TO-DAY.

No. 1.—JANUARY, 1884.

The Revolution of To-day.

JUST three years ago an article of mine entitled, "The Dawn of a Revolutionary Epoch," appeared in the *Nineteenth Century*, which though necessarily written from the middle-class point of view attracted some attention among men of advanced opinions on social matters as evidence that revolutionary ideas were slowly spreading even in England. The paper, of course, made no pretence to be more than a superficial survey of events which tended to show that in every European country, as well as here at home, a new era had begun, that the struggle for the emancipation of the people could not long be postponed, and that indeed it was going on already below the surface of commonplace political conflict. The upper and middle classes were then, however, perfectly satisfied with the situation, and saw none of the dangers ahead which were thus briefly suggested. The few who were not indulging in the soothing dreams of a complacent optimism could at least comfort themselves with the fatalist assurance: "It will last our time." But now that three years have passed it has become quite clear that the "it will last our time" sort of theory is but a poor consolation

after all: for the Revolution long prepared in the womb of our society is manifesting itself in open and declared antagonism to the cherished arrangements which have so precisely suited the convenience of the luxurious, the ambitious, and the idle. This being clear to all, it has occurred to my friends, the editors and proprietors of the new issue of *To-Day*, that a similar survey might interest their readers at the present time. In complying therefore with their request to give in the opening number a sequel to my article of January, 1881, I write of course avowedly as a Socialist rejoicing in the rapid growth of our cause, looking hopefully upon the spread of our ideas in every civilised country and feeling confident that in the near future Englishmen, Scotchmen, and Irishmen will join hands in a combined effort to set on foot an organised Social-Democracy in these islands.

Such an idea will appear chimerical to many even of our friends to-day. Will it to-morrow? In all revolutionary or evolutionary movements the real forces at work can be traced directly or remotely to economical causes. It is not, as superficial observers are apt to suppose, the action of one man or even of a body of men of strong opinions which stirs people to consider their surroundings, and arouses them to the necessity of class combination or class warfare in the hope of bettering their social position. No doubt the organised zeal and regulated enthusiasm of men and women who thoroughly believe in their cause and in themselves have often hastened on events which were certain to occur in any case; but they themselves have been moved by the current of the time, by the modification of methods of production below, by pressure of competition or conquest from without, in short, by the general development of mankind of which they themselves are but the unconscious exponents. Such changes are now going on more rapidly than at any period for the last hundred years, and those who imagine that they can take place without disturbing previous calculations, are themselves but the most hopeless of dreamers. The awakening promises indeed to take

a shape which those who fail to consider the development of the forces around them may find a rather rude one.

A glance at the progress of the Irish movement in favour of national independence and the abolition of landlordism will give some notion of the pace at which affairs are moving. Only by looking back two or three years can we form any conception of the distance already traversed in action as well as in thought. It is a commonplace to say that men are generally most ignorant of the history of their own time; but assuredly never was this more true than now. The news of yesterday is so soon effaced by the more startling news of to-day, and the news of to-day leads so naturally to the expectation of further excitement to-morrow, that all record is lost, and things lose their due proportion in the constant rush of fresh intelligence. At the beginning of 1881 the Irish revolutionary movement had barely commenced. The Irish Home-rulers in the House of Commons still formed a portion of that sham Liberal party which Irish votes had so materially helped to place in power. True, the Compensation for Disturbance Bill had been thrown out, and there were not wanting symptoms that the people would not bear patiently a renewal of the horrible evictions of 1848-49. Famine threatened a large portion of the island, and the possibility of a rising, aided by Irish-American sympathisers was hinted at. But the Land League had yet to be thoroughly organised, assistance in the shape of money from the United States had yet to be obtained, the grave blundering and iniquitous tyranny of the English Government had yet to produce their effects. Any man who had then declared that Mr. Gladstone's administration would introduce the most stringent Coercion Acts of this century; that the representatives of the Irish people would be turned out of the House of Commons for standing up resolutely for the freedom of their country against mechanical majorities composed of alien landlords and capitalists; that the leaders of this same Irish Parliamentary party, as well as the most influential men in Ireland itself, would be put in gaol for

exercising their right of free speech and taking part in a peaceful class-combination analogous to the English Trades' Unions, which was guilty of far fewer outrages, in proportion to their numbers than those Trade Unions had been guilty of under similar circumstances; that in a fit of blind panic the ancient Right of Asylum which Englishmen have maintained against all threats for generations would be tampered with; that a Third Section of irresponsible secret police would be established in London; that Ireland would be kept under a state of siege month after month, occupied by 30,000 troops and 12,000 armed constabulary; and that all this would be done by a Liberal Government with an overwhelming majority, in order to collect the rents of, at the outside, 12,000 persons guilty, as was freely admitted, of cruel and oppressive exactions at the expense of 5,000,000 of people—any man I say who at the opening of the year 1881 had drawn upon his imagination to the extent of predicting the occurrence of such an amazing series of events would have run the risk of being locked up as a lunatic; while even now that they have taken place it needs an effort of memory to be sure that the statements are correct.

Our procedure at home has in consequence been revolutionised alike inside and outside the House of Commons to an extent which we shall perhaps not fully understand until a reactionary and powerful minister obtains control of the repressive machinery which our cowardly Liberals and Radicals have so thoughtfully made ready to his hand. Let us hope at least that they may be the first victims to their own shameful contrivances. But if the rights of free men under the constitution have practically been set at naught and the middle-class Parliament rendered a common laughing-stock by what has been done, there is some compensation to Socialists on the other side, alike in Ireland and in England. Home Rule for Ireland, in some shape, has been made certain within the next few years; and the price which landlords can obtain for their properties, when they come

into the market, shows pretty clearly that, though rents may be forced from the tenants at the point of the bayonet to-day, purchasers are well aware that the Liberal Land Act is not the last word on the Irish Land Question. Though the sacred ark of middle-class political economy, enclosing within its holy of holies the unapproachable laissez-faire mystery of true commercial Liberalism, has been banished to Saturn, the end is not yet.

The slightest sign of really serious foreign complications, and the consequent withdrawal of troops from Ireland, would soon show what the Land Act is worth, either as a protection to Irish landlords, or as a sop to the Irish peasantry. An agrarian revolution of the most thorough character is going on under our eyes, and needs but a favourable opportunity to be carried to the most completely successful issue. The peace of the moment has no permanence whatever. This all thoughtful men are perfectly well aware of; but in these mealy-mouthed days it is not quite convenient to state in plain words that if trouble with a European power or in India were to arise, and our infantine army were called upon for real work, Southern Ireland would be in the full blaze of insurrection; it is pleasanter to potter about as to whether an extended franchise should apply on the other side of St. George's Channel or not. But the cry of the "Land for the People" means a good deal more than any Parliamentary tinkering will patch up. This is a social not a political question, and sooner or later, in spite of the bitterness between Fenian and Orangeman, Protestant and Catholic, will necessarily involve a combination of the democracy in both countries; though Ireland may, like other countries, first pass through a period of mean bourgeois nationality.

Nothing, however, has been more remarkable than the rapid effect of the Irish agrarian agitation upon England, and the form which it has taken. It was of course impossible that such a movement should arise and come to a head across St. George's Channel, and that it should form for a

time almost the exclusive subject of discussion in Parliament and in the press, without leading to a stir among the people of Great Britain, shut out as they are more completely than the inhabitants of any other civilised country from participation in their own land. Yet so great has been the apathy and apparent hopelessness of the working classes since 1848, that serious agitation still seemed unlikely. At first indeed it is quite certain that the English and Scotch proletariat had not the slightest idea that the Irish peasantry were really fighting their battle about the land. Their feeling was all against the men who were waging a class war for economical and national freedom. Their attitude of indifference throughout the passing of the Coercion Acts showed that; as well as the simplicity with which the majority of them accepted every invention of the capitalist press about Land League atrocities, quite regardless of the far worse landlord outrages on the other side. But during the last eighteen months a great change has come over the people, in the cities at least. Nationalisation of the land has developed into a demand which is making itself heard, for the time being, over any other. The Land for the People, which in Ireland meant peasant proprietorship, in England means collective ownership by the people at large. Thus have the ideas of Thomas Spence in the last century, and of Bronterre O'Brien during the Chartist movement, sprung up afresh and with renewed vigour.

Moreover, the agitation thus started is opposed alike by the landlords who of course hold to their own right of private property, by the capitalists who desire only what they call free-trade in land, and by the bourgeois economists who think they have settled the whole question, instead of giving it a more directly serious and practical turn, when they prove conclusively that it would never pay to "nationalise" the land by buying out or compensating the landlords. For among the people no such prejudices exist in favour of "vested interests," and they accept the collectivist view with none

the less alacrity because they see it opposed by those whom they are every day coming more and more to regard as their " natural enemies." Nor of course does the agitation for revolutionary change stop at the land. As Mr. Frederic Harrison was the first of the bourgeois economists clearly to see and express, nationalisation of the land must almost necessarily involve nationalisation of the other means of production, and the most vigorous agitators push the collectivist view solely to this end. The great meeting at St. James's Hall in November, when Michael Davitt spoke, was a marked evidence of progress in this direction. Every reference to capitalist robbery, as well as landlord robbery, was loudly cheered. No such distinctly revolutionary gathering has been held in London for more than five-and-thirty years. That a large English audience—for that only a minority present were Irish was at once apparent to anyone who knows the Irish population of London—should assemble to hear, and receive with the most extraordinary enthusiasm, a Fenian, a convict, and a ticket-of-leave man, whose character every effort had been made to blacken, was in itself a revolution of opinion betokening the approach of a still more remarkable revolution in the future. For similar meetings have been held with equal success, though without the same personal attraction, throughout the kingdom, and in every case the more distinctly socialist in tone were the resolutions and the speeches, the greater was the enthusiasm among the crowded audiences. The course taken by a great portion of the press of boycotting such meetings, as well as in shutting out reports of the revolutionary agitation among the Crofters in Scotland and elsewhere, is only evidence of fear of what the editors and proprietors know to be going on below the surface. To suppose that in these days of public lectures, pamphlets, fly-sheets, and the penny post a revolution can be kept back by fostering upper and middle-class ignorance is of course absurd.

Here, however, we come to the economical and social

causes of this apparently sudden agrarian excitement. That the struggle between classes, between those who own the means of production and those who, by their labor, provide the wealth which the monopolists take, has long been prepared in the past, is well known to all thorough students of our economical history; but it might have been reasonably supposed that the opening attack would be made upon the capitalists rather than upon the landlords. It is here, however, that the effect of American influence, and still more of American competition has been felt, and, combined with bad seasons, has for the moment turned the current of popular indignation chiefly against the landowners. Hereafter it may be noted as a singular coincidence that money from the Irish in the United States supported the Irish agrarian revolution in its early stages; that a book by an American writer —Mr. George's "Progress and Poverty"—gave the first serious public impetus since 1848 to the agrarian agitation in England; and that the cheap food sent over from the Far West of America should have rendered such agrarian agitation general throughout Europe. The discovery and conquest of America in the sixteenth century, together with the flood of precious metals poured thence into Europe, revolutionised the commerce of the world at that period. It is possible that we are looking on at an even greater economical revolution in the nineteenth century, of which we are now experiencing the earliest and simplest effects. Only by means of facts and figures can the truth about this be made plain. That grain, and fruits, and to an increasing extent meat, in the shape of bacon or tinned meats, as well as live beasts and frozen carcases, are being produced and transported to England and Europe from America, more cheaply than they can be grown at home under existing conditions, is well known. Competing, as all English producers for profit do, in an open-world market, cheapness necessarily commands that market in the long run. I have myself watched the growth of this American competition since the year 1871, alike in England and in America,

and I can no longer doubt that it threatens the very gravest results to the whole European system in the near future; nor in all likelihood, will the difficulties, as we shall shortly see, be confined to the field of agriculture.

To take this first, however, as, on the whole, the most important. When Messrs. Pell and Read were sent out as a commission to the United States in 1879, to inquire into the causes of American competition, they calculated the cost of transport from the Far West to England at 53¼ cents, or about two shillings and threepence, a bushel on the average. At present the average cost of transport, owing to improved communications, to the deepening of channels and canals, and to the combined action of the western farmers, has been reduced to something near one shilling and sixpence a bushel or a fall of just 33 per cent. Again Messrs. Pell and Read in the same year placed the average cost of production at not less than 84 cents the bushel, or about 3s. 6d. My friend, Dr. Rudolph Meyer, after a series of most careful calculations on the spot, aided by the officials of the Agricultural Department, places the cost of production at about half-a-crown the bushel. Thus whereas in 1879 these worthy English farmers thought that grain could not be landed at a profit in Liverpool at less than 5s. 9d. a bushel, or about 46s. a quarter, and that the cost of transport and cost of production would tend not to decrease but to increase, it is now ascertained that wheat can be delivered in Liverpool at a small profit at a dollar a bushel, or 33s. 4d. a quarter; whilst the cost of transport and production tends certainly to decrease and not to increase to such an extent that within the next few years wheat grown in the West of America will, almost without doubt, be profitably delivered in Liverpool at 30s. a quarter. It needs, I hope, but little comment to impress the importance* of these calculations upon the mind of readers of

* Of the grave danger we run of being starved like rats in a hole at the opening of a war with a great naval power, or a combination of naval powers, it is not necessary to speak. We may think the more.

ordinary common sense. This year we import fully two thirds of the food grain which we require for home consumption and to all appearance we shall become more and not less dependent upon foreign sources for our supply in future. Yet none but a free-trader run daft could contend that it is to the advantage of a country that its most important industry —for agriculture is still by far our most important industry— should be thus crushed by foreign competition.

If the cotton trade were thus overborne, as it is by no means certain it won't be in the long run, by the cotton producing countries, if our iron trade were in process of extinguishment, we should soon hear of it from all quarters. But the farmers with capital who are flocking into America, the landlords and capitalists who are buying land there and developing it, are increasing the pressure of the competition more and more, just as centuries ago the Merchants of Venice lent their capital to help on the threatening commercial growth of Holland. Each year that passes renders the situation more dangerous so long as we permit our miserable old semi-feudal land-system to go on at home and look upon the production of food in our country as simply a means of obtaining profits for the farmer and rents for the landlords out of the ill-paid labour of the agricultural hind. During the past ten years there has been a steady decrease in the number of cattle and live-stock in Great Britain, as well as in the amount of acreage under tillage. In the meantime the course of events in the United States has been quite the reverse, and the skilled farmers, with capital just spoken of, who are now flocking into the West from England, Germany, Scandinavia, &c., are remedying by careful rotation of crops and thorough manuring that reckless overcropping for grain alone which our landowners and farmers had before reasonably reckoned upon to wear out the American soil and thus to reduce the severity of the competition in the near future. After feeding and clothing their families far better than they could feed and clothe them in Europe, such farmers year by

year throw a larger and larger amount of grain, fruit, and dead meat on to the food-market of the world; an amount which, as already shown, the constantly lessened rates for transport tends also to increase.

Only figures can give a conception of the progress which has been made. Thus, in 1870, there were 5,922,471 persons at work in agriculture in the United States, of whom 2,889,605 were dependents of one sort or another, and the remainder or 3,033,866, were independent self-supporting farmers. But in 1880 there were no fewer than 7,670,493 persons following agriculture as a business, or 1,750,000 more than in 1870, and of these 7,670,493, there were 4,343,511 independent self-supporting farmers, and only 3,326,982 dependents. That is to say, the independent farmers had increased by 1,200,000, while the labourers had increased by only 500,000; showing at the same time a great increase of the most sturdy portion of the population, and a large development in the use of machinery. Yet it is worthy of remark that the number of women at work on the soil in this family industry forms but a small percentage of this number of hands, being less than 600,000 out of the whole 7,670,000. It is true that the average return of bushels to the acre, 11 to 13, is low compared with ours; but then the grain area under cultivation is enormously greater beyond all comparison, and the cost of production is, as already seen, very low, and constantly falling as farming is more skilfully conducted, and machinery is more widely used.

The American farmer has besides no rents, no excessive amount of taxes, no big debt, no conscription, as on the Continent of Europe, to render bad seasons ruinous. As a result of these various causes, and the large scale on which the operations of transport and storage are conducted, they are enabled hopelessly to beat the European farmer, hampered as he is in every way. Moreover the habit of work in America tells sadly against a community such as ours, where lounging alone is thoroughly genteel. Out of 13,907,444 males between

the ages of 16 and 59 in 1880, there were 12,986,111 actively engaged in work or business of some sort, but 921,333 wasting their time in "loafing around." Of the 13,377,002 women however, only 2,283,115 were at work, the remainder being more usefully and fittingly occupied in household duties; though America, as every Englishman who knows the States at all is aware, is the country where women are most free to do what they please. Well may we ask how Europe, with its enormous standing armies, its constant war scares, its bitter race hatreds and pressure of landlordism and capitalism, is to make head against such advantages as the farmers of the United States possess.* England, France, Germany, Austria, are all suffering from the effects of this competition, and will continue to suffer until the home system of production is entirely changed. The agrarian troubles of which we hear throughout Germany and Austria, the pressure increasing upon the peasantry of France, are directly due to the reduction of the value of their products in the open market in consequence of this never-ceasing flow of cheaper grain and wheat from across the Atlantic. And since 1880 the pressure has increased for us as well as for them.

To this great economical cause then, which is in part aggravated by Australia and India, coupled with a succession of bad seasons, not to the insidious teaching of ignorant Socialist agitators—all Socialists are of course ignorant in the opinion of bourgeois economists—or the writings of Mr. George and Mr. Wallace do we owe the fact that at the present time the question of nationalisation of the land is being forced to the front in Great Britain. This indeed is the only means, combined with the simultaneous or prior nationalisation of capital, machinery, and communications to meet our own future wants in a greater degree at home, and to avert grave danger. The concentration of population gives us a great

* Of course I am perfectly well aware that a desperate class struggle threatens in the American cities. But this does not affect my present argument.

advantage, and the proper use of manure now wasted, the improvements in chemistry constantly going on, the employment of machinery on a larger scale, the combination of small farming for poultry and dairy purposes with larger developments where advantageous, might soon enable us to hold our own. But in the next ten years the American production will almost certainly increase, and the amount left over for export will swell more rapidly than during the past ten years. For as the population increases in that great country, so does the export grow, and the price of it fall; nor is there any reason whatever to believe that there will be any check to this process within calculable time.

Of course it is easy to say that protection would stop this competition. But protection under existing conditions, even supposing it were sound economically which, in this case, it certainly is not, would merely increase the profits of the farmers, or the rents of the landlords, without benefiting the agricultural labourers or the artisans of the cities one atom. On the other hand the capitalist free-traders who are merely anxious that the rate of wages should be kept low for the benefit of the manufacturers are manifestly going wrong. For the home market—which is by far the most important after all—is being ruined by agricultural depression; while Americans, Belgians, and even Germans are pressing us hard, or even beginning to beat us, in the foreign and colonial markets which we have hitherto absolutely controlled. But for a country to be able to import two-thirds of its necessary food supply without grave injury, it is clear that the means of payment must in the main be derived from the manufacture and sale of goods and ores, or coal. If the outlet for these is in any way checked, by other nations obtaining control of equal or superior machinery and then competing with us as at present, the situation at once becomes perilous in the extreme. Thus then the agitation for the nationalisation of the land now going on is a necessary result of the truth about the economical conditions being brought

home gradually to the people: the only mistake made being the foolish attempt to strike at the landlords alone, when they are of course, under the present system of production for profit, mere hangers-on of the capitalist class. The revolution in fact progresses steadily in our midst, and is pushed on by the action of our own landlords and capitalists; yet they wonder at the results which they themselves help to produce!

But while the agitation about the land has thus extended, and has taken such deep root that there seems at last some possibility that Englishmen will ere long endeavour to make themselves masters of their own country, the condition of the poor in our great cities has begun to attract attention. The housing of the artisan class and the "residuum" is the point on which most has been said and written. That a supercilious marquis and an ambitious manufacturer should both have suddenly condescended to notice that the mass of their townsmen are crowded together like pigs in a sty, has quite impressed the vulgar middle-class mind. If titled or rich people like these deign to take up such subjects, why it must be really respectable to seem to know something about the habits and housing of the workers. That the great landlord and the great capitalist however should come to loggerheads over the matter, is of course highly satisfactory to the Socialist. When Lord Salisbury also is found among the prophets who declare that laissez-faire should be cast to the winds, and Mr. Chamberlain avers (in italics) that the ground landlords must pay the entire cost of the rehousing of the people, it is evident that we have here the making of a very pretty quarrel indeed. If those who rob the labourers by rents, and those who rob the labourers by profits, will only battle seriously over the spoils the workers may come by their own before we think. So far has the matter gone that "society" even has taken up the the subject: the "Bitter Cry" has wailed its wail in London drawing rooms, and the luxurious and over-fed have actually felt moved to be benevolent as a new sensation.

Fifteen or sixteen years ago a similar fuss was got up. Suddenly then too the West End of London, the highly-fashionable dwellers in Bayswater and Belgravia, South Kensington and Mayfair, allowed themselves to be roused to the fact that there were about 2,000,000 people living to the East of the Bank of England, and that many of them, owing to some breakdown of shipbuilding business, were really quite distressed. It became "the thing" to go down East. Guardsmen and girls of the period, prize philanthropists and prophets of Piccadilly betook themselves to the choice rookeries which are to be found along the river-side. My Lady Bountiful could be seen picking her way daintily through the unsavoury neighbourhood of Limehouse, chance encounters of high-born personages were frequent in Ratcliffe Highway, and more deliberate assignations were commonly made in the Poplar slums. Many a marriage in high life also was the result of these happy diversions in the unknown regions of the East. And that was the end of it. When the excitement was over, and benevolence became rather a bore, our exquisites returned West with their carriages and their footmen, and things went on as before. As it was yesterday so, as far as the rich are concerned, will it be to-day. The pastors and teachers no doubt will get a few churches and chapels built for them by men who wish to gain "influence," or women who are solicitous about their immortal souls; but as to any permanent benefit from this source the very idea is absurd.*

Happily, however, the working-classes already speak with contempt and hatred of their sham benefactors. Socialist literature is being distributed broadcast alike in London and

* How is it, by the way, we never hear of the misery of the workers from the clergymen and ministers, except when some advertisement is to be gained by it? "Why" a boy was asked at a school examination, "Why did the priest and the Levite pass by on the other side without attending to the man who had fallen among thieves?" The boy reflected for two or three minutes and then replied, "Because, sir, he had been robbed already."

in the great provincial towns of the North, wherein the Capitalists are plainly pointed out as the most infamous of all robbers, because they are the robbers of the labour of those who, as matters stand, are wholly unable to protect themselves. A totally different feeling from that of slavish subservience and submissive meekness is growing up among the workers. It begins to be clear, even to those who first began to handle this housing business, that there is a good deal more in the question than they thought, that to deal with it adequately in town and in country, we must cut at the very root of the competitive system, at the system of production for profit that is, and bare subsistence wages, on which we have been taught that the very greatness and glory of England must eternally depend. The workers, I say, and the poor unemployed, who are daily becoming more numerous, see this too.

Thus here again, we are brought face to face with revolution—a revolution alike of action and of thought, which must end either in frightful bloodshed and anarchy, or in a thorough reconstruction of the entire social fabric. Simple as it may seem to insist upon the right to good housing, good clothing, good food, and good education, for men who are willing to work, and their wives and children, this simple demand cannot be met without the complete overthrow of our present competitive society, and the consequent subjugation of the idle and profit-mongering classes. It is impossible indeed to meddle with any portion whatsoever of our modern social structure with a view to its improvement without becoming at once aware that the foundation itself is utterly rotten. It is at the same time amusing and instructive to note how, the moment they become aware of this fact our so-called statesmen, turn away from "revolutionary" to "moderate" measures, and proclaim that political and not social reforms are really needed, if indeed misery itself is not providentially decreed.

Thus in England which in 1848, the last great period of

revolutionary movement, was one of the mainstays of conservatism and reaction, we have a distinct economic revolution being wrought in relation to the land and our complete command of foreign markets, which is reflected in the growing agitation for socialist action with regard both to land and capital. In the coming time of upheaval, England will certainly not act as a conservative, but rather as a perturbing element in European politics. For apart from the causes of trouble at home and in Ireland, our position in India is rapidly becoming such as to render it certain that in the course of the next few years our hold upon that country must be seriously shaken. All accounts agree that never since the Mutiny has the feeling between the natives and Europeans been so bad in the cities, as it has been since the agitation about the Ilbert Bill; while as to the agriculturists, they are manifesting in many districts a sullen discontent previously unknown since our rule was established. Whether the Native States are hostile or friendly to us we scarcely know; but, generally, there is a sensation of uneasiness throughout the empire which, unless I am altogether misinformed by men who have never before deceived me, betokens the approach of a serious movement of some kind. Now I am not of those who think that English influence in India must of itself be injurious. On the contrary, I hold most distinctly that English officials have in many instances enabled the natives to obtain a better government than they could otherwise have secured; I am of opinion also that if we were driven out of India as a government to-morrow, Englishmen as individuals would ere long reassert their influence in other ways.

But of late years the whole thing has been greatly overdone, and the country—I speak of the mass of people, not of the profit-mongering classes—has been fearfully impoverished. Once more an economical cause, the inordinate drain of produce to this country, is the chief reason of the growing difficulty. Without, however, entering further upon this

question now, it is sufficient to point out that a large portion of our European army in India consists of little better than mere unseasoned boys; that even so it is 8,000 men under its complement; that any attempt to hold Egypt permanently in the face of the Mahomedan revival now going on will render the strain upon our inadequate military force still greater; and that—which is the most important point of all—if a serious rising took place the working-classes of this country have not the slightest intention of putting it down in order that the upper and middle classes who rob and oppress them at home, should continue to drag interest, pensions, profits, and home payments out of the starving ryots to the tune of nearly £30,000,000 a year. Let these facts once be thoroughly grasped and it will at once be understood how precarious is our hold upon that Eastern Empire, the retention of which is perpetually hampering our proper foreign policy in Europe, and retarding the advance of democracy at home. Every democrat and socialist must hope that the present system of government in India will shortly come to an end, if only for the sake of the change it would produce in England, apart from the monstrous injustice of maintaining our existing rule.

Of the grave results which might ensue from the threatening conflict between Europe and Asia as evidenced not only in India but by the probable loosening of the great Mongol avalanche owing to the French invasion, I have no room to speak. But those who have most knowledge of eastern nations, and especially of the Chinese, view with alarm the effect that may be produced by the rising power of these Asiatics, their growing confidence in their own capacity and their increasing ability to obtain and use modern implements of warfare; as well as the danger to be looked for in time to come from the commercial and industrial rivalry of these people, if the present competitive system and individual exchange are maintained. Enough to say now that in this direction also a revolution of the most decided character is

going on among hundreds of millions of people, beside which our western difficulties by themselves may yet seem child's play.

The points hitherto touched upon concern chiefly our own country, which as the centre of the commercial and industrial world, the nation where capital has obtained fullest development, will necessarily take the lead in the Socialist revolution and reconstruction; but it is impossible to doubt that events upon the continent of Europe may hasten on the development here more rapidly. The state of affairs among the great military powers is such that a continuance of the present unstable equilibrium is clearly impossible. For the time being actual war has been staved off, and Russia has been forced to assume an attitude of complacency and goodwill towards the German powers, whilst France has put herself out of the calculations by the incredible folly of her bourgeois government in the far East and Madagascar. But in every direction the elements of disorder still exist, both above and below. The hatred between German and Slav, and Magyar and Slav becomes more manifest each day. All the hobnobbing of monarchs and statesmen will not suffice to smooth down such a bitter race animosity as this, or to reconcile permanently interests so divergent. In Prague scarcely a day passes without some manifestation of Czechs against Germans, in Croatia the feeling against the Hungarians has recently been quite undisguised, and in Hungary itself the Slavs are showing that they have no regard for those whom they look upon as their oppressors. As an answer to Russian or Pan-Slavic intrigues in Austria-Hungary the most civilised Slav population in Europe has been stirred up to look again for national independence or national reunion, and the Polish question may once more be coming to the front in the politics of eastern Europe. But for the internal condition of Austria-Hungary it is almost certain that war would be a matter of months. It is the grave agrarian disaffection

throughout that empire, due partly to the American competition already spoken of, and partly to the pressure of military conscription and excessive taxation, the spread of socialist doctrines in Vienna and other large towns, owing to the frightful poverty of the people there, as well as in the country districts, which have given pause to the bold schemes of forcible partition and reconstruction north and south of the Danube. What is done must be done by agreement among the original band of international robbers or not at all. Of the Russian position it is needless to speak. By this time it is well understood that a revolution is brewing in that empire which may be as dangerous to her neighbours as it would be fatal to the Romanoff dynasty. Wherefore the word is passed for an armed peace more dangerous and ultimately perhaps more serious than open war. For Germany who is popularly supposed to stand at ease among this throng of armed men, Germany, with her Emperor, her Bismarck, and her unrivalled army, is herself in grave danger. Probably no one is better aware of this than the statesman who is responsible for so much of the mischief; he at least must be convinced that in the long run military conscription under capitalist rule will mean the victory of the people. But the object is postponement of the inevitable in the hope that it may not come in his time, hence futile measures of protection, which merely enrich the large landowners and capitalists at the expense of the labourers, and silly schemes of State Socialism over which the people are to have no control. Prince Bismarck to-day is the first revolutionist in Europe. All the blundering of the French middle-class republic, all the agitations of French anarchists could not so happily hasten on the general overturn as the masterly economical incompetence of the monarchical league-maker of Berlin.

After all, however, we have enough for the moment to consider close at home. Though Socialists are necessarily internationalists, each nation must take account thoroughly

of its own economical condition, and the strength of its oppressing class. For the first time then since 1641 London is taking the lead in our national movement, and this alone is significant that no half-measures will suffice to meet it. The Socialist movement which is becoming each day more clearly the real revolutionary force of the future began in London, has its head-quarters in London, and has spread from London to the provinces. The failure of the Chartists was in great part due to the fact that they never were able to move the masses of this great metropolis, or thoroughly to frighten the men and women—for "society" even counts a little—who control the vast international banking, mercantile and industrial machinery which is centred here. Those mechanical provincial wire-pullers, who imagine that real revolutionary changes can be wrought while a nation city of nearly 5,000,000 people, containing the highest intelligence, the greatest wealth, and the most complete organisation in the world, remains unstirred and indifferent, simply display that want of imagination and deficiency of real knowledge, characteristic of the huckster politician. In order to break down the shameful capitalist domination which overshadows and crushes us, we must strike at the centre as well as at the circumference. The effect produced will be enormously increased by the reflex action of foreign peoples when they begin to feel that the great financial and commercial heart of Europe and the world is no longer safe from the direct attack of men who know their own minds, and have distinct views as to the re-organisation which they intend to bring about.

In five years we reach the date of 1889. Two hundred years before saw the middle-class monarchical revolution of 1689 in England; a century later came the first outbreak of the great French Revolution of 1789. That year 1889 will be celebrated by the workers in every industrial city throughout the civilised world, as the time for a new and strenuous effort, not in the interest of the "gamesters who play with one another

for the labours of the poor," not to continue power and luxury and ease to the meanest class that has ever held control in the history of human civilisation, but to conquer for the mass of mankind complete control over steam, electricity, and the other forces of nature, which the progress of science is placing at the command of the race. The development of these forces, and the influence which they exert, on the peoples of the world constitute the real Revolution of To-Day. It is for us to take full account of their action, to educate our countrymen around us to a knowledge of their growth and to organise without rest and without haste, that certain victory of the people which shall be the real Revolution of To-Morrow.

H. M. HYNDMAN.

The Three Seekers.

There met three knights on the woodland way,
And the first was clad in silk array:

The second was dight in iron and steel,
But the third was rags from head to heel.

"Lo, now is the year and the day come round
When we must tell what we have found."

The first said: "I have found a king
Who grudgeth no gift of anything."

The second said: "I have found a knight
Who hath never turned his back in fight."

But the third said: "I have found a love
That Time and the World shall never move."

Whither away to win good cheer?
"With me," said the first, "for my king is near."

So to the King they went their ways;
But there was a change of times and days.

"What men are ye," the great King said,
"That ye should eat my children's bread?

"My waste has fed full many a store,
And mocking and grudge have I gained therefore.

"Whatever waneth as days wax old,
Full worthy to win are goods and gold."

Whither away to win good cheer?
"With me," said the second, "my knight is near."

So to the knight they went their ways,
But there was a change of times and days.

He dwelt in castle sure and strong,
For fear lest aught should do him wrong.

Guards by gate and hall there were,
And folk went in and out in fear.

When he heard the mouse run in the wall,
"Hist!" he said, "what next shall befall?

"Draw not near, speak under your breath,
For all new-comers tell of death.

"Bring me no song nor minstrelsy,
Round death it babbleth still," said he.

"And what is fame and the praise of men,
When lost life cometh not again?"

Whither away to seek good cheer?
"Ah me!" said the third, "that my love were anear!

"Were the world as little as it is wide,
In a happy house should ye abide.

"Were the world as kind as it is hard,
Ye should behold a fair reward."

So far by high and low have they gone,
They have come to a waste was rock and stone.

But lo, from the waste, a company
Full well bedight came riding by;

And in the midst, a queen, so fair,
That God wrought well in making her.

The first and the second knights abode
To gaze upon her as she rode,

Forth passed the third with head down bent,
And stumbling ever as he went.

His shoulder brushed her saddle bow;
He trembled with his head hung low.

His hand brushed o'er her golden gown,
As on the waste he fell adown.

So swift to earth her feet she set,
It seemed that there her arms he met.

His lips that looked the stone to meet
Were on her trembling lips and sweet.

Softly she kissed him cheek and chin,
His mouth her many tears drank in.

"Where would'st thou wander, love," she said,
"Now I have drawn thee from the dead?"

"I go my ways," he said, "and thine
Have nought to do with grief and pine."

"All ways are one way now," she said,
"Since I have drawn thee from the dead."

Said he, "But I must seek again
Where first I met thee in thy pain:

"I am not clad so fair," said he,
"But yet the old hurts thou may'st see."

"And thou, but for thy gown of gold
A piteous tale of thee were told."

"There is no pain on earth," she said,
"Since I have drawn thee from the dead."

"And parting waiteth for us there,"
Said he, "As it was yester-year."

"Yet first a space of love," she said,
"Since I have drawn thee from the dead."

He laughed; said he, "Hast thou a home
Where I and these my friends may come?"

Laughing, "The world's my home," she said,
"Now I have drawn thee from the dead.

"Yet somewhere is a space thereof
Where I may dwell beside my love.

"There clear the river grows for him
Till o'er its stones his keel shall swim.

"There faint the thrushes in their song,
And deem he tarrieth overlong.

"There summer-tide is waiting now
Until he bids the roses blow.

"Come, tell my flowery fields," she said,
"How I have drawn thee from the dead."

Whither away to win good cheer?
"With me," he said, "for my love is here.

"The wealth of my house it waneth not;
No gift it giveth is forgot.

"No fear my house may enter in,
For nought is there that death may win.

"Now life is little, and death is nought,
Since all is found that erst I sought."

WILLIAM MORRIS.

Christianity and Capitalism.

THE British public has been suffering in its amiable and dilettante fashion from one of those spasms of sympathy that attack it as periodically as spasms of virtue. In 1867 and 1868 a similar phenomenon was observable, and the no-results that followed on the agitation in respect to the condition of the poor in those years assure us that the present agitation will follow in the footsteps of its kindred predecessor. Indeed signs are not wanting that already the interest is on the wane.

Whether anything is done or nothing is done, little that is of any real or lasting value can be done until men and women fairly face the fact that the terrible condition of our poor is due, as are so many other ills, to the two curses of our country and time. These two curses are Capitalism and Christianity.

Throughout the multitudinous letters, speeches, articles, pamphlets, with which the public has been inundated, and by which the real question has been obscured, the two things that are at the root of the whole festering mass of misery and wrong are ignored. Not that they are unknown. The majority of men know them, but dare not speak of them. In their heart of heart a vast number of English-speaking people know that to the false nature of our commercial system, and the false basis of our ethical system are traceable the indescribable, the nameless horrors of our modern life.

Some few speak out. Other writers in To-Day are, within its pages and without them, laying bare the social sore that the average Englishman covers over with much

talking on the duty of the well-to-do classes to their less fortunate fellows. With Capitalism as one cause of the ills to which all flesh that is not capitalistic, is heir, others are dealing. My task is to point out that, next to Capitalism, the great source of the tremendous condition of things to-day is Christianity. And my part of this work is at least as necessary as that of my fellow-workers. For whilst no one is so reckless as to suggest as a remedy for the condition of our poor more Capitalism, not a few are so blind to the signs of these and of past times, as to recommend as a remedy more Christianity.

The Reverend Archibald Brown, of East London Tabernacle, is but the mouthpiece of many another as well-meaning, let us hope, as foolish we are only too sure, when he tells his congregation that education and total abstinence—strange collocation!—are wholly inefficient as nostrums for the condition of the poor; that the Gospel alone is the instrument by which men may be regenerated. Mr. Archibald Brown is no nearer to the solution than is another writer—M. L. in the *Daily News*—to the cause. "The surplus of labourers is the rotten core of the apple of distress," writes M. L. "Surplus of Capitalists" would have been nearer the truth. M. L. none the less comes more closely to the fact in the suggestion made than his (or her) reverend companion. "Why not an association to improve the condition," and so forth, cries M. L. Why not, indeed, if only the association is as wide-reaching as the population of the country; if, in a word, we have Socialism.

That the poor and social reformers can expect little or nothing from any particular class of politicians is shown to the blindest of believers in party-government by the words and the deeds, or want of deeds of even the so-called Liberal politicians. When we read that the Marquis of Hartington, laying the foundation stone of a school at Brixton, stated that the "condition of the working classes must be raised mainly by their own efforts," we recognise the sardonic bitter-

ness of the truth coming from his lips, and the uselessness of the expectation of any aid from the party of which he is the one extreme and the Capitalist, Joseph Chamberlain of Birmingham, is the other.

The class-supremacy of to-day is due partly to capitalistic influence, partly to clerical. And it is with the latter especially that I have to deal. Other writers have spoken of the monopoly of the land, of capital, of machinery. But there is "a monopoly of creed," and the last trace of that bourgeois feeling that the socialist justly condemns is traceable in the fear of attacking Christianity as well as Capitalism.

The clergy, with their usual acuteness, seeing the movement that is coming, and has already in fact begun, are taking it under their wing. That same patronage which they are now extending to the idea of Evolution, because they find the idea too strong for them, they are beginning to extend to the idea of Socialism, for the same reason. Socialism like Science will do well to have nothing to do with them, as clergymen. As men we are willing to work with them, but not as clergymen. To label Socialism with such a limiting adjective as Christian is fatal. It would be quite as fatal to label it with the adjective Atheistic. No man who has the triumph of Socialism at heart or its truths in his head will for a moment attempt to cripple the action of its principles and practice for good by applying to it any name that implies the expression of any speculative opinion. Socialism has nothing to do with religion or with irreligion.

G. R. Sims, who has done much to arouse the public in this matter, is unfortunately not without sin in this way. He still retains something of the sickly sentimental side of religion. He who has been amongst the poor and described their miseries as none other, yet can write of God curtaining "their staring eyes with the merciful film of death." It seems almost incomprehensible that a man with the acuteness of G. R. Sims cannot see that on the Christian hypothesis the same God who curtains the eyes with the film of death is responsible for

the misery that makes even death seem merciful. Still more painful are the words of the writer of the little book that has given the catch-phrase title to the discussion that has filled certain aching voids in our newspapers of late. The author of "The Bitter Cry of Outcast London" begins with this sentence: "There is no more hopeful sign in the Christian Church of to-day than the increased attention which is being given by it to the poor and outcast classes of society." He tells us, within a page of the commencement, that, "concealed by the thinnest crust of civilisation and decency, is a vast mass of moral corruption, of heart-breaking misery and absolute godlessness, and that scarcely anything has been done to take into this awful slough the only influence that can purify and remove it. Whilst we have been building our Churches and solacing ourselves with our religion and dreaming that the millennium was coming, the poor have been growing poorer, the wretched more miserable, and the immoral more corrupt." And yet on p. 27 of his work he tells us that "The Gospel of the love of Christ must be presented in its simplest form, and the one aim in everything must be to rescue and not to proselytise," and makes as his suggestion for the remedy of all the ills of poverty, the building of more mission halls. How can a writer such as this clergyman speak in the closing words of his pamphlet of "Him who had 'compassion upon the multitude because they were as sheep having no shepherd,' looking, with Divine pity in His eyes, over this outcast London," and yet believe in the omnipotence and the all-goodness of the God whom he preaches? It is the old cry that has never yet been answered. If God is good, why are these things? If he cannot prevent them, he is not omnipotent. If he can prevent them and does not, in the name of the suffering millions of the poor let us refuse to call him good.

Other men of the same calling as Mr. Mearns have followed much along the same lines. The Rev. Edward White ascribes to religion the "industrious, well-behaved, orderly,

decent, civilised " nature of the inhabitants of the metropolis, and would tell the poor of Divine pity! Even at the meeting at St. James's Hall, at which Michael Davitt spoke, in November last, the good clergyman who took the chair, did his honest best (and his best is always honest) to reconcile the irreconcilable. The earth was the Lord's, of course, and therefore not the landlord's. But the obvious answer is that, if it is the Lord's, the Lord has shamefully neglected his duty. The fact is that the land ought to be the people's, and platitudes as to divine ownership of it are so many condemnations of the divine conduct.

The truest representative of Christian Socialism we have seen hitherto is to my thinking the gentleman whom the erudite *Times* called "Herr Hofprediger Stöcker, the Court Chaplain." This gentleman professes to be a Socialist. He is certainly a Christian. For the word Christian must have the meaning that it has had these many centuries past, and not that which certain Christians, better than their creed, choose to read into it in the light of these later days. Again and again these men tell us that the Christianity of to-day is not the Christianity of Christ. But the Christianity of to-day is that of hundreds of years, and those who are content to use the word must take it with all its terrible history. Its history is that of bloodshed and of persecution, and it is in harmony with that history that Herr Stöcker, the Christian Socialist, is the leader of the Christian crusade against the Jews in Germany.

That Christianity is played out as to its hopes of reaching the poorest or ameliorating their condition we are told plainly by the two religious movements that are as the contractions of the muscles of a dying man. I mean the spasmodic movements identified with the names of Booth and of Moody and Sankey. Not even the vulgarity of the Salvation Army reaches the very poor. Its recruits are not the outcasts, but the uneducated classes, who have enough means to buy the trinkets that their astute leader compels them to hand into

the fund that, with an unconscious irony, is called a "general" fund. As to Messrs. Moody and Sankey, who have arranged their own quarrels as to money matters in order that they may the better prey conjointly on the gullible English middle class, they only touch that middle class. The reports of their meetings tell us that they are attended by nicely-dressed people, and I call to mind that my first visit, years ago, to the performance of the two American evangelists was preceded by a dinner at the house of a wealthy lady-member of a great banking family, and that the company, of which I was the only one not well-to-do, drove down in private carriages to the meeting.

I have contended above against the efficacy of preaching to the poor the Christianity of to-day and of the last 1,500 years. Equally unwise it is, as I think, to preach the Christianity that is said to be that of Christ himself. The teachings of Jesus Christ are not of that order which can regenerate society. In the first place they are essentially unscientific. That is no reproach to the Galilean carpenter. It is only a reproach to those who in the 19th century think that the ideas of an uneducated man of the 1st century can furnish us with a panacea for human woes of which he knew nothing. But, apart from the scientific objection, the sentimental side of the teaching of Christ is a difficulty in the attempt at solution of our great Social problem. From the lips of Christ fell the fatal words: "The poor ye have always with you." And if it be contended in opposition to the teaching of generations of priests that these words only applied to the time at which Christ lived, a contention untenable in the face of the word "always," yet the doctrine of personal immortality is detrimental to any attempt to better earthly conditions. As long as men believe that for the most miserable of their fellows a heaven waits, as long as these most miserable can be solaced with the hope of such a heaven, so long all efforts on the part of the would-be saviours and of the unhappy objects of their compassion will be impaired. Not till men

recognise the truth that here and here only have we evidence that life can be, will the sum of human energy be devoted to the redress of human wrongs.

Nor can the threat of hell avail. These unfortunates cannot conceive of a hell worse than that to which the civilisation in, but not of which they are, dooms them. And no man believes in hell for himself. It may exist for others, but not for him. Clemency in the hereafter he believes in for himself, and in many cases he charitably extends the belief until it includes the members of his own family, and possibly the whole circle of his acquaintance.

That I am not singular in my belief that religion as religion can do nothing for the poor may be shown by three quotations from writers who are not likely to be accused of holding the creed that I hold. The Rev. Dawson Burns tells us that "the whole machinery of religious instruction, were it multiplied a hundredfold, would be inefficient in acting upon the mass of misery and immorality which is drink-created." Mr. John Benn has it that "the homeless must be housed, and the hungry fed. The Gospel and charity have hitherto been unable to do it." In the *Pall Mall Gazette* of October 16th, we have the following notable paragraph—"What a satire it is upon our Christianity and our civilisation that the existence of these colonies of heathens and savages in the heart of our capital should attract such little attention. It is no better than a ghastly mockery—theologians might use a stronger word—to call by the name of One who came to seek and to save that which was lost those Churches which, in the midst of lost multitudes, either slumber in apathy or display a fitful interest in a chasuble. Why all this apparatus of temples and meeting-houses to save men from perdition in the world which is to come, while never a helping hand is stretched out to save them from the Inferno of their present life? Is it not time that the Churches, forgetting for a moment their wranglings about the infinitely little or the infinitely obscure, should concentrate all their energies on a united effort to

break this terrible perpetuity of perdition, and to rescue some at least of those for whom they profess to believe their Founder came to die?"

That the middle class people have a clear perception of the real value of religion to them is shown by a remark made to me by one of my colleagues on the School Board for London. A man by no means deficient in shrewdness, he yet had just so much want of it as to say to me that "religion was of use in keeping the poor in their places." Nothing could have put more forcibly the exact value of religion to the non-labouring classes. It was the 19th century echo of the 17th century words of Louis XIV., who, on January 10, 1681, wrote to the King of Tonquin:—"But that which we most desire for you and your country is that your subjects who have recognised the laws of the God of heaven and earth be granted the liberty to profess this openly. For this God is the highest, the noblest, the holiest, and above all, the most useful in giving to kings unlimited power over peoples."

As to one thing let us be very clear. Whatever we do must be done as a right and not as a charity. But let those who admit this remember that in justice this idea must be extended further. That right which man claims for his fellow he claims, if the God-idea is held out to him, from his God. On this point we have no right to speak with bated breath. If to the poor and unhappy, men go with the message that omnipotence exists, the recipient of that message may fairly turn upon its hearers with the cry, "We expect from the omnipotence which you say brought us into being, kindness as a duty from it to us, not as a mercy."

In the homely words of a poor man to a descriptive reporter of one of Moody and Sankey's meetings, "the poor want not Gospel but grub." The hope that the present writer heard the Rev. Canon Shuttleworth express, that charity might win back the working classes to itself, is a fallacious one. What was the reply of the "respectable weaver of Ashton" to the question as to the most remarkable

change which had taken place among the mill-hands during his 30 year's experience of them? "They have become Atheists." There is more hope perhaps for Christianity among the lowest of the low, because these are uneducated. But the want of education here may be compensated by the bitter feeling that the Christian deity is answerable for their misery. How dare any man speak of a merciful father to the dwellers in the fever-haunted charnel-houses for which they pay more weekly than their graves will cost once for all? Nay, how dare any man himself believe in such a merciful father, to whose ears this cry of the people has been welling up so long unanswered?

Socialists must have no pandering with the evil one. The belief in the supernatural must not enter into their schemes. Socialism is a scientific fact based on scientific facts. Just as science is entirely irreligious, socialism must be entirely irreligious. A few years back in England science was supposed to require the support and even the guidance of religion. To-day science walks alone. The destiny of Socialism will be the same. Some are dreaming that it must have the co-partnership of religion, if it is to endure. But by Socialism as by physical science the attentions of religion with which it is encumbered, and by which its progress is impeded at the outset, will be quietly but swiftly and firmly rejected, and the great idea will pursue its majestic way humanising people, unhampered by any dreams of the supernatural.

EDWARD B. AVELING.

Record of the International Popular Movement.

GERMANY.

The months of October and November have been almost wholly given over to "Luther Festivals." From the Emperor and his keeper Bismarck, down to the Radicals, Progressists, and Liberals, the governing classes have united in rendering homage to the "Great Reformer,"—that perfect embodiment of the bourgeois ideal. Very much was said about the freedom of speech and of the press, that Germans owe to Martin Luther. A delicious comment on the liberty of speech was the prohibition of a lecture on Luther, by Wilhelm Liebknecht, (just released from prison), and on the liberty of the press, by the prohibition of Bebel's excellent book "Die Frau, in der Vergangenheit, Gegenwart & Zukunft," and T. Frohme's "Entwicklung der Eigenthumsverhältnisse." It may interest English readers to know that Wilhelm Liebknecht is a direct descendant of Martin Luther.

It is difficult for English people—in spite of Irish Coercion Bills, and Holloway Gaol, to realize the difficulties under-which the Socialist campaign is carried on in Germany. Expelled from one town after another, their papers suppressed, their meetings prohibited, Socialists are none the less actively carrying on their Propaganda, and daily growing in numbers. That the "official" organ of the party, the "Sozial Democrat" published at Zurich, numbers

over 9000 subscribers, (and be it remembered that every copy has to be smuggled into Germany, and that one copy often does duty for a whole town), and that within a few months Engels's admirable work "Entwicklung des Sozialismus von der Utopie zur Wissenschaft" has reached a third edition, sufficiently proves that all the repressive laws have utterly failed to arrest the spread of the Socialist doctrines.

To give English readers some idea of the persecution to which a German Socialist may be subjected, I translate the following from the "Sozial Democrat." "A Socialist workingman, industrious and thorough, is one evening while talking to some fellow workmen in a cafè, pounced upon by the police, who declare they have come upon a "Secret meeting." After the usual preliminary arrest the men are brought up for trial, and the allegations of the police naturally believed. The man is condemned to imprisonment. On the expiration of his sentence he wants to return to his work, but this does not suit the police, who expel him as a "Foreigner." [Under the Socialist Law the police can thus expel men from one town after another.] Not content with this they give him a passport, stating that he has been expelled for contravening the Socialist Law. And now begins the chase. The workingman is denounced to the whole German police. Everywhere he is asked for his passport, which becomes in his hands as the letter carried by the unfortunate Uriah from David to Joab. If the police are merciful they only go to his master, and warn him that he has a dangerous Socialist in his employ—with the inevitable result that the man is dismissed. If the police are not mercifully inclined, they expel him at once. It is no use remonstrating, no use appealing to the celebrated "Practical Christianity." Go the man must, and only now and then is he allowed to rest in prison when he is arrested as a "Vagabond," and for "begging," because, thanks to the police, he has no

where to lay his head, and perhaps asks for a piece of bread on his dreadful marches. This "hunting-down" has gone on for six months. How will it end? Either the man will die exhausted and despairing by the road-side, or in a prison or hospital, or he will commit what is called a "crime." But who is to blame if the man thus dies, or is driven to become a "criminal?" Is not the police the criminal, the murderer?"

Bismarck is not happy. The Socialists will none of his State Socialism, and neither cajolery nor coercion has prevented his making a perfect fiasco. Meantime the monstrous "Socialist Law," i.e., the law directed against the Socialists is to be renewed.

The "Christlichsoziale Korrespondenzblatt" of that really logical Christian Herr Stöcker expresses disapprobation of English institutions. "What conditions are they" it says, "where such things (Stöcker's Memorial Hall, reception) are possible? Truly we do not envy English men the "freedom" that suffers such things..... There are things where all else fails, and only the knout would be in place." *There are.*

In a circular addressed to the German press the Socialist deputy Vollmar has called attention to the latest infamy of the Prussian government—the arresting of Russian subjects and handing them over to the Prussian government. Keppelmann and Kutienewki have thus been given over to the tender mercies of the Russian police, and Kusabutski has only escaped the same penalty by timely flight. Vollmar further points out that five Russians, Mendelssohn, Irussolowski, Padlewski, Enzukiewitsch and Sotwinski—are still imprisoned, and he asks if these men too are to be "delivered into Russian dungeons." And the whole press—Conservative, Liberal, Progressist, Christian, has been so

busy celebrating the boldness of Martin Luther, that it has not found time even to protest against this iniquitous proceeding.

FRANCE.

It is satisfactory to find that a real labour party is at work in France, a party which repudiates alike the sound and fury of Anarchism, that bitter experience has taught us signifies nothing, and the cowardly trimmers, known as "Possibilists." The "parti ouvrier" is a revolutionary party, but the revolution it is helping to bring about is merely the means to the end pursued by all Socialists, and that is best summed up in my father's words, "the expropriation of the expropriators." Two of the leaders of the party, Jules Guesde and Paul Lafargue were released from Ste. Pélagie, on the 21st of November. The government has been looking after them for the last six months, because they had at public meetings denounced our present capitalist régime. On the evening of their release they held a meeting in the Salle Lévis. At least 4,000 persons were present, and numbers could not get in. The "prisoners" received a hearty welcome, and warm sympathy was expressed with Dormoy who is still in gaol.

It is perhaps hardly necessary to refer to the so-called "International Working Men's Congress," lately held in Paris. The names of Messrs. Broadhurst, Brousse, and Costa speak for themselves. Had, however, any doubts been possible where Possibilists are concerned, the enthusiastic admiration of Meyer Oppert (of Blowitz in Silesia) and the pæans of praise sent up from the bourgeois press for the "moderation," and the "practical good sense" of the congress, must have set them at rest.

M. Ferry, who thanks to the cowardice of the Chamber is

now indulging in a "little war" of his own, has also been posing as a martyr because he was nearly shot at. With regard to the poor boy Curien, the *Cri du Peuple* says: "Curien is neither mad nor a police agent. So much is certain. We say this frankly because the Socialist Party has no interest in concealing the truth. Curien belongs to those embittered ones, who, like Fournier at Roanne, and Florion at Rheims cannot await the time propitious for a general rising, and who imagine that with a pistol shot they can shatter the basis of our Society. We do not approve of these individual acts because they seem to us useless, and at times even harmful. Gambetta, whom Florion wanted to remove, is dead, but capitalistic exploitation flourishes, The life of a statesman does not count in the life of a people. We wage no war against individuals, but against institutions .....and we hold that the struggle against the bourgeoisie can be no personal or isolated one, but a common and general one, CLASS AGAINST CLASS."

How thoroughly the *class* character of the struggle is understood by the government is illustrated by certain events that have just occurred in the great mining district—Monceau-les-mines. Some time ago, without rhyme or reason, the gendarmerie was suddenly set in motion; houses were searched, arrests made, and all with the ostensible object of looking for dynamite. Of course no dynamite was found, and the arrested men were released. But the object of the police was attained—for a list of subscribers for the candidature of the Socialist Bonnot had been found. Fifty workmen were there and then dismissed by their employers, a proceeding that called forth protestations from the people of Monceau. These protestations, consisting of the meeting of some workmen, had been of a perfectly pacific nature, when we were informed by the bourgeois press that a battalion of the 134th Line had been telegraphed for, and that a squadron of dragoons from Dijon had already reached

Monceau. The object of the government and of the Company that works the mines is clear. It is to provoke the people into rising, and so afford fresh grounds for a persecution of the Socialist Party. It is to be hoped the miners of Monceau will not fall into the shameful trap laid for them.

The "bitter cry of out-cast London," has once again called attention to the wretched condition of the poor in this Christian city. An equally bitter cry is just now going up from Paris, where the condition of the poor seems almost more appalling than in London. Cases of death from starvation are becoming so common that they are now only recorded under the "faits divers." What an answer is this to the christian or atheistic bourgeois, who would have us believe that a "remedy," nay the "one remedy" for all this misery is to be found in the teachings of Parson Malthus. The French are practical Malthusians—and the French working-class is even more wretched than are their prolific English brethren.

After twelve long years the grave of Charles Delescluze has been traced out, and the remains of the heroic old man removed to Pére Lachaise. May I remind the readers of To-Day that a subscription for raising a monument to his memory has been set on foot? Delescluze devoted his long noble life to the cause of the people; he died for them in that terrible May week of 1871, and his name truly deserves to be "enshrined in the great heart of the working class." Any one who wishes to contribute anything towards this fund may send to the journal *La Bataille* (Souscription Delescluze) 9, Rue d'Aboukir, Paris, or to myself. All contributions will be acknowledged in *La Bataille*.

SPAIN.

A Spanish friend has sent me some extremely interesting

notes on the "situation." Space allows me to make only the following extract: "The National Working Men's Congress at Barcelona in August, 1882, definitely constituted the 'Democratic-Socialist Working Men's Party,' and issued a manifesto almost identical with those of the French 'parti ouvrier,' and the German Social Democrats. In it is set forth the necessity for the Spanish proletariat of seizing political power 'in order to transform individual and corporate property into common property belonging to the whole community.' Besides this 'Socialist Workmen's Party,' the Congress founded the 'National Association of Spanish Working-men,' principally with the object of grouping the forces of the Spanish proletariat for its economic struggles with capital. The Statutes of this Association are almost identical with those of the old International. This is the situation of the Socialist group; the bourgeois parties are much in the same position as after the fall of the Republic. The Federalist Party has gained in popularity since the defeat of the Cantonalists, and the long resistance of Cartagena, and the heroic defence of Seville, Malaga, etc., have given it an indisputable influence with the people. It has for it all the revolutionary elements in the country. On the other hand the fraction of the 'Possibilists,' the partisans of Castelar, has lost ground, and is considered merely as a monarchical reserve-force. These men have no *prestige* whatever, and the monarchy will be badly off indeed, when it is reduced to leaning upon them. The partisans of Zorilla will join the Federalists. Zorilla, who has little intellectual or political value, owes his influence to his relations with the army. Since the restoration he has declared himself frankly republican, almost revolutionary, and he has placed himself at the head of all those who desire the speedy overthrow of Alfonso. Zorilla's integrity, firmness, and loyal nature have given him much authority with the men of action. The late insurrectional movements, which attained such striking dimensions were organised and

directed by Zorilla. They were premature and failed, but they have added immensely to Zorilla's *prestige*. Everyone in Spain is now convinced that it is he who will make the next revolution, which as usual, will begin with a 'pronunciamento.' . . . . All that is being said about an alliance between Spain and Germany is absurd, and rests on absolute ignorance of the situation in the peninsula. The day the government sent an army to the Pyrennees, would see the overthrow of Alfonso."

On October 4th, the Annual Conference of the Spanish Working Men was held; 120 delegates were present, many of whom were representatives of the Agricultural Labourers.

HOLLAND.

The "Sozial Democrat" reports the remarkable growth of the Socialist movement in Holland, due, not a little, to the energy of F. Dowela Neuwenhuis. The best proof of the spread of our doctrines is to be found in the demand of the bourgeois press that the sale in the streets of the Socialist Organ "Recht voor Allen" shall be prohibited, and that landlords should refuse to let their halls for Socialist meetings.

RUSSIA.

News direct from Russia is necessarily scanty, but such news as we get is enough to show us that despite the wholesale arrests, the terrific struggle is still going on with unabated vigour. Especially noteworthy is the fact that of late so many of the arrests have been made among officers in the army. The "little father's" position must be getting more and more unpleasant when even the army is not to be relied on. Of great interest, also, is the declaration of the most powerful sections of the Revolutionists, that they have

abandoned "pure anarchy" for the programme of the Communist Revolutionary Party.

A series of standard Socialist works is just now being issued, under the editorship of Lavroff, by the Russians at Geneva. A new periodical is also being brought out by Lavroff and Tichomiroff. May it be as successful as its predecessor "Vorwärts."

POLAND.

In no country is the Socialist movement of greater interest. A few years ago the party did not exist here. All the revolutionary tendencies of the heroic country were directed to the one object of throwing off the hateful yoke of Russia. The Polish people to-day, however, recognise that they have to fight something besides Russian despotism, and that is class despotism. In their organ—now unhappily seized and suppressed—the "Proletarian," the Polish Socialists had the generosity and courage to hold out a hand of brotherly love to the Socialists of Russia. Truly the work of the International has not been in vain!

SERVIA.

Milan has been trying to prove that he has profited by the example of his imperial brethren, and has been shooting political opponents as energetically as if he were a great potentate.

ENGLAND.

That so frankly Socialist a periodical as To-Day—a periodical that does not weaken its Socialism by labelling it with any modifying word—has been founded, is yet another proof of the extraordinary spread of Socialism in England. A few months ago such an anomaly as a Socialist lecturing

in Oxford would have been impossible. Now we hardly feel surprised that William Morris was not only listened to in Oxford, but met with the greatest sympathy. It suffices to announce a discussion on Socialism to ensure a large audience, and the "Conferences" held by our Christian friends have been largely attended. It is a little difficult to understand by what chain of reasoning these gentlemen reconcile Christianity and Socialism, and they must forgive us if we cannot quite believe that after nearly 1900 years it has been reserved for them to discover what Christ really meant to teach, though he forgot to make his meaning plain. We are very willing to work with Christian, Pagan, or Jew, in the great cause of Socialism, but it is our duty to protest against Socialism being made a stalking-horse for any creed. Let us not be mis-understood. We know the perfect sincerity of men like Mr. Headlam and his friends, but we also know there are Christians less honest than these who would use this Socialist movement to their own advantage, and to our loss.

The English Police feel it to be their constabulary duty to keep pace with the times, and they have been trying their hand at plots. They are still such novices in the business that it would be unkind to criticise their first failures. Perhaps in time they may succeed almost as well as their *confréres* of France and Germany.

ELEANOR MARX.

Abstinence and Moderation.

IT will be admitted by all thinking men that a considerable part of the evils afflicting society at the present day are largely aggravated by the abuse of strong drink. It may be that this is even to understate the facts, but I own to a certain impatience of the sort of questions sure to arise if the matter is put more strongly, such as whether drink causes poverty or poverty drink, whether a sober man can possibly improve the rooms offered him in parts of the town as his only accommodation. All this is like arguing on theories of combustion while a house is on fire, instead of doing the best at the moment and leaving theories for a leisure time. We know—and this is enough—that pauperism, crime, insanity, sickness, accidents, are all increased by intoxicants. What have we each of us to do with this, and what can we do?

In the past it may have been no business of ours, for the simple reason that our attention was not drawn to it. No man is bound, like the knights of old, "to ride abroad redressing human wrongs" at a venture, and thereby not seldom neglect the duties which are near home. With Don Quixote we run the danger of mistaking sheep for an army, and windmills for giants. And if we have felt any desire to take our part in endeavouring to make the lot of those about us brighter, better, and happier, it by no means follows that our minds have been turned to the evils of intemperance as the special matter on which we have to work.

But just now the subject is in the air, few of us can escape it. Unrestricted competition so multiplies the number of public houses that in many districts the ways are adequately lit by their lamps, rather than by those of the vestries, the attitude of a candidate for parliament towards the liquor traffic may make or mar his chances of success; the various religious bodies have taken up the subject with almost theological violence, and it is impossible that any reformer, religious or social, should ignore or evade the question thrust before him. Scarce any other is so prominently the question of to-day.

Various schemes have been proposed for checking the evils of intemperance, the most prominent being just now the Permissive Bill, and though the most prominent, it is often misunderstood. But it is not my business to speak on these schemes; they are obviously all for the future, our business is with to-day.

It is a matter for all classes, for it is nonsense to speak of abuse of drink as though it were a workingman's or a poor man's vice. Neither is a bout of drunkenness, shameful and disgraceful as it is, and more common among the poor than among the better to do, so harmful to the constitution or the purse as the more gentlemanlike and refined habit of "nipping." I say deliberately, that the man who gets drunk now and then, being, on the whole, a fairly abstinent man at other times, is less a foe to himself, and to society, than he, who taking each day such a quantity of alcohol as keeps his blood in a constant fever prepares for himself premature disease and old age, weakens his will and increases his temptations. But I assume that every sane man will wish to avoid both forms of evil, the more base as well as the more insidious.

The one remedy for the evils of which I have spoken is personal total abstinence, and it is this which I wish to advocate, on purely social grounds.

It is a simple remedy, admitted by all as needful in the case of the man or woman who is under slavery to drink.

When a man has reached the point at which he feels that so soon as he puts strong drink into his mouth it surely steals away his brains, there is nothing for it, but in the words of Charles Lamb to

> "Close his lips and ne'er undo them
> To let the moist damnation trickle through them."

If he fancy, quite erroneously, that in giving up stimulants he is giving up a source of strength, either mental and bodily, I would suggest, even supposing this to be a possible danger, that, whereas he knows that drink is sapping his strength, weakening his will, lowering his bodily tone, abstinence can do no more, while it may do much less, and if he is to be a weakling under any circumstances he had better be a sober than a drunken invalid. But if all this be admitted in regard to the intemperate, those who take wine or other alcoholic drinks in moderation, think the use may well be permitted as against the abuse. They urge, and with force, that if abuse were enough to prohibit use, the world would come to a speedy end, and long before it ended, all delight that makes life worth living would die.

But the case is not the same in regard to drink as ot any other thing which men may be called upon to renounce. There is nothing more common than to hear the matter put in this way. 'Drink is a temptation to my friend, therefore he must give it up, it is none to me therefore I will not, though to me it is no temptation.' The effect of this would be to draw a hard and fast line between abstainers and non-abstainers, so that as a rule, the abstainer would by his abstinence admit that he was a potential drunkard. The very essence of all temperance work is that those who are not tempted should put themselves on the level of those who are, to encourage and aid by example, that none should know the motives and the needs of the abstinent. To refuse to share a burthen with our brothers, when the need for sharing it is once plain, is not the part of a friendly and kindly man. To him who has once been given to over-indulgence in

strong drink, its taste, even its smell, comes at times like the grip of some strong power outside self, the whole flesh will quiver and burn for that which will for a moment slake desire. And the man to whom, as he says, this is no temptation at all, will in a light and airy way bid the sufferer deny himself at the cost of any pain, yet will not, by his example, bring about a less use of that which is a snare to many, so as to lessen the temptations and opportunities to those who are weak.

I pass over the cynical argument that this is an indulgence pleasant to ourselves, because my contention is addressed to those who are no *mere* pleasure seekers, but men and women touched with a zeal for human improvement, which was never aided a step forwards without some self-denial, nor is it easy to be much more tolerant to the argument that some danger of ill health may possibly result from the disuse of stimulants. The assertion is devoid of all sound basis, but suppose there were a grain of reason in it, he were a bold man who, once engaged in the work, would press it. In days when medical men, in the cause of humanity, and to spare human suffering, have experimented on themselves to danger and to death in the use of anæsthetics, when they fear not to visit patients in all loathsome and infectious disease if it be their duty, when tender and delicate women penetrate court and alley in works of mercy and love, daring sickness and the exhaustion which comes of long protracted toil, when the clergy are, as so often, spending their health and energy for their people, it would ill become the pioneers of a coming brotherhood of man, to plead a possible slight deterioration in vigour as a reason against joining a great social work.

But the contention has no basis in fact. No doubt some years since the matter was not as clear as now, the issue was uncertain, the labourer with hand or brain might feel a doubt how the work he had to do could be done without stimulant. Now there are men in every trade and every occupation who can say triumphantly that to them work is as

easy as, perhaps easier than before, because it is more even and regular. A trifle of extra work, under the stress of stimulant, is not counterbalanced by a reaction. They can say that all the wear and tear of life is borne with greater equanimity, the temper is more even, the pleasures of life are not less, its joys if less riotous are deeper. And if this be the case in health, so is it more and more the case in sickness. An ever increasing number of medical men are diminishing the use of alcohol under any circumstances to a vanishing point, and agree with an unanimity which is almost startling that the cure of ordinary disease and accident is in almost exact proportion to previous sobriety.

Indeed I should go much further than this. Even the moderate and refined use of alcohol does not render general life brighter, easier, or more comfortable, and in so saying I am far from appealing to persons whose whole conceptions of life, whether in the present or the future, would be considered dreary and uncomfortable. I would point to persons of all positions who find that there is even a wider difference in the healthy feel of body and mind between the man who takes no stimulant and him who takes a little, than between the man who takes little, and him who without visible excess drinks a good deal; and on personal as well as social grounds I would press the experiment on all.

For those who may agree with me now or in the future, it does not seem quite enough to abstain, the pledge also is most desirable as welding those who have a common cause into a coherent and compact body. It is very simple, free from all statement of views, theological or political, "I promise to abstain from all intoxicating drinks as a beverage, and to discourage their use by others." The amount of discouragement, and the way in which it is applied, must depend on the individual, but that some article of agreement should as a rule bind men engaged in the same work would rarely be disputed.

In what I have said, I am not carried away by a prevailing

fashion, or love of a decoration at a button-hole. I am not a member of the Blue Ribbon Army, since, as I understand the condition of adherence, certain views on religious matters which are not my own, are implied in it. But having been an earnest, perhaps a fanatical teetotaller for many years, I can work with them or any men whose object is the gain of society by the abolition, at least in their own particular case, of the use of alcohol.

It is a clear, simple, and easy matter for most of us, it will not interfere with health, or work, or enjoyment, it will enable us to see more clearly what abstinence does and can do, when once we are engaged in the cause. We can make this trifling sacrifice, if sacrifice it be, which I have urged, each on his own grounds, and that is the beauty and advantage of a common and great cause; we can throw into it all our zeal and our energy, adding behind it the force which most moves our being, whether that be the love of God, or the reformation of society, or the love of our fellow men.

C. KEGAN PAUL.

Baiting the Jew-Baiter.

BY ONE WHO DID IT.

IF a man has done a journey he ought to be able to relate something; if that journey was a missional excursion the traveller is expected by his friends to report success (and generally does so, if he can); but if a man has travelled on a mission, whose success he was confident to announce to the world in the telegramatic style of the despatch of Julius Cæsar to Rome from Zela, and has now to admit that he "came," "saw,"—and was whistled off the stage it must be aggravating in the highest degree, even to one whose chief business of life is avowedly humility and devotion.

Herr Stöcker came to London with the purpose of increasing his repute by glorifying Luther, by vilifying the Jews and by proclaiming Prussian State-Christianity as the panacea for all the social evils that beset the world. Everybody knows that he failed in all three as decidedly as he succeeded in making himself profoundly ridiculous. His audience refused to hear him and treated him not as a hunter but as game. Thereat the New-German State-Christians are amazed and Herr Stöcker is wrathful beyond discretion. In his endeavour by explanation to place himself in the best possible light he calls his opponents nasty names and is full of accusation and insinuation. His audience, he says, was made up of a mob of the worst class of foreigners, out-cast atheistic Socialists who had made close alliance with money-

mongering Jews in order to vent their fury on a christian preacher.

Now, we, German materialistic Socialists are used to such language and can afford to smile at it. National-liberal Capitalists get never tired of accusing us of making common cause with the Romanists, (or the "Black International" as they style them,) and thus to befriend "Reaction;" the Radicals of the Manchester school tell us that we are allies of the Tories and thus dead against progress; and now we are said to have made friends of the Jews, and are thus backing up our worst enemies out of sheer spite against the Christian religion. The truth is that we are simply consistent in our hatred against the existing powers in State, Society, and speculative thought. We demonstrated against Herr Stöcker, because he came here as the representative of everything we hate and abhor.

Of Luther we need not say much except that we look at him not only as a monk and religious reformer, but also as the man who in the peasant's rising urged the princes to slay the rebels "like dogs;" he was never a man of the people but always on the side of the powerful against the oppressed.

As to Herr Stöcker's Prusso-Christian State-Socialism which stalks about with breechloader and spiked helmet, preaching a crusade against the Jews chiefly on religious grounds, it is such an abominable abortion of priest-and police-craft that no audience of even half-intelligent foreigners could calmly stand its exhibition, and we were determined to have none of it. We know that economically and socially the Jews are our antagonists. But so are most of the Christians who hold an advantageous position in modern society and are not without reason afraid to lose it in the social revolution that is gaining upon them every day.

On the other hand there are so many noble exceptions among the Semitic race. Our best and foremost men were of Jewish extraction, whereas our most powerful and persistent enemies are to be found among the professors of the Christian faith.

Were we, then, who have thought and striven, who have fought and suffered, who have through the assertion of our convictions been driven into exile, were we to allow a Chaplain of the Prussian Court to assume the mask of a preacher of socialism, to listen to the servant of the man of blood, iron, and exceptional laws propounding with a lying tongue the gospel of peace and goodwill upon earth? No, there was only one course for us to take. There was no discussing with such a fellow. We had only to *demonstrate*; no resolution to be *proposed* (as in an orderly English meeting would have been the case) but only a resolution to be *shewn* and that was—not to let that military court-hypocrite rise in the garb and utter the language of a friend of the human race!

This resolution was carried nem. con., and Herr Stöcker has been taught a lesson he is not likely to forget. His superiors, who let him play his game as long as he managed by it to divert the attention of part of the German people from the real point at issue, now they find their tool a fool most naturally show their inclination to drop him. They informed him, we are told, that he has either to give up Jew-baiting on so large a scale, or his court Chaplaincy.

We have no doubt about what he will do. He is not the man to forego the pleasure of the royal favour, and to court the wrath of the Almighty—Chancellor. He will stick to his post and leave London and its Jews alone.

AHASVERUS.

The Doctrine of Diminishing Returns from Agriculture.

THIS doctrine is usually stated by political economists as a law. It will be convenient to take its enunciation from Mr. Mill, (Book I. c. 12) both because he is one of the most authoritative of its expositors, and because he sets it forth with studied moderation and subject to many exceptions. He says :—

"After a certain and not very advanced stage in the progress of agriculture, it is the law of production from the land, that in any given state of agricultural skill and knowledge, by increasing the labour the produce is not increased in an equal degree, doubling the labour does not double the produce ; or to express the same thing in other words, every increase of produce is obtained by a more than proportional increase in the application of labour to the land. This general law of agricultural industry is the most important proposition in political economy. Were the law different, nearly all the phenomena of the production and distribution of wealth would be other than they are."

In the more recent work, Thompson's Economics of Industry, the law is stated thus (Ch. iv, para. 3.)

"An increase in the amount of capital, (or to speak more generally in the amount of effort), applied in the cultivation of land, causes in general a less than proportionate increase in the produce raised."

The purpose of the present paper is to show that these statements are erroneous in fact, and that there is no such law as is deduced from them. It is not meant to assert that land is capable of yielding unlimited returns to labour, but to maintain that, up to the limit which nature places on its capacity of production, additional labour if applied with knowledge and judgment does not yield a less than proportionate increase of produce, but on the contrary such increased labour gives on an average, at least an equal, and often a larger proportion of increased produce.

It is to be observed indeed that all modern authors, though they insist on the correctness and importance of the alleged law, yet qualify it to a material and quite indefinite extent. The Thompsons state it as "in general" true, but admit that it is subject to exception from "progress in the art of agriculture." Mr. Mill in the first place illustrates some examples of what he means by the application of additional labour. He shows that the same amount of labour applied to less fertile land produces a smaller return, and then he goes on to suppose that in order to obtain a higher produce from the same land "it might be ploughed or harrowed twice instead of once or three times instead of twice, it might be dug instead of being ploughed, after ploughing it might be gone over with a hoe instead of a harrow, and the soil more completely pulverised, it might be oftener or more thoroughly weeded, the implements used might be of higher finish or more elaborate construction; a greater quantity of more expensive kinds of manure might be employed, or when applied they might be more carefully mixed and incorporated with the soil." All these outlays he considers may yield a profit, but it is a less profit than is yielded by the same amount of labour previously applied, so that the point is gradually approached at which the return is not equal to the value of the extra labour. Then follows the insufficiency of food for the population, and the argument of the necessity of placing restrictions on the growth of population is held to

be incontestable. But Mr. Mill, after thus stating and illustrating the law, immediately proceeds to declare that its operation may be staved off to some extent by new processes of improvement, such as draining, by advances in knowledge of agriculture, by growth of new plants, by making roads, by cheapening implements and so on. In point of fact he devotes to the statement of these useful forms of application of labour, all of which are hostile to the principle of diminishing returns from labour about four times the space which he gives to the exposition of the principle itself.

It will have been observed also that with his usual care to avoid over-statement, Mr. Mill has introduced in the very expression of the so-called law the qualification that it holds good only "in any given state of agricultural skill and knowledge." But this proviso is in point of fact as broad as the law which it qualifies. A "given state of agricultural skill and knowledge" does not now exist. Agriculture is the most progressive of arts. It depends on the most youthful and rapidly growing of the sciences, chemistry and biology, and every advance in either of these or in mechanics gives more or less vital improvement to practical agriculture. But it depends above all on the individual intelligence, with which these sciences are employed in it, and on individual powers of observation of natural facts, in each special variety of circumstances. Thus it cannot be said that any two farmers possess a "given state of agricultural skill and knowledge," nor is the "given state" of any one of them, if he is the least intelligent, the same this year as it was last year. Now the profit yielded by labour in agriculture depends in all stages on the skill with which it is directed. In the rough instances selected by Mr. Mill there might be any degree of difference either of profit or of loss. A second ploughing or harrowing given to lea broken up for potatoes would often more than double the crop; a second ploughing given to turnip land to be sown with barley, would probably reduce the crop by a half. Weeding depends for its value entirely

on the state of the land and of the weather when it is done. It may pay with one farmer or in one season, while it is a dead loss in the next field or in another year. Manures to the same value may be applied so as to give cent per cent of profit, or to have no effect at all. There is not in short a single operation of agriculture of which it can be said as a general principle that the labour applied will be profitable or not profitable. The result does not depend on the amount of labour but on the judgment with which it is applied, and on the conditions of weather which follow. But the last bestowed labour may often be the most profitable of all, from the single circumstance that it may be that which in the circumstances is necessary to educe the full advantage from the land, or from the labour previously bestowed.

Undoubtedly also there may at every stage be a waste of labour. But that is the case in every department of industry. Every raw material is susceptible of only a certain amount of refinement. It will not pay to work the finest flax into sailcloth, or to inlay the shaft of a steam engine with arabesques of gold and silver. The profit from all labour depends on its being usefully applied. Whatever is beyond this is wasted, and is lost. Capital may thus be wasted by being badly applied in farming as in every other art. In farming, as in cotton spinning it is easy to spend capital without obtaining corresponding returns. In both there is a fixed limit beyond which capital can do no more. But in both the return from labour does not inevitably diminish as more is employed, but is always higher or lower according to the knowledge and skill with which at each stage it is directed to a useful end.

In truth this is the case in agriculture even more than in any other art. Speaking generally, persons who fail in any branch of manufactures (apart from questions of markets or defects of quality) do so because they spend more money on labour than their rivals do. Their machinery is less perfect, and therefore they must employ more hands and pay more

wages, which eat up the margin of profits. When they fail, another man takes the mill, alters the machinery, or superintends the work more closely, and gets the same returns from less labour, or a larger return from the same labour. But when a farmer fails, it is in five cases out of six (barring results of weather only), because he has employed too little labour. He is succeeded by a man who invests more capital, farms more highly, employs more men and machines and manures, grows better crops, secures them more promptly, utilises them more profitably (which almost invariably implies with more outlay of labour) and makes the farm pay a higher rate on the extra capital than it did on the smaller amount which his predecessor invested.

The same truth is taught by the admittedly larger profits made by the cultivation of a small farm over those of a larger farm. The farmer spends much more labour, and everyone agrees now that as a rule he raises larger crops. If it be said that the extra return is not proportioned to extra labour, the answer is found in recent experience. In all parts of the country the small tenant has stood his ground better than the large tenant, the small tenant has been able to pay rent when the larger failed, or was only saved by considerable abatement.* Therefore the net profits of the larger amount of labour bestowed by the small tenant, after feeding himself and family, must have been greater than the net profits made by the large tenant out of the smaller amount of labour which he employed.

Again it is only necessary to appeal to the universal conclusion of the agricultural interest at the present day. The hope for the future, it is unanimously agreed by the highest authorities, lies in the investment of more capital in farming. In other words, all that has been already invested will be made to yield a higher rate of profit by the process of

* This has been publicly stated by Lord Derby, it has also been confirmed to me privately by a firm of solicitors in Edinburgh, who have the management of many of the largest estates in Scotland.

investing more. Which means that the next "doses of capital" instead of yielding smaller returns will yield much larger returns than those which have preceded.

In presence of these unquestionable facts, it may be asked how political economists came to lay down the law, that profits of farming diminish with increase of labour. The reason is probably the not uncommon one for inaccurate generalisation, they looked at the circumstances of their own time, and the opinion of those around them, as if the circumstances were incapable of change, and as if the opinions were infallibly true. Up to about the end of the last century the crops cultivated, and the mode of cultivation were, in the main, the same as had prevailed for generations back. There was then what might be called a "given state of agriculture." Individual farmers differed of course in their skill as regards the time and manner of performing the usual operations, but there was a simple and tolerably uniform succession of crops grown by substantially identical processes. Then therefore it was true that a second ploughing or harrowing would not give proportionate increase of return; and as to a double manuring, the means for it did not exist. As to the reason why any operation was performed, or the reason why manure was necessary, no one professed to have any idea. It was a "law of nature" that it should be so. When war, or floods, or drought, sent prices up farmers could pay higher rents. But at the same time some additional grass land was broken up for wheat, the crops on it were inferior to those on the special wheat soils, therefore the rent for it was less, and Ricardo's theory of rent seemed justified by facts. On this mummy system of farming the political economists of that period built their "law of diminishing returns." It resembled the law that "nature hates a vacuum," or the notion of phlogiston; that is to say, it was the best explanation which their actual state of knowledge enabled them to give of the facts they observed. It was no fault of theirs that they did not foresee the discovery of other facts which would prove

their "law" to have no existence. Later writers accepted the reasonings of their predecessors, because they were not farmers, and chemists, and physiologists, and therefore did not know, or knew only by vague and imperfect report, the fundamental change of ideas and practice of which advancing science had compelled acceptance. So they repeated the alleged "law," and even magnified its importance at the same time that they added provisoes which annulled it, and expounded at some length certain of the changes of system which had reached their ears, which they admitted would defer to an indefinite period its coming into operation.

But passing from consideration of past errors, let us now briefly enquire what are the true principles of agricultural production. Mindful of the dangers of dogmatism in science let us however admit in advance, that we can only reason on what we know, and that future progress in knowledge may cause the modification or reversal of some of our present conclusions. But at least there are some fundamental facts now ascertained and confirmed by practice, which may give us confidence in the preliminary steps of the enquiry.

The external conditions of plant growth was no new discovery. They are that the soil must be mechanically suitable, and chemically sufficient. Both these were supplied in what of old was simply known as "fertility" and which was supposed to be the gift of nature alone. But what we have now learned is that both can often be artificially ameliorated. The improvement of the texture of the soil is effected by drainage, and by gradually deeper cultivation. An enormous amount of capital, which it is impossible fully to estimate, has been expended on these objects. In the form of advances from the State; or from private companies, charged on the land, more than £15,000,000 has been spent on drainage alone within the last 35 years. Very much more, certainly more than three times as much, has been expended out of the private funds of landlords and tenants. All this outlay (with of course a few exceptions of individual mistakes) has brought

in a return exceeding the rate of prior returns from cultivation. It is common for tenants to agree to pay 5 to 7 per cent. of interest on sums thus expended, and of course they make a percentage over and above for themselves. It has been shown by the managing director of the Lands Improvement Company that the average rate of profit on all improvements (of which drainage is the principal) has been fully 15 per cent. It is in fact to such improvements, executed with public or private capital, that this increase, arising within the last 30 years, and estimated at £600,000 per annum, is mainly due. The rental is of course exclusive of tenants profits. And over and above the outlay on drainage there has been an expenditure of probably one- third as much on roads, buildings, and other appliances of agriculture, the remuneration of which is more indirect but certainly considerable. By all these means the capacity of the soil for producing larger crops, and the profit obtained from them, have been immensely increased. It is not too much to estimate the increase at a value of £3,000,000 per annum.

The second element of fertility, the supplying to plants the inorganic constituents of their growth, has made perhaps still greater progress within much the same period. The discovery foreshadowed by Sir Humphrey Davy, and perfected by Liebig, that each plant contains a nearly definite quantity of mineral matter, absolutely indispensable to its existence, which must be supplied by the earth, and the further fact that a proportion of nitrogen, equally indispensable to growth and to the formation of food for animals, must also be supplied from the soil, while the carbon which forms the bulk of its tissues is almost wholly elaborated, under the influence of light, from the atmosphere, has borne practical fruit only within the last 40 years. It was in 1842 that experiments with inorganic, or what are called chemical or artificial manures were first attempted on any considerable scale. Their striking success led to their being immediately followed up by a host of experimenters, in whose hands the idea became reduced to a

practical system, and an immense industry is now the result. The effect is that those soils which were unfertile through absence of the essential ingredients of plant life are now rendered fertile by the addition of these ingredients chiefly imported from other countries. The amount thus applied is prodigious. It is calculated that £3,000,000 worth of nitrogen and £2,000,000 worth of phosphoric acid are annually imported for these purposes, besides a large and increasing value of potash. There is also a considerable home production of the two former articles. Besides these there is the manurial value of the linseed, cotton, rape, and other oilcakes, and of a considerable portion of the foreign maize and barley used for feeding purposes in this country, the whole forming an addition to fertility which cannot be valued at less than £3,000,000 more. In these items we have therefore some eight or ten millions of pounds annually spent in making inferior soil more nearly equal in productiveness to those which are naturally the best. And since this annual outlay must be annually repaid with profit, which it is not too much to take at 25 per cent. (for few farmers would apply 40s. worth per acre of artificial manures unless in the expectation of obtaining in that or succeeding years at least 50s. worth of increased produce), we have the result that the production from inferior soils has been thus augmented by at least £2,000,000 worth per annum. Added to the profit from other improvements this makes £5,000,000 per annum.

Let it be noted that it is on inferior soils that this increase of fertility, both by drainage and by manuring, has taken place. First-class soils do not permit of improvement. Their texture is already what suits the roots of plants, and they contain all the requisite constituents. Drainage would be wasted on them, and additional manures would produce rank and diseased growth. But science has taught, and practical skill has learned, how to extend enormously the area of first-class soils, by supplying the deficiencies of nature. It has done this by the application of more capital, and the return on

such capital, we have seen, cannot be estimated at less than between 15 and 25 per cent. Let every deduction be made for excess in such an estimate, there still remains a margin so large as to place it beyond doubt that profit has not diminished on the capital thus applied.

The question now arises, how much further can such improvement of the capacity of the soil be carried? It is impossible to answer such a question with any precision. Very good authorities estimate that only half the amount of drainage really necessary in England has yet been executed. What remains to be done will certainly yield a profit not less than that given by what has been already effected. But not even a guess can be offered as to the limits of improvement by use of artificial manures. Every year they are employed by farmers more largely, just as their use is becoming better understood. There is no visible limit to their profitable employment until the most barren soils are brought to equal fertility with the most productive, in so far as fertility depends on the constituents of the soil. The sea sand *dunes* of Craigentinary, near Edinburgh, worth intrinsically 2s. 6d. per acre, yield an annual produce for which £20 per acre of rental is paid. That is effected with no permanent enrichment of the soil, but merely by the annual application of Edinburgh sewage. Sewage contains animal matter, but its virtue lies wholly in the chemical constituents. Given the water for irrigation, it would be a simple matter to add to it the chemical salts which would make it as nutritive as as sewage. At Rothermstead, Sir John Bennet Lawes, has for thirty years grown in succesion larger crops by inorganic manures alone than he has by the most copious dressings of farm manure. I have myself during last season grown 7 tons per acre with potatoes with artificial manure alone on a gravel soil valued by an eminent farmer at 5s. per acre, and pronounced by him to be not fit for cultivation.

It may perhaps be suggested that such increase of crops are themselves subject to a law of diminishing returns, and

that larger applications of manure do not produce corresponding increase of crop. There are many experiments which may be cited in support of such a proposition. This is not the place, nor would there here be space to consider them. I must therefore be content to say that I have examined all with which I am acquainted, and that whenever the result suggested occurs it is almost always due to the deficiency of some single essential element of plant food in the manure applied. The soil furnishes a proportion of all the necessary elements, and may suffice to yield enough of one for a moderate crop, but if the further supply of this one is neglected, then additional doses of the others fail to give full returns. Thus, to adduce a single example, Sir John Bennet Lawes found in experiments at Rugby that sewage gave crops of grass tolerably proportionate to the amount of sewage supplied up to a certain point, after which the proportion fell of. But when the composition of the sewage and of the grass is examined, it becomes apparent that there was a deficiency of phosphoric acid in the sewage. Consequently, when the supply of that ingredient existing in the soil was exhausted, additional doses of sewage failed to afford the phosphoric acid needed to produce the additional crop of grass which the other elements would have been able to support.

In considering the rate of profit to be obtained from manurial applications, we have data, which suffice for a fairly accurate estimate. It has been already observed that plants draw from the soil nearly a fixed amount of mineral ingredients, and of nitrogen; their carbon being obtained from the air. Of the requisite minerals, silica, iron, and lime are nearly always present in ample quantity, the last when deficient may be cheaply supplied. The three essential ingredients of which the supply is limited are nitrogen, potash and phosphoric acid. In so far as these are removed by any crop they must be restored, even to the most fertile soils, or their fertility is lessened. To pasture lands nine-

tenths are returned, and therefore naturally rich pasture lands continue for many years with apparently unabated fertility. But there is no arable land in England which would not show signs of diminished fertility if two or three crops were removed from it without return of the minerals and nitrogen removed. In this respect the most fertile and barren soils are on the same footing, except that the process will be slower on the former than on the latter. Now if we compute the amount which a large crop will remove, we find it very uniform for each of the principal grain and pulse crops. It is per acre for a large crop about 50 lbs. of nitrogen, of which the present price, in compounds suitable for assimilation, is about 7d. per lb., 30 lbs. of potash, at 1½d. per lb., 20 lbs. of phosphoric acid, at 2d. per lb. This is a total of £1 16s. 3d. per acre. But the experiments of Sir John Bennett Lawes have shown that in wheat only about one half, and in barley two thirds, of the artificial manures applied are recovered in the next crop, we may therefore take the expense at an average of £3 per acre. Now the full crop which we have supposed would be, say 40 bushels of wheat, 50 of barley, or 60 of oats, each of which at present prices would be worth £10, while the straw of each would at a very moderate estimate be £3 more. Thus then we have £10 per acre left to pay for the labour, after restoring to the land the whole elements abstracted from it, which are the same whether the soil be fertile or not. But the labour of ordinary culture is not more on the barren than on the fertile soils, and we may roughly estimate it for grain crops at £2 per acre. Hence the large crops supposed will yield a profit of £8 per acre.

It must be kept in view that large crops äre only possible in favourable seasons. In bad seasons they may be less than half as much, perhaps on an average of seasons 20 per cent may be deducted from them. This would leave a gross return of £10 8s., and since expenses would be the same, a net profit of £5 8s. per acre,

I do not attempt to go into similar calculations for grain and root croops. Both remove larger amounts of minerals and nitrogen, and therefore are somewhat more costly to grow. But this is about balanced by the circumstance that grass requires less labour, and also utilizes the whole instead of as wheat does, the half of the manure applied. Roots again cost more in labour but they give a greater weight of dry matter in the crops. The net result is nearly the same on an average weight of crops as is the case with grain. The rotation of crops is an economy of manure when only farm yard dung is applied, but it is of little consequence when an estimate is based on actual manures required. So also the feeding of cattle affords a better price for some crops, and economises manure for all. But it may be left out of account when the price of grass and straw is taken at merely their feeding value.

It may excite some surprise to be told that the cost of cultivation and manure, and the amount of crop, is the same on what have hitherto been reckoned barren soils as on those which have been esteemed highly fertile. The statement is nevertheless true, subject to some qualifications, Where sterility has arisen from presence of some noxious ingredient (a rare case) it is of course not removable by additional manure. Where it arises from impermeability of the soil to air and water it may often be modified by drainage, but in many cases it cannot be entirely remedied. Such soils form however no large percentage of the land of the country. Where it is the consequence of high situation or bad exposure, it cannot be removed by art, though drainage often sensibly improves climate. In such situations, unsuited for grain crops, cattle food may generally be profitably grown. Where its cause is over dryness of soil it can only be aided by deeper cultivation or by irrigation. Lastly, where it exists on account of the soil being what farmers call "hungry," that is to say not only barren but incapable of retaining manures for any length of time, it can only be over-

come at the cost of some additional labour, in giving rather larger doses of manure; but above all in dividing them into several applications, so that at each stage of existence the plant finds a fresh supply. From some experience with such soils I can state that this is very effectual, and at a moderate additional cost, not on the whole exceeding 20s. per acre. But the advantage of this method has not been generally recognised, and for this reason the use of artificial manures on such soils has been supposed to be unprofitable, if not injurious.

It must however be added that the additional capital thus to be advantageously employed will not wholly go to the payment of agricultural labour strictly so-called, The drains will be dug by navvies rather than by ploughmen, and the artificial manures will afford less employment on the farm than to the miners, the seamen, the chemical factories, and the railways. But labour is now like food, international, and if employed for the purpose of agricultural profit it is the same whether exercised on the farm or elsewhere. In any case the new fertility will bring some soils into cultivation which without it would have lain waste. Even in the growth of grass, to which the recent development of the foreign corn trade, concurring with bad grain seasons at home has tended to give an impetus, there is a probable field for the employment of more labour. Some more hay or ensilage must be made to furnish winter food, if roots find less place in rotations. It will probably also be found that the succulent growth yielded by top dressings may be more profitably utilised in stall feeding than in grazing. Some leading English farmers have already adopted this Continental practice and have found the extra labour thus employed return a good profit.

So far then as we can look forward at present there is no appearance of any diminution of profits from employment of additional capital. That however there is at last a limit which will be reached not gradually but sharply, is unques-

tionable. It lies partly in the invincible obstacles of nature, not remediable by art in the present state of knowledge, and next from weather, which in every season fixes a different limit for all soils. But last of all there comes a nniversal and insuperable limit in the quantity of light. The sun's rays are absolutely necessary for organised growth, and no fertility of soil, no benignity of temperature can push growth beyond what the precise amount of these rays is able to elaborate into organised matter. This fixes absolutely the ultimate amount of crops which the most fertile land can yield.

But up to that point (which itself varies slightly with the seasons) there is in our present state of knowledge no reason to believe that labour, applied with due judgment, is less productive at one stage than at another. It is most certain that there is at this moment a field for labour in cultivation even in England, which offers as full returns as any that have been yielded by labour in the past. Scarcely any agriculturist will deny that the capital invested in cultivation might be increased by a half with a certainty of even increased profit. With this assurance we need hardly be tempted to look beyond, or to argue on speculative possibilities which may be entirely reversed by the progress of knowledge before the time arrives for their coming into practical operation.

J. Boyd Kinnear.

Reviews.

THE WIND AND THE WHIRLWIND,* by Wilfrid Scawen Blunt. The poem with the above title which Mr. Blunt has written on the subject of the sowing of the wind by our action in Egypt, and its probable results in the way of reaping the whirlwind in the future, was published before the discomfiture of Hicks Pasha in the Soudan, and has no reference to that event. The force of the whirlwind in that direction seems to be already growing considerable, but the fulfilment of Mr. Blunt's terrible prophecy is not yet. He has something to say on the late events at Alexandria and Cairo, but is not altogether sure of an audience.

> I have a thing to say. But how to say it?
> I have a cause to plead. But to what ears?
> How shall I move a world by lamentation—
> A world which heeded not a Nation's tears?
>
> Where shall I find a hearing? In high places?
> The voice of havock drowns the voice of good.
> On the throne's steps? The elders of the nation
> Rise in their ranks and call aloud for blood.

Yet none the less does Mr. Blunt speak, and we are convinced that there are still thousands in England, who, not having shared in the shame by becoming accomplices of our iniquity in Egypt, will be eager to hear what he has to say. For he says it well, and his manner is as attractive as his matter is sound. He has given a truly poetic form to his

* London: Kegan Paul, Trench and Co., Paternoster Square

plea for Arabi and the Egyptians, and to his denunciation of the oppression and butchery which we have done our best to authorise and abet. He is not afraid to attack the idols of of the day,

> A day of wrath when all fame shall remember
> Of this year's work shall be the fall of one
> Who, standing foremost in her paths of virtue,
> Bent a fool's knee at War's red altar stone.
>
> And left all virtue beggared in his falling,
> A sign to England of new griefs to come,
> Her priest of peace who sold his creed for glory,
> And marched to carnage at the tuck of drum.

We have not space for lengthy quotations, though there are few stanzas in the poem which are not worth quoting. Mr. Blunt describes the hail of iron which was poured upon the defenders of their country at Alexandria, and declares that he would rather fly with the craven who flings away his arms in a good cause, "than head the hottest charge by England vaunted, in all the record of her unjust wars." The subsequent cruelty which was perpetrated in our name and with our support is denounced in burning words, and Lord Dufferin especially seems to be pointed at in the following stanza:

> They scoffed at you and pointed in derision,
> Crowned with their thorns and nailed upon their tree.
> And at your head their Pilate wrote the inscription—
> 'This is the land restored to Liberty.'

We do not know whether Lord Dufferin intends to proceed against Mr. Blunt for libel, nor whether an action of this kind would lie, but it must be somewhat annoying to be called a Pilate. We can only rejoice that a man like Mr. Blunt has been able to throw into such eloquent verse, and to publish to the reading world, sentiments which must find an echo in the hearts of those just Englishmen who refuse to applaud a crime although it is done in the name of the country which they love.

A History of Philosophy from Thales to the Present Time.*—We have received from Messrs. Hodder and Stoughton a copy of the Third Edition of this standard translation of a standard text book. To praise the work of Ueberweg is superfluous at this time of day. Though in no sense a man of original ability as a thinker, Ueberweg combined the qualifications of a scholar to an extent rarely equalled even in Germany, and probably never surpassed. He was painstaking, accurate, laborious—in short, possessed the characteristic which has been without doubt erroneously identified with genius, but which is equally without doubt the main ingredient in successful scholarship, namely—"the unlimited capacity for hard work." Ueberweg, whose death in 1871 at the comparatively early age of forty-five after a nine years' Professorate of Philosophy in the University of Kant was the subject of universal regret, succeeded in leaving to the world two works of superlative and lasting excellence; irrespective of his minor treatises, including many of those tracts and essays on obscure or disputed points of criticism and erudition such as are racy of the soil of the German University. The first of the two works referred to is the present Treatise; the second, the shorter (though equally exhaustive in its own sphere but less widely read) "System of Logic and History of Logical Doctrines." In both of these works there is the same clearness of expression, combined with the same marvellous condensation of material irrespective of its complexity or amount. This is conspicuously noticeable in the work before us, when we compare it with either of the two best-known English Histories of Philosophy—those of George Henry Lewes and of Frederick Denison Maurice respectively, both of which, though works of high literary merit, are deficient in that concentration of the essence of doctrines and treatises which is the great merit of Ueberweg. In the former the

* By Dr. Friedrich Ueberweg. Translated from the German by George Morris, A.M., &c. With additions, &c. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 27, Paternoster Row.

material, even when given in its essential entirety, which is by no means the rule, is coloured by the prevailing tendencies of the writers to an extent seriously impairing their usefulness as works of reference. Ueberweg, on the contrary, wisely abstains from interpolating any philosophical criticism into his text; his aim is simply that of the expositor. He endeavours to present a fair, clear, and distinct view of the salient points in all systems and doctrines, critical comments of which he is sparing being relegated to foot notes and not interfering with the exposition. His absolute objective handling of his material is remarkable by the side ot the, in many respects, admirable treatise of his countryman, Erdmann, with its distinctly Hegelian bias. Of course, it may be alleged, and perhaps with some justice, that Ueberweg lacked that "scientific imagination" which can trace the fundamental unity and filiation of different standpoints —that his view is too statical and leaves too much out of account the dynamic of the history of thought. Still, we venture to think that, for a student who seeks above all things a reliable statement of principles, this is an error on the right side. There are many tendency-histories of philosophy but Ueberweg's stands unique in its clear and accurate statements of fact and analysis of writings. His is a history in which, the reader can rest assured, he will find no *suppressio veri* or *suggestio falsi* in the presentation of any doctrine or theory. An important feature in the present volumes is the excellent and copious reference catalogues, exhaustive, up to date, interspersed throughout them. This of itself renders the book invaluable to students. It is only fair to say a word as to the excellence of the English rendering and the judicious additions of the translator (*e.g.*, the interpolation of the account of Lotze from Erdmann in Vol. II., p. 312). If we want to see how a History of Philosophy should not be written we have only to turn from the masculine and scholarly text of Ueberweg to Appendix I., by "President Noah Porter," of Yale College, which consists of a crude, slip-

shod and inaccurate dissertation on British and American speculative thought, the most prominent feature being perhaps the writer's theological prepossessions. As a curiosity in literary blundering we give the following, which occurs on p. 422 of Vol. II. :—

"George Henry Lewes has written a general History of Philosophy from the same standpoint (the associational) in the metaphysical spirit (!) of Comte which is shared by all associationists. The doctrine that psychical states are developed by inveterate and inseparable association prepared some of this school to accept the more general doctrine of the evolution of species in the sphere of animal and vegetable life which was suggested by Lamarck and subsequently revived by the author of the 'Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation' on grounds of Analogy, drawn from the Nebular Hypothesis on the one hand, and the supposed successful experiments of producing organic germs from inorganic matter on the other (!) and has been reinforced by the undecided and doubtful (!) allegiance of Richard (*sic.*) Huxley, the Physiologist."

The literary style of the above truly wonderful production, we venture to think, "goes on all fours" with its accuracy as to fact and grasp of principle. Dr. Noah Porter now and again makes a feeble and ghastly attempt at satire. A specimen of the "President's" wit anent Mr. Herbert Spencer, which he doubtless considers annihilating in its pungency, will be found in a foot note to page 433 of Vol. II. We would earnestly suggest to the publishers of these volumes the propriety of a thorough overhauling of this appendix before issuing the next edition.

Dr. Vincenzo Botta's survey of modern Italian philosophy which constitutes Appendix II., though it falls far short of President Noah Porter's standard of all-round execrableness, must nevertheless be pronounced undeniably "thin" in quality. It is too short and "sketchy" to do any but scant justice to the subject; it contains little, moreover but what is tolerably well-known to all who take any interest whatever in contemporary philosophical movements. Still, after all that may be said, the comparative worthlessness of

the two appendices detracts but little from the value of this, to the student of philosophy, indispensable book of reference. It only remains to add for the sake of those who buy books, not so much to read as to serve as furniture for bookshelves, that they will find in the present volumes what is known as a "handsome addition to the library," their "get up" being uniformly excellent and elegant alike as to print, paper, edging, and binding.