

William Morris' "Chants for Socialists" have been printed in a neat 16pp. demy 8vo pamphlet at one penny. The "Socialist Platform" series will begin with "The Class Struggle," by Edward Aveling, after which will come "Useful Work and Useless Toil," by William Morris, and "Love and Hunger," by Andreas Scheu.

The Socialist League determined to move a rider to the first resolution at the meeting against the Soudan War held in St. James's Hall on April 2nd. Comrades Morris and Mowbray were told off to move and second the rider, which ran thus:—
"And that this meeting believes that the invasion of the Soudan has been prompted solely by the desire to exploit the country in the interests of capitalists and stock-jobbers; and warns the working classes that such wars will always take place until they (the workers) unite throughout the civilised world, and take their own affairs into their own hands."

The audience was attentive and moderately enthusiastic against the war—any reference to the cause of which was carefully avoided in the resolution. Mr. Bradlaugh from the chair opened the meeting, and was followed by Prof. Beesley, Mr. Storey, Prof. Thorold Rogers, and Mr. N. L. Ghose. In spite of the inspiring subject, the speaking was on the whole below the average: Mr. Storey's speech was the staidest, and Mr. Bradlaugh's the most conventional; Mr. Thorold Rogers alone made a vigorous and pointed speech, justly throwing the onus of the war on the sluggishness of the whole British people who have permitted it to be undertaken and continued. He also, using partly the words of our Manifesto, pointed out the large share which Gordon's treacherous conduct had in bringing about the invasion, and his remarks on this point were received with applause by the greater part of the audience. At the close of Mr. Ghose's somewhat dreary speech, the Chairman announced, without reading out, our rider, and said that he would allow the mover and seconder five minutes each. This promise he broke by calling Morris to time after he had spoken a few sentences, which were reported verbatim by the *Daily News* next day, and can only be spun out to something less than two minutes. There was no excuse for this unfairness on the Chairman's part, as the audience was quite prepared to give a fair hearing to our speakers; the reading of the rider was interrupted by widespread applause, the mention of the Socialist League was well received, and so were the few words spoken by Morris. The mover protesting against the Chairman's unfairness, Mr. Bradlaugh offered to let him speak through the seconder's time if the latter would give it up. This he (very reasonably) declined to do, and Morris was compelled to retire. Mowbray was then allowed to speak for his allotted time, after which the chairman rose and announced that "we cannot accept the rider," thus dictating to what was supposed to be a free public meeting. He then called on Mrs. Besant to oppose the rider. This lady, called on to answer arguments which Mr. Bradlaugh had forbidden the meeting to listen to, made but a poor job of it, and would scarcely have had a cheer till the close of her speech if she had not quoted the last sentence of the rider, which was received with loud applause. After she had concluded, she of course received the applause that politeness usually awards to a lady. Though Morris asked the chairman to allow a brief answer to Mrs. Besant, and John Burns (S.D.F.) attempted to reach the platform and speak, this slight indulgence to freedom of discussion before a good tempered and more or less sympathetic audience was refused by the chairman, who then put the rider (again without reading it). As matter of course, after such treatment, it was rejected. The only other remarkable event of the meeting was the uproarious applause which greeted Mr. Labouchere's rising to move the second resolution, compared with which Mr. Bradlaugh's reception was cool. This seemed to indicate a large contingent of Northampton voters, which makes the reception by the audience of our speakers the more encouraging. A considerable number of the *Commonweal* was sold at the hall doors, and the Soudan War Manifesto was widely distributed. In considering their delegates' report of the meeting, the following resolution was unanimously passed:—"This meeting of the Provisional Council of the Socialist League considers the action of Mr. Bradlaugh as Chairman of the St. James's Hall meeting of 2nd April to have been a flagrant breach of faith towards a delegate of the League, and in future resolves to treat Mr. Bradlaugh in accordance with this consideration of his conduct on that occasion."—W. M.

ANTI-WAR MEETING.—A well-attended gathering at South Place Institute on Thursday, April 23, passed with one dissentient the following resolutions:—

"That this meeting denounces the aggressions on the peoples of Egypt and the Soudan, which have occasioned such wrong, waste and slaughter, and sympathises heartily with the brave men, women and children who have offered such dauntless resistance to Tyranny. It considers all this robbery and violence to be only the necessary outcome of the system of commercial exploitation, which in one way or another curses all the countries of the world, and it calls on all workers to resist such policy to the utmost, and to combine for the final removal of the causes which produce it."

"That this meeting recognises in the endeavour to impose upon the English people an 'imperial policy' an attempt on the part of the ruling classes to get rid of the most glaring outgrowth of the commercial system, by planting its victims in the soil of unexploited regions and of colonies already in the grasp of Capitalism, in order

to extend the area and prolong the existence of this system so fruitful of misery and degradation to the workers. Furthermore, that this policy of Commercial Patriotism, if persistently pursued, must inevitably entangle the Government of this country with the contending Governments of other countries, to result in war and bloodshed, the burden of which will have to be borne by the working classes of the world, who have neither wish nor cause for quarrel among themselves."

William Morris was in the chair. The first resolution was proposed by Joseph Lane, and seconded by the veteran E. T. Craig, who left a sick bed to attend the meeting. An amendment denouncing the Arabs as merciless and lawless found no seconder. John Burns, of the Social Democratic Federation, and Edward Aveling, supported the original resolution. The second resolution was proposed by Frank Kitz, seconded by Eleanor Marx Aveling, and supported by C. Mowbray, H. H. Champion (S.D.F.), and Andreas Scheu.

REPORTS.

TOWER HAMLETS.—A lecture was delivered on April 19th at the Tower Hamlets Radical Association, by David Nicoll, on "Socialism and Political Economy." The audience, though small, was very appreciative, and listened attentively to the lecture, after which a few questions were asked, and answered by the lecturer.

LEEDS BRANCH.—The usual meetings have been held on Sunday afternoons at Vicar's Croft, and have been very successful. The Branch meets every Wednesday evening at 54 Myrtle Street, where communications may be addressed to the Secretary, T. Maguire.

WOOLWICH.—The Woolwich Socialists took to open-air propaganda on March 28. We started with an address on "The Aims of the Socialists," R. Banner speaking for an hour to a large audience, and D. J. Nicoll, acting as chairman, closed the meeting with a stirring speech, which enabled us to sell over 300 copies of the *Commonweal*. On April 5, J. L. Mahon spoke on "Property," but the cold being too severe for the people to withstand, we had to dissolve the meeting after having spoken for 30 minutes. On the 12th, A. Scheu spoke on the "Labour Question" to a very large gathering, numbering several hundreds towards the close of the meeting. He gave a graphic picture of the condition of the so-called "free" labourer under the rule of King Capital, that went home to all. Referring to the determination of Capitalists at home to extend their markets abroad, he appealed to the meeting to denounce the Soudan butchery as a war undertaken in the interests of profit-hunters. A few questions were put at the close of the meeting, and brought forth some able replies, which were of a striking and convincing character. Thirty-two copies of the *Commonweal* were sold.—R. B.

EDINBURGH BRANCH (Scottish Land and Labour League).—We have had lectures every Saturday evening this month. April 4th, the lecture was, "What the English do for India." Briefly, the lecturer's answer was—Plunder it. 11th, Mr. Traill's subject, "The Prospect of Socialism," drew a good attendance and led to an instructive discussion. 18th, M. Mallet-Prevôt concluded his reminiscences of the Commune of Paris. People in Edinburgh wishing to learn the aims of Socialists should visit the Hall, 20 Picardy Place, on Saturdays, at 7.30, when lectures are given, and literature on the subject can be purchased. Persons desiring to join the League should communicate with the Secretary, at 20 Picardy Place, Edinburgh.

REGENT'S PARK.—The open-air lectures were begun on Sunday, 19th April. The first meeting was a large and orderly gathering of people, who listened attentively for an hour and a half to some animated speeches by comrades Wade, Mahon, and Nicoll.

MILE END.—At Swaby's Discussion Room, on 5th April, Comrade Scheu took part in a debate on Socialism, rousing considerable interest by his brief speech. On the 12th, Comrade Mahon attended and opened the debate in a crowded room. An interesting discussion followed, and it was evident that the feeling of the audience was generally in favour of the Revolutionary views which had been advocated.

SHOREDITCH.—At the Town Hall, on the 21st April, Albert Grey, M.P., delivered a lecture on "Industrial Partnership," the Bishop of Bedford presiding. The audience consisted chiefly of a number of Socialists, who attended to discuss the lecturer's views. Although questions only were invited, a long discussion ensued, with the result of disturbing the Bishop and making the M.P. rather uncomfortable. The evening was profitably spent, and if M.P.'s would more often visit the East-end of London, they would benefit considerably by the teachings of the working men.

HAMMERSMITH BRANCH.—Meetings have been held twice a week, as is usual here. Those held on Sunday evenings have been well attended. Comrades William Morris, W. Bridges Adams, Leonard Hill, and Andreas Scheu have been the lecturers. Several new members have joined during the month.—E. W., Sec.

MERTON ABBEY BRANCH.—On 17th April, Comrade Theodore lectured on "The Wage-Slaves' Struggle for Emancipation," giving a review of the development of the Socialist movement, and showing that this emancipation struggle of the modern wage-slaves, by force of consequence, must inevitably end in triumph over the present Capitalistic society. The lecturer was warmly cheered at the conclusion, and hopes were expressed that he would soon come again. On 24th April, Comrade Mahon lectured on "Politicians and Socialists," his uncompromising antagonism to all things political meeting with approval.

LESSONS IN SOCIALISM.—On Thursday, April 16, Edward Aveling, in concluding the first course, gave a recapitulation of the past seven lessons on Value, Money, Capital, Surplus-Value, Working day, Co-operation, Manufacture and Machinery. The class was well attended.

LECTURE DIARY: May, 1885.

[H. HALLIDAY, Lecture Secretary.]

OPEN AIR PROPAGANDA.—Two speakers every Sunday at Hoxton, Islington, Canning Town and Notting Hill.

HOXTON BRANCH (L.E.L.), Academy Schools, Hoxton Street, 8 p.m.—3rd, J. Lane, "The National Loan;" 10th, A. Scheu, "Source of Wealth and Cause of Poverty;" 17th, J. L. Mahon, "Politicians and Socialists;" 24th, H. Halliday, "The Blind Samson;" 31st, W. J. Clark, "Imperialism and Democracy."

MILE END BRANCH, 110 Whitehorse Street, Stepney, 8.30 p.m.—3rd, A. Scheu, "Source of Wealth and Cause of Poverty;" 10th, W. J. Clark, "Imperialism and Democracy;" 17th, C. W. Mowbray, "Lords and Commons of the People;" 24th, W. Morris, "Work as it is and as it might be;" 31st, J. L. Mahon, "Politicians and Socialists."

NOTTING HILL BRANCH, "Magdala Castle," Blechynden Street, 8 p.m.—3rd, W. J. Clark, "Imperialism and Democracy;" 10th, H. Halliday, "The Blind Samson;" 17th, David Nicoll, "The Coming Revolution;" 24th, J. Lane, "The National Loan;" 31st, A. Scheu, "Socialism and Capitalism."

HAMMERSMITH BRANCH, Kelmecott House, 26 Upper Mall, 8 p.m.—3rd, Edward Aveling, "Capital and Surplus-value;" 10th, W. Morris, "How can we Help?" 17th, W. J. Clark, "Imperialism and Democracy;" 24th, A. Scheu, "Marx and Blanqui;" 31st, H. Charles, "Society v. State."

MANCHESTER.—Open-air meetings every Sunday at 6.30 p.m., at the Viaduct, Chester Road, Hulme.

EDINBURGH.—Every Saturday, at 7.30 p.m., Picardy Hall, 20 Picardy Place.
MERTON ABBEY, High Street, Merton, 8 p.m.—1st, Chas. Theodore; 8th, William Morris, "How can we Help?" 15th, J. L. Mahon, "The Future of the Socialist Propaganda;" 22nd, Andreas Scheu, "Love and Hunger;" 29th, David Nicoll, "Socialism and Political Economy."

Supplement to "The Commonwealth"

VOL. 1.—No. 4.

MAY, 1885.

UNATTRACTIVE LABOUR.

For our purpose of considering the relations of labour to industrial art, the wares made at the present day, the articles made for the market that is, may be divided into two classes—those that have some pretensions to be considered ornamental, and those that have not. The latter, I suppose, is much the larger class; but at any rate the important thing to remember is that there is this difference. Now it seems to me necessary to understand that everything made by man must be either ugly or beautiful. Neutrality is impossible in man's handiwork. But in times past, before the commercial age, it did not follow that a piece of handiwork was ugly because it did not aim at being ornamental; it had a certain use, which it fulfilled, and at the same time, without apparent effort of the maker, it was beautiful. *It grew so*, one may say, exactly as a piece of Nature does. That is far from being the case now. In the wares which are made for utility only, it is rare that you find any beauty of form; they have a natural tendency to grow ugly, like a London starveling has. Even in the commonest things, such as fences in fields and other simple agricultural appliances, except for a few survivals, matters which have accidentally clung to old traditions, ugliness is the rule. An ordinary house, or piece of furniture or of attire, is not only not beautiful, it is aggressively and actively ugly, and we assume as a matter of course that it must be so. And if we have a mind for any beauty (or pretence of it), we must make a definite effort; we must give our orders for an ornamental article to be made for us. And I may say, in passing, that, order as we please, we cannot always get our order executed. The sense of beauty and power of expressing it, under the present circumstances, is one of the rarest of gifts, so that the ordinary public have to put up with such pretence to beauty as the so-called ornamental class of wares can furnish to them. Therefore, while the rich man, by spending much money, can gather about him a certain amount of beauty, and while the man of moderate means may be able to attain the same end by taking an infinitude of trouble, the working man, who has no time to take trouble and no money to enable him to dispense with it, must put up with the lack of beauty altogether. Here, then, is a strange thing, that whereas in the pre-commercial ages we had beauty without paying for it, it has now become an article of the market, and, like most other market articles, is so shamefully adulterated that we can scarcely buy it even for our money.

I know that to many people this will seem a small matter, because only those (and how few they are!) who can make their surroundings decent can understand the full horror, the dulness and poverty of life which it involves. For my part, having regard to the general happiness of the race, I say without shrinking that the bloodiest of violent revolutions would be a light price to pay for the righting of this wrong.

For this is not a matter of accident, but springs from the form which the slavery of the many has taken in our days. It is but one of the consequences of wage-slavery. Until that wage-slavery was completed and crowned by the revolution of the great machine industries, there was some attractiveness in the work of the artisan. There is now none, or next to none; and the reason why the ornamental wares above-mentioned are so adulterated is because the very ornament itself is but a part of the machine labour, made to sell, and not for use, whether it be done by human machines or non-human ones. It is no exaggeration to say that our civilisation has destroyed the attractiveness of labour, and that by more means than one: by lengthening the hours of labour: by intensifying the labour during its continuance; by the forcing of the workmen into noisy, dirty, crowded factories; by the aggregation of the population into cities and manufacturing districts, and the consequent destruction of all beauty and decency of surroundings; by the levelling all intelligence and excellence of workmanship by means of machinery, and the consequent gradual extinction of the skilled craftsman. All this is the exact contrary of the conditions under which the spontaneous art of past ages was produced. Our forefathers of the Middle Ages worked shorter hours than we do (even since the passing of the Factory Acts) and had more holidays. They worked deliberately and thoughtfully as all artists do; they worked in their own homes and had plenty of elbow room; the unspoiled country came up

to their very doors and, except in their dreams of hell—if even there—they could have had no conception of the glories of the Black Country or South Lancashire, which I heard a famous demagogue the other night enumerating among the blessings of peace, such peace as he could conceive of. Finally, all their work depended on their own skill of hand and invention, and never failed to show signs of that in its beauty and fitness; it was even thought wrong to cheat people by adulteration of goods, so that (strange to say) good work was creditable to the worker.

Thus the development of the commercial system crowned by the revolution of the great machine industries has deprived us of the attractiveness of labour, and as far as it could of the beauty of the earth. What, then, has it left us? The hope of revolution, of the transformation of civilisation, now become on the face of it a mere corruption and curse to the world, into Socialism, which will set free the hands and minds of men for the production and safe-guarding of the beauty of life.

I have said that our mediæval forefathers worked shorter hours than we do; but yet they worked far too long, and of course suffered from their special form of slavery, that is serfdom, and other arbitrary violence of the privileged classes, and their chances of successful rebellion were pretty much *nil*. It was necessary that they should struggle upwards till they formed a middle-class and created commerce with its proletariat doomed to ceaseless unattractive dull labour, in place of the old yeoman and crafts-guildsman with his pleasant easy-going work. Nevertheless, it is that proletariat only that can make good the claim of workmen to their share of art, without which no art can live long.

It is no real paradox to say that the unattractiveness of labour which is now the curse of the world will become the hope of the world. As long as the workman could sit at home, working easily and quietly, his long hours of labour mattered little to him, and other evils could be borne. Those evils, too, were visible and palpable to everyone and external to their lives; and the remedies were not far to seek. Peace instead of violence, equal rights before the law, these were things which people might hope their very masters would try to win for them.

But now that labour has become a mere burden, the disease of a class, that class will, by all means, try to throw it off, to lessen its weight, and in their efforts to do so they must of necessity destroy society, which is founded on the patient bearing of that burden. For there is no longer, as in the days of feudal violence, any means of relieving them of the burden while our present society exists. True, their masters, taught prudence by fear, will try, are trying, various means to make the workers bear their burden; but one after the other they will be found out and discredited. Philanthropy has had its day and is gone; thrift and self-help are going; participation in *profits*, parliamentarism and universal suffrage, State Socialism will have to go the same road, and the workers will be face to face at last with the fact that modern civilisation with its elaborate hierarchy and iron drill is founded on their intolerable burden, and then no shortening of the day's work which would leave profit to the employer will make their labour hours short enough. They will see that modern society can only exist as long as they bear their burden with some degree of patience, their patience will be worn out, and to pieces will modern society go.

And I repeat, that to my mind the unattractiveness of labour, which has been the necessary outcome of commercial industry, will have played a great part in this revolution; the price which commercialism will have to pay for depriving the worker of his share of art will be its own death.

WILLIAM MORRIS.

THE SOLIDARITY OF LABOUR.

BY A TRADES UNIONIST.

In an article in last month's *Commonweal* I endeavoured to show that our Trades Unions were now little else than "buffers" between Labour and Capital; that they were wasting their efforts in miserable makeshifts and paltry political expedients instead of recognising the solidarity of Labour and organising for its emancipation from the slavery of Capitalism. I shall now call the attention of my fellow-workmen to one or two points which seriously hinder our progress. In the first place, unfortunately, our efforts and

sympathies are circumscribed. Instead of regarding every worker as a comrade, and uniting to raise the *status* of all, we think only of our interests as tailors, shoemakers, bricklayers, compositors, etc. This of itself is a sufficiently serious matter. Thoughtful men will easily understand, even if they have not experienced, the disastrous effect of want of unity in the case of associated trades, and a little reflection will show that the interdependence of all our Unions is as real as that of the regiments which compose an army. To me it seems as absurd to stand idly by and see a Union of Workers vanquished by the Capitalists as for an army to allow itself to be cut to pieces in detachments. There is, however, another and a worse evil resulting from the lack of *solidarity*, namely the fostering of a spirit of *caste*. Thus we have classes of workers—the head workers looking down upon the artisan, and the artisan in turn looking down upon the labourer. And these classes are subdivided into various grades. The monopolists of course encourage these divisions, as by the same rule that the artisan claims a higher remuneration for his labour than that of what is termed the unskilled worker, the monstrous incomes obtained by the *exploiters* and the enormous salaries paid to governors, generals, bishops, lawyers, and other officials are justified and upheld.

I ask the careful attention of my fellow-workmen to the following comparison of labour-values:—

MONOPOLISTS.*			WAGE-SLAVES.	
Official.	Salary.	One year's work (?) Equal to.	Artisan. Wage £80 per year. Years of Labour.	Labourer. Wage £50 per year. Years of Labour.
The Queen ...	£60,000	..	750	1,200
Prince of Wales ...	40,000	..	500	800
Master of the Horse (Duke of Westminster)	2,500	..	31	50
Master of the Buckhounds (Earl of Cork)	1,700	..	21	34
Black Rod ...	2,000	..	25	40
Hereditary Grand Falconer (Duke of St. Albans) ...	1,200	..	15	24
Captain of Yeomen of the Guard (Lord Monson) ...	1,200	..	15	24
Groom of the Robes ...	800	..	10	16
Lord Lieutenant of Ireland ...	20,000	..	250	400
Ambassador to Paris ...	10,000	..	125	200
Commercial Attaché do	1,200	..	15	24
Consuls ...	500 to 1,000	..	6 to 12	10 to 20
Duke of Cambridge ...	22,000	..	275	440
Lieutenant-Generals ...	1,800	..	22	36
Admirals ...	3,500	..	43	70
Archbishop of Canterbury ...	15,000	..	186	300
Dean of Canterbury ...	2,000	..	25	40
Canons ...	1,000	..	12	20
Lord Chancellor ...	10,000	..	125	200
Lord Chief Justice ...	8,000	..	100	160
Judges ...	5,000 to 6,000	..	62 to 75	100 to 120
Magistrates ...	1,500	..	18	30
Chief Secretaries of State	5,000	..	62	100
Heads of Departments	2,000	..	25	40
Average pay of the whole class of minor officials ...	800	..	10	16

In the above list I have omitted capitalists, landlords, stock exchange sharpers, burglars, etc., because these classes simply plunder as much as they can lay hands on, and though the contrast between a great landowner or mine-owner, with a revenue of £100,000 a year, and the poor agricultural labourer or pitman, dragging out a miserable existence on 12s. or 14s. per week, might be more sensational, my purpose is to deal with the question from the purely practical standpoint of a comparison of labour-values. I contend that the table given above, which understates the disparity really existing, is a most striking condemnation of our present-day civilisation, and is proof of the profound degradation and abject flunkeyism engendered by commercialism. How can freedom and fraternity flourish in a community which permits—nay, fosters—such frightful social inequality? What are we to think of men who submit to give fifty years' hard and continuous labour in exchange for a few months' service (often useless, if not mischievous) of some fellow man? Yet, so enslaved and corrupted are numbers of the people, in a great measure owing to our venal press, which holds up these superior beings as models of virtue and industry, that not only are they content to be thus shamelessly plundered, but they look up with

* A Monopolist is one who is able to force others to perform more labour for him than he does for them in return.

reverence and awe to, or blindly prostrate themselves before, the gods whom they have themselves created. We Socialists are continually met with the objection that we would place the skilled mechanic and labourer on a level. So deeply has the degrading *bourgeois* spirit permeated society that Trades Unionists, even though they call themselves Radicals and Republicans, and whilst they might be willing to level down to themselves, still cherish the snobbish conviction that they are a superior *caste* to the labourer. I contend that the only equitable and rational basis for the exchange of labour is that of quantity—measure for measure; that the division of labour into skilled and unskilled is arbitrary and illogical; that all labour that is necessary for the subsistence of society—according to the standard of comfort determined by the stage of development reached by the community—is of equal importance; and that no one is entitled to, or ought to wish for more, than his share of the common produce. Skill is, after all, chiefly the facility derived from practice and experience with which special kinds of work is done, and it is absurd to limit the term only to manufacture. The old recipe to cook a hare is prefaced with the injunction, "First catch your hare." In the same way, before the skill of the artisan or mechanic can be exerted, we must first get our raw material. Manual labour is, therefore, the very basis of existence, and in the getting of that raw material—the felling of timber, the quarrying of stone, the getting of minerals, etc., etc.—surely skill is equally as much exerted as in the handling of tools in the processes of manufacture. I doubt not, too, that many of us would discover that there is an art even in carrying the hod. Those who argue for the superiority of their own particular work conveniently assume that those engaged in what they consider inferior occupations are fit only for that particular kind of labour; they entirely overlook the fact that fitness is rarely taken into account, and choice seldom exercised in determining the avocations of the great mass of the workers. The tendency of the present chaotic state of society is to crush out individuality and arrest the development of special abilities by stereotyping, as it were, classes of workers—sons succeeding fathers, as a rule, in the particular labour *caste* in which they were born. It should be borne in mind, too, that production now-a-days becomes more and more complex. The introduction of machinery tends constantly to reduce the importance of individual skill and to make the creation of wealth depend mainly on collective effort. In fact, the skilled workman of yesterday may become the labourer of to-morrow, or he may be dispensed with entirely, and his place supplied by a machine watched by a woman or child. Thus while slight variations of skill or labour-power may exist between man and man, the average production of any hundred or thousand men will be pretty nearly the same. In any case, the difference in capacity between two different sets of workers is no greater than the difference between individuals in one common employment. The conclusions, therefore, at which I arrive are (1) that the production of wealth being socialised, so ought also to be the distribution; (2) that all useful work is equally honourable; (3) that the united labour of all being capable of producing enough for each, and no one requires more than enough, the highest interest of the workers demands the recognition of the solidarity of labour and the speedy abolition of the absurd *caste* spirit unhappily still so potent a factor for evil in our ranks.

It is curious to note that the *superior* people who justify the system whereby those who to-day do the hardest and most disagreeable work get the least pay, and whose feelings are shocked by the notion of a state of society in which the services of the labourer should be valued as highly as their own—are the same people who are so anxious to know how the hard and dirty work is to be done in a Socialistic State. It is not within the scope of this article to discuss the whole question of Socialism; but it is essential to my argument to point out that if any qualitative difference in the value of labour be admitted, it is not the skilled worker, but those who perform dangerous, difficult, and unpleasant tasks, who would be fairly entitled to increased remuneration. Personally, I am in favour of absolute equality in the reward of labour and would meet the difficulty, if it should arise, by the lessening of the labour-time and by other and nobler incitements than the sordid pecuniary motives which govern us so largely at present.

I now come to the practical application of the foregoing remarks, especially in relation to our Trades Unions. I ask my fellow-unionists seriously to consider how much, or, rather, how little, we have yet accomplished. I have been a unionist for twenty years, yet to-day I am neither better fed, clothed, nor housed than when I became a journeyman. The only real improvement in my condition is a slight decrease in the hours of labour, and even that is minimised by the distance at which our accursed landlord and capitalist *régime* compels me to live from my work. Take the whole body of Unionists. It is doubtful whether the nominal increase in their wages amounts to fifteen per cent., and the best part of this is given with one hand and

taken back with the other in the shape of rent, etc. The cause of our failure hitherto is because we have not perceived the unity of labour. The tendency of wages is always to a minimum. The efforts of the strongest unions seldom achieve and can never retain a rate of pay much in excess of the average. It follows, therefore, that the inequality between one kind of workers and another, besides being morally injurious, is also most inimical to our material welfare. For as the strength of a chain is determined by its weakest link, so also is the well-being of a community to be judged by the condition of its poorest members. The existence of a large ill-paid body of workers in our midst is thus a constant menace to the slight advantages which the more fortunate of us have been able to gain. Our highest duty and our best interest both counsel us to work for the common weal. Only by lifting up our poorer brethren can we hope permanently to better our own condition. Hitherto we have been fighting in groups, sometimes carelessly, selfishly indifferent to the fate of our fellows. It is time we began to see in every worker a comrade, and to close up our ranks shoulder to shoulder. United action, however, requires a common aim, and here again the varying rates of wages are a serious obstacle to unity. It is the first and greatest difficulty in the way of a federation of Trades Unions. True Fraternity implies Equality, and till the workers recognise this the emancipation of Labour cannot be accomplished. The competitive wage system necessarily engenders and fosters class antagonism, and produces the frightful social disparity we deplore. It is useless to expect any material improvement in the condition of the workers so long as it exists. In this fact lies the germ of our hope for the future. Whatever may be our grade as workers, we are nevertheless all victimised by the capitalistic system of production which compels us to be in reality the slaves—notwithstanding our "Rule Britannia" rhetoric—of the monopolists of the means of life. Let us no longer waste our strength and resources in isolated, costly, and futile attempts to better ourselves by striking for a few pence additional to our scanty wages. Above all, let us not be lured from the highway which leads to freedom by political will-o'-the-wisps; but, recognising the Solidarity of Labour, let us unite with our brethren throughout the world, steadily organising our forces, and patiently waiting the time till a supreme effort shall once for all burst our bonds asunder, and make us truly masters of our own destinies.

THOMAS BINNING.

IMPERIAL POLICY AND COMMERCIAL PATRIOTISM.

It appears, that in this British Monstre Empire, resting with one foot in South Africa, with another in India, with a third in Egypt, with a fourth in America, a fifth in Australia, and with many more on many other benighted spots of our globe's surface, there is but one thing needed to make people still happier than they already are, and this is—"Expansion." At least, so says Professor Seeley, and he ought to know as well as any Imperialist what is good for "us." That such expansion is a violent process, Mr. Seeley is fully aware; but he is quite willing and prepared to sacrifice England's blood (which is not his) to the expansion of England's commerce, in which he seems interested. Wars, he says unblushingly, are business undertakings, and hence more than their cost will be got out of them (by the masters of the nation).

"Mr. Bright tells us," says Professor Seeley, that the wars of the British Empire were due to guilty ambition, that the proceeds of them went into the pockets of admirals and generals, and, generally speaking, that the British Empire was founded in the interests of the younger sons of aristocratic families. Now, all this is not to see just the very thing about those wars which is most certain and obvious. They were not at all prompted by lust of empire, and they were waged in the interests, not of the aristocracy, but of the trading classes. They were business undertakings, and it was the standing marvel of the eighteenth century that the more England fought the richer she became, and that if her debt increased fast, her ability to bear it increased yet faster. "And if you ask," said Professor Seeley, in conclusion, "what we have got for our 800 millions of debt incurred in these wars, the answer is very simple. We have got Canada, and South Africa, and Australia, and India, and a world-wide commerce such as has never before been seen."

Very good, Mr. Professor, as far as you deal with the sentimental freetrader, who would like to charge the aristocracy exclusively with the crimes of commercialism, in which the whole plutocracy of the country have an equally damnable share. But why should you abuse human language in order to confound the understanding of your audience? Who is England that fought, and who is England that became richer? Who has "got" Canada and the colonies, and who pays the eight hundred millions of debt incurred in these wars of "expansion"? The marvel of

this century is that a working men audience should be found patient enough to listen to such commercially patriotic jargon. Put in plain and true English your epistle ought to read:

"These wars (for the expansion of Big Britain) were business undertakings of the trading classes, and hence it is not at all marvellous that the more the poor worked and fought, the richer and more insolent their masters became, and that the more the debt of the country increased, the more the capitalists succeeded in making it pay by the exertions of their slaves. England has annexed Canada and the colonies, and the consequence is such a world-wide misery as has never before been seen."

Mr. Bradlaugh is, like Mr. Bright, disgusted at England's wars of aggression. He holds that the Empire owes her greatness to the factory chimneys. But this is only an aggression of commercialism in a different direction; and whether Mr. Seeley is in favour of horizontal expansion, or Mr. Bradlaugh prefers a perpendicular one (which, indeed, would make the commercial system more effectually "stink to heaven"), it virtually means the same thing: the glorification of a system, the curse of which is fortunately becoming more evident to its victims every day.

BERTL WINSOME.

RECORD OF THE INTERNATIONAL MOVEMENT.

FRANCE.—In another column of the *Commonweal* our comrade Paul Lafargue gives us some account of M. Ferry's fall and the Tonkin crime. But here are a few details worth recording. On the day that the Ferry ministry was overthrown funds fell 3fr. 35c. On April 1st, Rochefort's paper the *Intransigeant* asserted—and this has not been contradicted—that on the preceding evening M. Ferry, "foreseeing" this fall, had given orders to sell largely. ("Des ordres considérables de vente.") The next day the *Paris*, a journal notoriously supported by the "reptile-fund," and which appears in the evening just when Bourgeois operations begin, announced that M. Ferry had been to M. Grévy and had assured him that peace was concluded, and a treaty signed with China. Immediately the funds went up 1fr. 25c. People not unnaturally ask whom is this jobbing to profit? In the Chamber a Bonapartist Deputy, M. Jolibois, demanded that for the honour and dignity of the Chamber these "*Coups de bourse*" should be put a stop to. He was violently interrupted by a deputy belonging to the Majority, E. Cornudet, who exclaimed "Such words are ignoble." And the majority cheered frantically! "That such jobbery goes on in French politics," writes a Parisian friend, "and that a majority in the Chamber is ready to support and defend it, shows to what a corrupt condition our bourgeoisie has sunk. The victims and the defeats of the '*patrie*' are now only so many pretexts for bourse speculation."

Though much has been written about the excitement that prevailed in Paris over this Tonkin business, few people in England have, I believe, realised what the condition of Paris really was. "We have been on the very brink of a revolution" a correspondent writes to me, "and for some time we all fully expected a street-riot. It is quite impossible to give you, or any one not living in this land of surprises an idea even of the state into which this Tonkin trouble has thrown us Parisians. We are at fever heat, and no one can say what the next few hours or days may bring forth."

Of course our Socialist friends have taken advantage of this ferment to "preach the doctrine." At all meetings on the subject of the war, whether convened by themselves or others, they have proposed the three following resolutions: "1. Immediate peace with China; recall of all the unfortunate soldiers sent out, and retirement from Tonkin, Cochin China, and, if need be, from all Asiatic colonies. 2. Impeachment of the Ferry ministry. 3. The confiscation of all the goods and property of the ministers and of all deputies who voted in favour of the Tonkin expedition, in order to cover in part the cost of the war." The last two resolutions, it is interesting to know, were passed at all meetings, the third being especially applauded.

GERMANY.—English penny-a-liners have been "deeply moved" at the national birthday gift to Prince Bismarck. They have forgotten to tell their readers either the manner in which money was literally extorted—in some cases stopped out of their wages—from factory-workers, and obtained by threats. They have also forgotten to say that the whole thing was a gigantic swindle and that the money was obtained under entirely false pretences. When the idea was started it was announced that the money was to be devoted to "some great national object"—this would be the most appropriate, the most pleasing, etc., etc., etc., manner of showing the respect of Germany for her great Chancellor. But when the money was in hand the promoters calmly declared that, instead of the "great national object" the money should be handed over to Prince Bismarck personally in order that he might increase his landed property! This disgraceful affair has called forth protests, even from such papers as the *Deutsche Tagblatt*, to whom a correspondent writes: "We learn from the newspapers that the whole of the sums collected are to be handed over, for his personal use, to Prince Bismarck. This has made a most painful impression, not only on myself, but on other great admirers of the Prince. We stated to others, and were led to believe, that the object of the collection was to found some establishment for the good of all; it was only under this impression that we succeeded in getting subscriptions—more especially the smaller sums. If our promises are

therefore, not adhered to, we shall not only be seriously compromised, but the popularity of Prince Bismarck and respect for his person will be much shaken." Of course, Bismarck and his beloved disciples Bleichröder and Co., think money now-a-days more useful than popularity and respect. He has played the confidence trick, and can afford to laugh at the idiots who were taken in by it.

One of the most interesting events I have had to record for some time from Germany is the growth of the Socialist movement among the German women. A meeting was held lately in Berlin at which some 500 or 600 persons, mostly women, were present. Frau Stageman spoke admirably. She pointed out to the women and men that by united efforts alone could they achieve any measure of success. She called on the working women to join the Socialist movement and by their organisation become a power able to cope with their capitalist oppressors, who exploit the women even more hideously than the men, and who encourage "family-life" by forcing the wife to undersell her husband. "We must and will prove," she concluded "that the women of the proletariat are not less advanced than the men." This speech, and many others were received enthusiastically, and a "Union of the Working Women of Berlin" was started. I hope our English women will go and do likewise.

That considerable differences of opinion between the various sections of Socialist members of the Reichstag have arisen is well known; that some of these gentlemen objected to having their conduct in the Reichstag criticised by the *Sozial Demokrat* is also known, but a few words on the actual "situation" may be of interest and service to English comrades. Of course our English friends must bear in mind that all public meetings, all public expression of opinion in Germany are impossible.

The immense and unexpected success at the last elections seems to have turned the heads of a few of the elected, who seem to think that the voice of the people has invested them with quite superior powers. This appears to be especially the case with what may be called the right wing of the Parliamentary Party. Every political party must necessarily be composed of one set of men who will act fully up to the principles of the party, and draw all the consequences evolving from them; and another set of men, who will be more cautious and more easily prepared to compromise with their Parliamentary neighbours. Thus it goes with Socialist parties too. As long as the class next adjoining the working class, both in social status and general education, is the class of small tradesmen, and as long as this class of small tradesmen, by the crushing competition of the large capitalist, is more and more ground down, and its individual members more and more brought down to the level of the working class, so long will the Socialist party in every country include men who from habit and education retain trains of thought more appropriate to the status of the small trading class, than to that of the proletariat. In other words, a Socialist party will have a Left Wing, representing thorough-going proletarian revolutionary Communism, and a Right Wing, holding views of a more diluted nature, and eager, above all, to prove to their political opponents how little they deserve the opprobrious names heaped upon them. In Germany, from very self-evident reasons, the anti-Socialist law appears to have given a majority of deputies to the Right Wing of the Party—the only real harm, by the bye, that law has so far inflicted upon German Socialism. This new majority, finding itself in contradiction with the "official" organ of the party, on a particular point of policy, considered it necessary to proclaim the discrepancy to the world by an act of publicity of a more than unusual character. There the matter will probably end. The *Sozial Demokrat* will remain what it has been, and proclaim the same revolutionary principles as heretofore. The offended deputies will be satisfied with the publicity they have given to their difference of opinion, for they know too well that after all they will have to conform to the will of their electors—though the electors have at present no power to express their will in public meetings—and that the vast majority of these electors are working men and not small tradesmen. Of course a large number of the Revolutionary deputies have cordially approved the conduct of the *Sozial Demokrat* in condemning the action of certain deputies.

AMERICA.—The news that comes to us from the United States is of so interesting a nature, there are so many facts to record, events to chronicle, that to do anything like justice to the subject in this short summary is impossible. All I can hope to do is to help our friends to some faint idea of the condition of things there. We do not, in Europe, sufficiently realise either the frightful condition of a large mass of the people of America, or the magnitude of the Revolutionary movement there. The great miners' strike in the Hocking Valley has been now and again referred to, and English Socialists will hardly be surprised to hear that the "Union" there is much what are the "Trades Unions" here; in a word, to quote the correspondent of a New York Socialist paper, "a milch-cow for the 'leaders.'" This same correspondent adds: "The strike has, however, had one good result. We have founded a section of the Socialist Party, whose numbers grow daily. We could do even more if we had more speakers, and if friends would send us more Socialist literature. The soil is splendid. . . ."

But the Hocking Valley strike is only one of hundreds into which the workers are willy-nilly, and often to their own great disadvantage, forced by the capitalists. One of these strikes is specially worthy our notice. The hat-makers of South Nowalk, to the number of 400, struck work—that is work for their exploiters, but instead of allowing them-

selves to be starved into submission they have opened a large co-operative store entirely conducted by themselves, one large branch of which has been started in New York. Thanks to the hearty support of other workers both undertakings seem to be prospering. As a last resource the capitalist press asserted that the New York store had nothing to do with the strikers. But the working men have not been taken in by this lie.

Perhaps one of the most infamous of the many infamous "Bills" against the people is that one lately become law, directed apparently against so-called tramps, but in reality against any one out of work. An enormous meeting to protest against this iniquitous Act was lately held in New York. At this meeting Frederic Haller, Secretary of the Cigar Makers' Progressive Union, pointed out that at the present time there were in New York alone *seventy thousand* unemployed workers; in the United States at least *six hundred thousand*, everyone of whom could in fact be comprehended under the Tramp Bill. He showed how by this Bill employers could get their work done—work of the heaviest kind—in return for *one meal a day*, and concluded by saying that as things were going "Tramps" would soon be an "overwhelming majority in the land, and would then make a law by which the lazy and rich non-producers would be thrown into prison instead of, as to-day, the willing workers." The resolution passed by this large meeting runs thus: "Considering that in New York alone there are 70,000 unemployed. . . anyone of whom may be called a 'tramp.' . . we brand this Bill as a villainy of the exploiters against the workers whose very blood they drain, and see in it a fresh proof that political freedom must be a lie as long as private capital and wage-slavery exist." I must not omit to add that Germans and Americans both took part in and spoke at this meeting.

Some sanitary inspectors have lately made reports respecting the housing (?) of certain of the poorest classes in New York that throw the "Bitter Cry" of London quite into the shade. These facts are the more interesting that the "Tenement House Commission" had quite recently issued a rose-coloured report, in which everything was represented as very nice and pleasant. Police Inspector Gastlin now gives a quite different account. He describes more especially some of the docks and landing-places at North and East River. A great number of the unfortunates here are Italians, "who live in this filth like rabbits in a warren. They all sleep in the midst of pestilential smells. . . . The floors in some of these 'huts' were three inches deep in dirt. Adjoining these 'rooms' were others, containing large cases of stinking bones and rags. . . . The stench from some of these places, filled with refuse from the markets and putrid meat, could be noticed fifty feet off." What wonder that Socialist papers in America constantly warn their European friends not to come over to this hell upon earth.

Perhaps the most interesting matter to record is the "Labour Convention" just held in San Francisco. Over two hundred delegates were present, and an earnest debate was carried on for three days. Finally the following resolution, and others which space forbids our reproducing, were passed.

"Resolved. That, in the opinion of this convention, 'hard times' are the result of a monopolisation by non-producers of the natural resources, the tools of production and the medium of exchange, and must occur periodically until these monopolies are abolished.

"Whereas the continued invention of machinery, the monopolisation of the natural resources, competition, profit, production and the concentration of capital are fast reducing the working classes to absolute slavery;

"Resolved. That it is imperative that every branch of wage-workers be organised, and that, when so organised, the work of agitation, organisation, federation and education be unceasingly pursued.

"Resolved. That this convention, while not condemning strikes for shorter hours or higher pay as temporary measures of relief, regards the nationalisation of land, of the means of transportation, of the circulating medium and of the implements of production as the only satisfactory solution of the labour question.

"Resolved. That this convention, having regard to the strained relations at present existing between employer and employed, looks with the gravest apprehension upon the virtual establishment of a standing army in this country by the continued enrolment of new militia corps, and the employment by the capitalists of armed detectives, and that this convention commends this matter to the serious attention of the labour organisations of the coast."

So significant a fact as the passing of such resolutions unanimously by *two hundred delegates* from Trades' Unions as well as Socialist bodies needs no comment.

ELEANOR MARX AVELING.

A Capital-inspired paragraph is going the rounds. "Capital" qualifies "inspired," not "paragraph," in the preceding sentence. Its effect is that there is a "project for the development of legitimate commerce in the regions of the Upper Nile." Its adoption is contingent upon the construction of the Souakim-Berber railway. This is the railway about which Sir Henry Tyler, company-monger, was so anxious. The project is, of course, "well-considered" (in the interests of Capital) and "influentially supported" (by the same interests).