

# THE COMMONWEAL

The Official Journal of the Socialist League.

VOL 3.—No. 79.

SATURDAY, JULY 16, 1887.

WEEKLY; ONE PENNY.

## A WRITTEN DEBATE

BETWEEN MR. C. BRADLAUGH, M.P., AND E. BELFORT BAX.

SUBJECT:

### “Will Socialism Benefit the English People?”

V.—*Affirmative*: E. BELFORT BAX.

I REGRET that Mr. Bradlaugh's second paper should not have contained a more distinct criticism of the modern Socialism set forth in my opening article than it does. Mr. Bradlaugh in his last complained that I had not made myself clear to him on certain points. These I endeavoured to explain in a few sentences. He now again says he does not understand what I mean. Briefly then, once more, the “economic basis” of modern society is production for profit, through the monopoly of the means of production by the named and unnamed individuals constituting the capitalist class, in its various sections. The “economic basis” of Socialism is the collective ownership of these means of production by society as a whole, and their working not for the profit of individuals or classes but for the use of society as a whole, both collectively and individually. I believe, as I before said, that the tendency under Socialism would be increasingly towards a collectivisation of the product, but when, how, and the precise proportions in which this would take place I do not pretend to prophesy. In fact, when Mr. Bradlaugh pursues me with four wheeled cabs, wooden clogs, and his long and supple leather fishing-boots, and says, what of these? who shall ride in this cab? who shall wear these boots? how do you know that he who wears the boots will like the boots he wears? there is only one truthful answer I can make him, and that is, “I don't know, and I don't care”; and in saying this I am sure I express the sentiments of the immense majority of modern Socialists. Such conundrums have not the slightest practical interest at the present time; and if Socialism pretended to answer them it would thereby proclaim its own absurdity and worthlessness. If Mr. Bradlaugh wants to discuss such interesting details as these, I commend him to the Positivists, who will further inform him how many times a man is to tap his forehead or scratch his left ear (I forget which) before going to bed in the society of the future.

And this brings me to the point where, with due respect to Mr. Bradlaugh, I should like to signalise what I think is the cause of Mr. Bradlaugh's failure (as I cannot but deem it) even so much as to touch the question at the root of the issue between us. Mr. Bradlaugh seems to be looking out in my exposition for something he doesn't find, and he is disconcerted because he doesn't find it. Hence his unwillingness to deal with the historical and other points put forward by me, and his anxiety to waive aside so many things as “irrelevant to the issue between us.” This latter practice or proceeding reaches its acme of eccentricity, if I may so call it, when Mr. Bradlaugh intimates his opinion that the question of the unemployed has nothing to do with Socialism, and challenges me to prove that Socialism would benefit the unemployed! Now I submit that though human nature can stand a great deal in controversy, yet there is a limit to all things under the sun. And I do think that Mr. Bradlaugh might have borne in mind the elementary fact that Socialism by its very definition excludes the possibility of there being any “unemployed” to benefit. The “unemployed” belong to present society, and it clearly devolves upon Mr. Bradlaugh as the champion of present society as against Socialism to deal with this great problem of modern times. He may say, of course, that Socialism is wrong and impracticable; but granted Socialism and *ex hypothesi* there is no such thing as an “unemployed” class. However, I will not press this point.

The question then arises, what is this “something” Mr. Bradlaugh is trying to find in modern Socialism, and can't? I think I am not far wrong in saying that what Mr. Bradlaugh is looking for is (1) a handy and portable conspectus of future society, which, when found, he might proceed to pull to pieces at his leisure; and (2) an attempted application of such a scheme to the English people as English—*i.e.*, considered as an isolated whole and without reference to the rest of civilisation. Unfortunately, in neither of these respects can modern Socialism oblige Mr. Bradlaugh. The Socialist of to-day does not profess to carry in his pocket any ready-made detailed scheme for the future of human society. Such schemes he regards as mere quackery nowadays. All he professes to do is to proclaim a law, or a system of laws, if you like, of social evolution. He shows the development of society in the past, exhibits the logical tendency immanent in that development, and

deduces therefrom the main principle of the next stage of social progress. For this reason an international Socialism, with the means of production and distribution concentrated in the hands of society, as advocated by modern Socialists, could not have taken place in any previous period of the world's history. As to the details of the arrangement, whether immediate or ultimate, these no human being can see. All we say is, let the working classes, organised to this end, take over the means of production, distribution, and exchange; first the land, railways, mines, factories, credit establishments, and the larger warehouses and retail stores, which stand ready organised to their hand; at the same time let the executive proceed to establish new workshops, warehouses, and stores on a large scale in those trades where they do not already exist, and so undermine the smaller establishments possessed and worked by individuals, and which might for that matter remain unmolested until this happy consummation. Beyond this we do not profess to make any definitive proposal as to production or distribution. The rest must be left to time and circumstances to work itself out. (The above is, I think, in itself a sufficient answer to Mr. Bradlaugh's paragraph 7. It will be seen from this why I regard Mr. Bradlaugh's first definition as inadmissible on all the three sub-heads he mentions.) Before leaving this question of “detail,” I should like to illustrate the common absurdity of requiring a detailed plan of the new society in its completed form, of its pioneers to-day, by asking Mr. Bradlaugh if it would have been very reasonable to have expected a member of the Long Parliament (let us say) to give a detailed exposition of the political and social relations of the modern commercial world? The Puritan townsman of the seventeenth century undeniably represented the principle of the supremacy of the middle classes as against Feudalism, and yet we know how little he could have pictured to himself the ultimate issue of this principle as presented in nineteenth-century England. Yet the parallel is feeble, seeing that his principle had already made some practical headway, and the change from the social life of the seventeenth to that of the nineteenth century is immeasurably less in scope than that from a fully-developed capitalistic civilisation to a fully-developed Socialism.

To come to the other point. Modern Socialism is unable to deduce the social change it deems imminent, from the idiosyncracies of a particular people, or to conceive Socialism as applied exclusively to any one people. The modern European States (with the various colonies which are their offshoots) had their origin in loose feudal confederacies with little or no national cohesion. (I should not have insulted Mr. Bradlaugh with references for this elementary historical fact but for certain remarks in his last paper; as it is, I refer him, as regards England, to almost any page of Green, Freeman, or Stubbs.) We regard the modern national stage as merely transitional; Mr. Bradlaugh, on the contrary, seems to regard it as a sort of thing that was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be. Already we see the nationality idea becoming a mere cover for financing operations, market-hunting, and capitalist competition generally. The “differences” of type, temperament, etc., are but surface-differences compared with the fundamental laws governing the development of all human society. The most diverse nationalities were once united under the very inelastic civilisation of Roman antiquity. Western Europe, irrespective of race, was, again, dominated by the feudal system; the whole civilised world is now alike under the iron heel of modern capitalism—*i.e.*, profit-mongering and wage-slavery. Mere racial differences may be quite well left out of account in dealing with the deeper problems of social development. If Mr. Bradlaugh would deign to notice my brief historical sketch, he would find the essential identity, irrespective of nationality, of Western development from Feudalism to capitalism there indicated. Nay, even the Socialist movement has already taken hold in greater or less degree of the workers of the whole of modern civilisation from the Pacific to the Volga. A few years ago there was no Socialist movement either in England or America; it is now daily advancing by giant's strides. Mr. Bradlaugh makes a difficulty as to what I mean by the well-known phrase modern or western civilisation. I mean of course the economic, political, social, and intellectual life of Europe and its colonies, including the greater part of America. In economics this means modern capitalism, with its railways and great machine-industry; in politics, middle-class “constitutional” government (monarchical or republican); in social relations, the particular compound of vulgarity veneered with culture sometimes termed Philistinism; in religion, the organised hypocrisy which assents to, or does not reject, a body of dogmas, rites, and ceremonies the plain meaning of which is obsolete or no longer believed in by the educated classes. But, says Mr. Bradlaugh, how about Russia, there is no constitutional

government there? No, and every one recognises the Russian despotism, as an anachronism—that is, as something out of place in nineteenth-century Europe. There are, of course, “backward” countries in Europe that fail as yet to reach the standard of completed bourgeois perfection, as reached in England and the other important Western nations. The attainment of this, however, as we have often seen, is only a matter of a few years. But modern capitalistic civilisation, I may observe, *rapin*, is not the only form of civilisation. There have been other and more immature forms of civilisation, the “economic basis” of which has been serfdom or chattel-slavery. Some of these survive still in a stationary or decaying state—notably in Asia, and here and there in Africa. These (with the barbaric and savage populations of the globe) may be left temporarily out of account. They are outside the main stream of modern social development.<sup>1</sup>

As regards Mr. Bradlaugh's paragraph 3, I would like to ask him in what *purely* barbaric or savage community he finds a dominant class of exploiters and a dominated class of exploited within the community, it being understood that we are not talking of cases here and there of rapacity on the part of individual chieftains; or what is more to the point, I would ask him to explain how my definition of civilisation can be made to apply to the internal economy of those primitive tribal communities, by the gradual consolidation of which all centralised nations were formed, and the last remaining survivals of which may be seen in the Russian Mir, the Swiss *Allemen*, the Hindoo “village,” etc., etc.<sup>2</sup> (*cf.* Maine's ‘Village Communities’ and other works, Laveleye's ‘La Propriété Primitive,’ Maurer's ‘Deutsche Markverfassung,’ also Mommsen's ‘Römische Studien,’ and first volume of ‘Roman History,’ etc., etc.). *Appropos* of this I might quote Emerson's words with one alteration: “Society is *civilised* (Emerson said *barbarous*) until every industrious man can get his living without dishonest customs.” When this latter is the case we shall have Socialism.

Mr. Bradlaugh's paragraph 8 evidently implies more than it says. I am sure Mr. Bradlaugh would not feel inclined to be rude without thinking he had some very good cause. Notwithstanding, as I really cannot see the terrible *lapsus* I am supposed to have made, I must still adhere to both my statements as to Owen, Fourier, and Co., to wit, that though the end of modern Socialism is, broadly speaking, similar to that of Utopian Socialism, as I understand it, yet that as a science or theory of Society it stands in much the same relation to the latter as modern chemistry does to alchemy, or astronomy to astrology.

In paragraph 9, Mr. Bradlaugh again discredits the historical side of my opening paper without discussing it. He says I ought to bring forward some evidence in support of the statements challenged. This I should have been most happy to do, if I had known what *were* the statements challenged. But seeing that Mr. Bradlaugh admits my account to be “sometimes consonant with fact,” I had surely a right to expect that he would name the points where, in his opinion, it was “utterly conflicting” therewith, and briefly state his reasons for so thinking. It seems to me this would have been more germane to the issue (seeing the importance modern Socialism attaches to its “historical basis”), than propounding impossible riddles as to the precise point where communisation of the product will begin and end in future Society, problems which obviously can only be solved by experience, and upon which modern Socialism does not profess to dogmatise.

One last word on the point about Christianity incidentally raised in my first article. What I meant was that the *essential principle* of Christianity, that upon which its whole theory of life and conduct is based, is an assumed relation between the individual soul, and the divinity directly revealed in it and to it. The end of the individual's being and conduct is his union with this divinity, all moral action is in the last resort subservient to this as its supreme source and object. My aim was to place this morality in contrast at once with the old tribal morality of the early world and with that of modern Socialism, the object of which was and is, not the perfection and apotheosis of the individual soul but the welfare of the social body. I still contend that isolated passages in the Acts (which, *bien entendu*, may or may not represent historical facts) do not “in the least affect” my position. A policy pursued under special circumstances as a matter of convenience cannot be taken as affirming a principle. I may say, however, before leaving the subject, that I can find not the slightest justification in the text for the gloss Mr. Bradlaugh has put upon the Ananias incident in his last paper.

And now then for the promised facts and figures relative to Mr. Bradlaugh's paragraph 18 in first paper, and the progressive concentration of capital in fewer hands. Does Mr. Bradlaugh know that (1) in the bakery trade a complete transformation has taken place within the last few years; that whereas every baker used to bake his own bread, now there are hundreds of bakers in London who sell but do not bake

bread? (The reason of this is that large firms like Neville are able to bake bread and deliver it cheaper than retailers can bake it.) (2) In the fancy bakery trade I am told the same fact is still more noticeable, where firms like “Huntley and Palmer,” and the “National Bakery Company,” are ousting the small capitalist completely out of the field. Moreover, in this as in other departments, it is becoming general for large grocers to supply cakes and biscuits made by the firms in question, thereby completely crushing the small specialist retailers. (3) Take, again, the refreshment trade, and the same process will be found to hold good, as evidenced by the success of the “Aerated Bread Company,” “Lockhart,” etc. (4) I am informed by a correspondent of large experience in the glass bottle trade, that he is convinced that the whole of the smaller makers must before long “go to the wall.” One of the largest glass-bottle makers in England has absorbed, to his personal knowledge, eight small factories within a few years, and no new ones have sprung up to take their places, or are likely to do so. (5) Again, Joseph Chamberlain's (or rather Nettlefold's) screw-making business has, it is well known, very nearly crushed all other screw-makers out of existence. Lipton's is also a case in point. (6) The business of transportation shows precisely the same phenomenon, large men crushing small men, and large companies crushing small companies. An immeasurably larger amount of the carrying trade, as every one knows, passes into the hands of the few large shipping companies than into that of all the small firms combined. The instances pointed out, I think, fully bear out my friend, Alexander Donald (who has for two or three years passed been specially investigating this matter at first hand and in detail) in writing: “The facts (relative to this subject), which have not been reduced to tabular form by any one, simply because the bourgeoisie don't want information on the subject, leave no doubt as to the truth of your statement.”

I will not weary the reader by running through the gamut of the various trades and industries, which, so far as I am aware, all without exception tell the same tale; but here are a few official statistics:—From 1863 to 1869, there were 4,782 new limited companies started; from 1870 to 1876 there were 6,905; from 1877 to 1883 there were 8,643; and in 1883 alone there were 1,634, the largest number ever started in one year. Of course, a considerable proportion of these fail; in the sharp competition there is among them it is the fittest to cope with existing conditions only, which survive. But here again the main element of success is practically unlimited capital, wherewith to “hold on” and to “push.” I would ask Mr. Bradlaugh to consider the amount of concentration of capital all this means, for statistics in this case where every company is officially registered must obviously be rigidly accurate. The same remark applies to the figures respecting bankruptcies and compositions with creditors, which form part of the obverse of the same medal. Here are a few taken haphazard:—The bankruptcies and “compositions,” which in 1870 were 5,002, in 1875 realised 7,899, and in 1879 attained the enormous total of 13,132.

Of course, I must accept Mr. Bradlaugh's statement that the boot-making districts are better off to-day than forty years ago. I must only call Mr. Bradlaugh's attention to the fact that forty years ago the industry of the country was only beginning to settle down from the acute crisis caused by the introduction of the great machine industry. Now no one denies that the sudden and severe misery caused by this subsided for a time, during the flourishing period of British manufactures and trade, otherwise the Cobden-Bright school of politicians could never have got the ear of the English working-classes as they did. It may well be that the after-glow of this period of “leaps and bounds” lingers still in some industries and in some districts. Our contention is that, taking things all round, and setting aside this as well as temporary trade “booms,” etc., the tendency toward a polarisation of wealth and poverty is making itself apparent in a yearly accelerating ratio. When Mr. Bradlaugh asks me to furnish statistics of every important town in Great Britain in 1847 and in 1887, he is, I respectfully submit, making a somewhat unreasonable and unnecessary demand upon me. My opinion of the value of such statistics considered *per se* is not such as would induce me to undertake elaborate researches on that head. On this point I am entirely of Carlyle's way of thinking. Figures which appear so orderly and beautiful and convincing, are but abstractions; they are only serviceable as a shorthand registration of a conclusion arrived at by other means. The, in most cases insuperable, difficulty of initial verification, the difficulty of finding out the precise data on which they are based, the facts they suppress and the facts they express, render them practically valueless. Statistics have a fraudulent appearance of an accuracy which they can only possibly possess in a very few special cases. Hence the superstitious belief in figures on the part of the modern mind. For my own part, no number of statistics would have ever made me a Socialist, and no number of them would *unmake* me one; so Mr. Bradlaugh must pardon my declining to treat the statistical side of this question as possessing any but a purely secondary and formal interest.

In concluding my share of this debate, I must again apologise for the length of this paper, only pleading the largeness and importance of the subject in excuse. At the same time I should like to express my sense of the uniform courtesy of Mr. Bradlaugh in the conduct of his side. The subject, “Will Socialism benefit the English People?” as I believe, is necessarily decided in the affirmative by an understanding of what Socialism (in its modern sense) means, and can only be profitably discussed on this issue. Hence the direction I have endeavoured to give to the debate.

E. BELFORD BAX.

<sup>1</sup> To mention one point only, as regards nationalism. Under nationalism the capitalist can play off the imported foreign workman against the native, or can transport his capital to other lands, where he will find a crowd of starvelings to do his bidding. This could not happen were the national barrier broken down. When Mr. Bradlaugh looks at the interconnection of modern industry and commerce throughout the modern world-market, he must surely see that the establishment of Socialism in England implies the immediate co-operation of at least the nations constituting the van of civilisation.

<sup>2</sup> The not infrequent existence of slavery in its cruder form in barbaric societies, while apparently contradicting my contention, does not really do so. The captive taken in war is reckoned a chattel precisely because he is not in the tribal society, within the limits of which alone social life is as yet recognised. There is no exploitation of tribesman by tribesman.

## THE MORROW OF THE REVOLUTION.

(Concluded from p. 220.)

ONE great idea which dominates all others has taken firm hold of the brains of all Socialists, the *suppression of individual property*. The Anarchists themselves, who are, without knowing it, the representatives of the "*laissez faire, laissez passer*" of property, are drawn into its current. The idea of the suppression of individual property is not one which has sprung up spontaneously in the human skull; it is the intellectual reflexion of the economical phenomenon which is evolving in the capitalist world.

What is the true characteristic of individual property. It is that the owner should work on his own property; this is so true that the peasant, the propertied animal above all others, when he grows too old to cultivate his land, rather than see it worked by hirelings divides it between his children, although this surrender of his land, his only love, is as torturing to him as the tearing out of his entrails. The old French proverb, "Property is the fruit of labour," expresses this fact. Consequently the only true property-owner in the old sense of the word is the peasant who cultivates his own land, the landlord who inhabits and repairs his own cottage, the shopkeeper who buys and sells merchandise in his own shop, the carpenter who himself uses his own saw and plane. All that these property-owners possess belongs to them in all justice, it is the fruit of their labour and not of that of others, for no wage-earner has worked on "their property."

But is it the case that capitalist property presents this character? Are the owners of mines, of railways, of great warehouses, the landlords who own hundreds and thousands of acres, and whole quarters of towns, really property owners? Have they ever worked on their "property"? They only know it by the rent it brings them in; it is the wage-earners and not the owners who work on their property. In the capitalist world we must correct the ancient proverb, and say, *Property is the fruit of labour, and the reward of idleness.*"

The capitalists by not working on their property, but by using it to lay hold of the fruit of the labour of others, have destroyed the essential character of individual property.

The capitalist property-owner is a being absolutely useless in the scheme of property; all the shareholders and bondholders of the railways might be drowned in the Channel, and yet the railways of Europe would go on carrying passengers and merchandise. The capitalist property-owner is a useless mouth which consumes a terrible quantity.

Everything that is eaten by a rich man, and the domestics and other folk who serve and satisfy his tastes and needs, is consumed in pure loss. It is as if instead of burning coal in a machine to transform its heat into force, one were to burn it in the open. The capitalist being useless therefore ought to be suppressed to lessen the expense of social production. The Socialist revolution will be bound to accomplish this economical operation; it will not destroy property, it will free it from its parasites.

The very day of the revolution the first decree of the revolutionary government will be the confiscation of capitalist property (mines, spinning-mills, foundries, railways, etc.), and its transformation into social property.

Bax and the English Socialists think that the State will take the place of the capitalist property-owners, and continue the exploitation of the great instruments of labour as in the past, but at the same time bringing in certain ameliorations in the lot of the worker, such as shorter hours and higher wages, etc. Their ideal is the capitalist public service (post-office, telegraphs, police, etc.), brought to perfection.<sup>1</sup> But for us, we believe that as a consequence of the very fact of the establishment of the revolutionary government, the State with its public offices (post-office, national debt, police, magistracy, army, etc.), will disappear. The State is a machine cunningly organised to serve the interests of the capitalists, and to keep the proletarian mass in slavery. The revolutionary government which will temporarily replace it, will have to disorganise the bourgeois machine and to draw all its power from the proletarian mass, and so to lay the foundations of the new order.

Instead of its being the State which will be the manager of the post-office, and telegraphs, the minter of money, and director of the railways, as it is now in nearly all capitalist countries, instead of its being the State which will be the manager of spinning, and weaving, and director of the mines, etc., as Lassalle wished, and as the English Socialists now wish, the revolutionary government will have to act in such a way that it will be the workers themselves who will become their own employers and their own directors.

The revolutionary government will not have to impose on the workmen, their directors, the rules of their labour, or rate of wages on the workmen, the telegraphists, the employés of the railways, or the miners, foundrymen, etc. On the contrary, the workmen will come to an understanding among themselves as to choosing their engineers and foremen, and on the sharing of the gains of their business. The nation will put at their service the instruments of labour; special commissions will be charged with drawing up a table of charges; that is to say, a rate of wages which can be claimed for services rendered, the sum which it will be necessary to set aside for the repairing and improving of the

<sup>1</sup> Comrade Bax must speak for himself, but I cannot think he would endorse this statement of his views; and there are other "English Socialists," among them the editor of the *Commonweal*, who would not walk across the street for the realisation of such an "ideal." The fact that a French Socialist who knows so much of England as Citizen Lafargue does, can have such an impression of the views of "English Socialists," shows the danger of coquetting with palliative measures.

machinery, and the sum to be paid into the public treasury to assure to each member of society victuals, lodging, and clothing.

On the morrow of the revolution, the work to be done will be so colossal, that it must not be increased still more by turning the revolutionary government into a director of spinning mills, or a shoe manufacturer; on the contrary, it must hasten in the masses themselves, the development of all the organisers and directors of social labour. Capacities towards direction exist, since it is the wage-earners only who direct all production, and it is only a matter of grouping them to find those commissions which will be charged with regulating scientifically the production and equitable distribution of products.

For the end of the social revolution is *to work as little as possible, and to enjoy as much as possible*, and that can only be attained by a continuous improvement of machinery and a scientific division of labour amongst all the members of Society, and by ensuring a just proportion of production to the needs of Society.

But before arriving at this Communist Society, in which labour and pleasure will be free and in common, we must pass through a transitional period, in which it will be necessary to maintain wages and to keep the due proportion between them and the service rendered and the effort given. For our part we believe that the workers themselves have more qualities to enable them to distribute the hours of labour and the gains, than the functionaries of any State would have.

For the rest we only formulate here the desiderata; events will force us on the road to be followed; and it is more than probable that the two systems will be combined in various proportions.

The Morrow of the Revolution the revolutionists will have to arm the wage-earners and organise them as soldiers; to lodge, feed, and clothe them gratuitously; and to confiscate and nationalise capitalist property. The nation which has once tasted this Socialist *regime*, even if it were but for a month, will be gained for ever for the Social Revolution.

PAUL LAFARGUE.

## SCOTTISH NOTES.

A statue of Sir William Wallace, the greatest hero in Scottish history, was recently unveiled at Abbey Craig, Stirlingshire, and the one man in all Scotland deemed worthy of performing the ceremony was—the Marquis of Bute!

Scotchmen are Liberal in politics, Presbyterians in religion, they adore Wallace and worship Burns, but they would not for the world permit the statues of their dead heroes and poets to be unveiled by a mere *man* if anything bearing a human shape with the title of lord could be found within the four quarters of the earth.

Wallace was no patriotic fanatic or bully. He was the arch-agitator, conspirator and traitor—the Socialist of his day. His army was filled with the victims of poverty and oppression—*les miserables*. Rogues and vagabonds of every description followed him, and fought and bled like heroes under his banner. Probably it is as a representative of these latter that Lord Bute was asked to unveil the statue of the warrior hero, but in that case a great injustice is done to the memory alike of Wallace and the companions of his toil.

Lord Bute it is true is a plunderer—a most colossal one; but he plunders the poor because he is rich, not the rich because he is poor. So far from being a representative of the poor oppressed and outlawed soldiery who strove manfully against the oppressors of their time, he is a lineal descendant and representative of those very oppressors whose law was their swords and whose swords were law. Were Wallace alive to-day, his enemies, instead of being foreign hirelings or predatory aliens, would be the titled and untitled knaves of his own country who rob the people of their land and every means of sustenance and happiness; and Scotchmen if they had anything of the spirit of their "glorious ancestors who wi' Wallace bled," would be leagued together—gathering with them the unfortunate, the ragged and torn from the highways and the byways—to wage war against their common oppressors, who make their lives miserable and scourge the land with a more terrible devastation than the fire and sword of Edward's feudal hordes.

At a meeting of the Trades Council held here last week one of the members, a comrade of ours, Mr. Carson, brought forward a resolution declaring that inasmuch as the policy hitherto pursued by trades unions had achieved practically nothing for the workers, it was necessary that the workers adopt a more advanced programme, demanding the full fruits of their labour. The motion was lost by 17 votes to 4. Had our friend moved a resolution that a testimonial be presented to Lord Rosebery or Mr. Andrew Carnegie, or anything that might testify the Council's appreciation and respect for the interests and rights of anybody but the people for whose weal they profess to confer together—it would no doubt have been carried with acclamation.

The *Scottish Leader* calls the attention of those virtuously indignant against the practice of boycotting by the Irish tenant-farmers, to the fact that in Aberdeen where the masons had succeeded by a strike in compelling a number of employers to grant an advance of wages, the principal quarrymasters of the district have signed an agreement with the masters who held out against the men, to supply no material to any master mason who has conceded the advance!

The miners' union in Scotland, except in one or two districts, has practically collapsed. In Lanarkshire, where the union did brave work some time ago, the men have become quite disorganised and demoralised, and have submitted to a reduction of 7½ per cent. without protest. Still it would be unwise not to recognise the fact that the men are submitting to the iron law of capitalism merely because of their present helplessness, and that the feeling against their oppressors is bitter and deep, and may very soon become dangerous.

J. BRUCE GLASIER.

If the social condition of a great part of the English people and of the whole mass of the Irish people be ignored, there is nothing to interrupt the strain of national self-glorification appropriate to a jubilee.—*N. Y. Times*.



"HAVE YOU NOT HEARD HOW IT HAS GONE WITH MANY A CAUSE BEFORE NOW? FIRST, FEW MEN HEED IT; NEXT, MOST MEN CONTEMN IT; LASTLY, ALL MEN ACCEPT IT—AND THE CAUSE IS WON!"

Communications invited on Social Questions. They should be written on one side of the paper, addressed to the Editors, 13 Farringdon Rd., E.C., and accompanied by the name and address of the writer, not necessarily for publication.

As all articles are signed, no special significance attaches to them because of their position in these pages. None to be taken as more than in a general manner expressing the views of the League as a body, except it be so explicitly declared by the Editors.

Rejected MSS. only returned if a stamped directed envelope is forwarded with them. Subscriptions.—For Europe and United States, including postage, per year, 6s. six months, 3s.; three months, 1s. 6d.

Business communications to be addressed to Manager of the COMMONWEAL, 13 Farringdon Road, E.C. Remittances in Postal Orders or halfpenny stamps.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

E. W. A. (King's Langley).—Thanks, but fear readers too sick of the subject.  
C. W. T.—Account of Bolton affair already in type when yours received.

Periodicals received during the week ending Wednesday July 13.

ENGLAND	John Swinton's Paper Boston—Woman's Journal Chicago (Ill.)—Vorbote Fort Worth (Tex.)—South West Hammonton (N.J.)—Credit Foncier Milwaukee (Wis.)—Volsblatt New Haven (Conn.)—Workmen's Advocate	FRANCE	Le Revolte SWITZERLAND Zurich—Sozial Demokrat
Justice Jus Londoner Arbeiter-Zeitung Norwich—Daylight	CANADA Toronto—Labor Reformer	AUSTRIA Vienna—Gleichheit	ROUMANIA Jassy—Lupa
UNITED STATES New York—Truthseeker Der Sozialist Volkszeitung Leader	Philadelphia (Pa.)—Carpenter Paterson (N. J.)—Labor Standard San Francisco (Cal.)—The People St Louis (Mo.)—Altruist Portland (Oreg.)—Avant-Courier	DENMARK Social-Demokraten	SWEDEN Stockholm—Social-Demokraten

NOTES ON NEWS.

WHEN one has said that the Coercion Bill has passed its third reading, there seems little more to be said on the subject at this stage of the proceedings, except perhaps to express wonder at the meaning of all the fine phrases about the civilisation of the times, the freedom under which we live, the progress we have made in the toleration of the expression of opinion, the power of rational minorities, and the like. It is as well to descend to earth after all those fine flights, and to remember what the whole event means. Simply that political changes which are purely political and seem to lead nowhere, are accepted with little struggle as mere shifting in the rules of an amusing game, in which there must be a certain amount of give and take; while on the other hand changes that threaten ever so little the sacred "rights of property" are to be defended by any means, fair and foul.

And these means are really only manifestations and forms of one when once the possibilities of fraud are exhausted, and that one is mere brute-force. That really lies behind all the junketing and gentilities of modern society, all its philanthropy and cant, and self-satisfied priggism. Brute-force is the foundation of all that, neither more nor less than it was of the devastations of Atilla or Timur: neither is it any more forgiven than in the days of the older brutalities, when once it is known for what it is. From that point of view we owe some thanks to the Tory Government and its steady majority of nobodies; in this instance of Ireland they have stripped the veil of pretence off their actions, and they say to the Irish, "Dog, do this because it is profitable to us!" It will be a good day for the Social Revolution when the masters of society generally are forced into the same course, and dropping all pretence, to say openly to their slaves, "Work for me (mostly gratis) or die."

The Liberal successes at Spalding and Coventry, and the reduction of the Tory vote at North Paddington, are no doubt promising to the "outs" in the game of "ins and outs" as it is now being played. But hear the *Daily News* as to the spirit abroad among the working men at North Paddington:

"A number of working men who possessed the vote could not be got to use it, being swayed by an overmastering impression that in regard to the two parties in the State it was 'six of one and half-a-dozen of the other,' and that neither cared a straw for the interests of the working man. 'Why should I trouble about voting? What is it to you or me who gets in? They're both a set of humbugs, promising you anything and everything to get in, and doing nothing when they get there.'"

Yes that is why the Tories are able to keep their places, and why their party is being continually helped by persons once called Liberals and Radicals: because the working-men voters have got hold of one truth at least, that Parliament, with its parties, auxilliary newspapers,

and the like, is not kept going for them but for their masters. This is encouraging to Socialists and other honest men—who will all be Socialists presently.

The Government has sustained a sharp defeat, owing to their own inconsiderate folly and want of foresight in not seeing how probable it was that the Cass incident would be taken up by the shop-keeping group, and what dangerous enemies they are. On the other hand, so good-natured and easily-pleased (and one must add so stupid) the general English public is, that the House of Commons has considerably reinstated itself in public opinion by voting, by a very narrow majority, that it may be wrong for a policeman and a magistrate to commit an act which is at once (for a wonder) illegal and unjust, and for a great official to decline to consider such a proceeding.

Again wonders will never cease! The martinet Sir Charles Warren has issued instructions to the police not to go beyond the law in persecuting poor girls in the streets, who are doing what our present society insists that some women shall do; that is, to serving as a safeguard to the chastity, or a veil to the respectability, of their richer sisters.

As to Mr. Newton, what can one say but that he has acted after his kind? What he did in the case of Miss Cass he does, no doubt, every day: only this time to injustice, brutality, and cruelty he added a mistake. He thought he was dealing with a defenceless person, and lo! the shopkeeping class spring up behind her like a jack-in-the-box. No doubt he will take care not to do it again;—that is the mistake, not the injustice, brutality, and cruelty. W. M.

Some idea of how landlords plunder the unhappy devils in their clutches may be gathered from the figures that appear now and then in the press. The *Daily News* of July 8 said, in commenting on a return of judicial rents in Ireland, then just published: "We have it on the authority of the Land Commissioners that seven tenants whose aggregate rental was £372 ought not in equity to be required to pay more than £157; that one man has been paying fifteen guineas for land not worth more than five pounds; another £54 for land not worth more than £20; a third £107 for land not worth more than £50."

Knowing what "in equity" and "not worth" mean when used in a capitalist organ, this reads as a strong condemnation of the landlord system.

The *Saturday Review* has been lucubrating upon modern society and its evil condition. In the course of its remarks it says: "There are several great influences that influence the destiny of nations: one of these is the social condition of a people; the fountain-head and mainspring of which in this country is London society. It is composed of the wealthiest, richest, and best-born in the land!"

It is difficult to see how those whose social function is consumption only can be the "fountain-head" of anything, nor, supposing that a "social condition" is furnished with a "mainspring," is it easier to understand how those who "toil not, neither do they spin," can supply that useful portion of machinery.

I am not acquainted with the difference there is intended to be made between the "wealthiest" and "richest"; nor, after the disclosures so often made, with what may make men the "best-born"; but I would suggest that when even a "respectable paper" like the *Saturday* can talk of the "rottenness and degradation" of those who form the "fountain-head and mainspring," that it is time something was done toward making a new "fountain-head and mainspring."

Of course the old series of dread examples is duly trotted out to show that great wealth brings luxury and deterioration upon a people and has wrecked all great empires hitherto; but, from lack of logic or otherwise, it is carefully kept out of view that these results have ensued upon great wealth in the hands of a class.

The experiment of a people free from class-rule and monopoly, holding wealth as a social possession, has not yet been tried. But the time comes, and that right soon, when it shall be, and succeed! S.

CONCERNING USURY.

THE new Socialistic economy is rapidly taking root in the popular mind and conscience, but there are points connected with it still involved in considerable obscurity and doubt. Take, for example, the subject of "Interest," as it is called. Henry George, in his great epoch-making work, 'Progress and Poverty,' sanctions a form of that dreadful social cancer which, to my mind, is a deplorable blemish. Why? Because it leaves a door still open for a section of the community to live in idle luxury on the produce of other men's toil. "The produce of labour," said Adam Smith, with wonderful penetration, "is the natural reward or wages of labour." The converse of this proposition is obviously: Idleness produces nothing, and is therefore entitled to nothing.

Those economists who maintain the validity of "interest" do not in so many words deny that idleness should go without any reward. What they contend is that idleness which has once been industrious and produced something, should be entitled to live happily ever after—

wards on the product of that product. In a word, they affirm the justice of what the Bible calls "increase," in despite of the Hebrew Lawgiver, who, in my opinion, saw very much further into this milestone than any one or all of them combined. All interest and increase are unjust in principle, and calamitous in their effects, and should simply be stigmatised generally as "usury."

Permit me to recall a few historical facts relating to usury. The Saxon laws in restraint of usury were sufficiently severe. Edward the Confessor forbade usurers to remain in any part of the kingdom, outlawed their persons and confiscated their property. A clergyman convicted of usury had his goods distributed for pious uses. Usury was thus defined: "*Est usura suos si quisquis tradit mihi nummos spe lucri. Pœnus duplex usura vocatur*"—"It is usury if any man lend me his money in the hope of gain. Compound usury is called *fœnus*."

"For the honour of God and the good of this realm," Edward I. inflicted the heaviest penalties on usurers. In the City of London alone he hanged two hundred and eighty Hebrews of the Rothschild and Goschen stamp *pour encourager les autres*. Coke, in his 'Institutes,' expressly declares that "all usury is directly against the law of God." Indeed, it is not till the time of Henry VIII., and what Cobbett not unjustly calls the Protestant "devastation," that we find the scourge of usury sanctioned by Act of Parliament. By 37th Henry VIII. the rate of interest was fixed at ten per cent. The first "Defender of the Faith" is remembered chiefly for his matrimonial exploits; but these were of small importance compared with his heretical innovation in the matter of usury. In less than seven years, however, our Bluebeard's Act was repealed by Edward VI., who enacted that "No person should lend on usury or increase to be hoped or received beyond the sum lent." This statute was in turn repealed fourteen years later by that dreadful person "Good Queen Bess." The "Jezebel of England," as John Knox appreciatively called her, revived her father's ten per cent. statute, declaring at the same time, with inimitable hypocrisy, that "all usury is against the law of God, sinful and detestable"! In 1625 James I., "the British Solomon," in his wisdom reduced the rate to eight per cent., his statute concluding, "Provided that no words in this law contained shall be construed or expounded to allow the practice of usury in point of religion or conscience." Oliver Cromwell brought down the rate from eight to six per cent., and Queen Anne reduced it to five.

Holy Writ is one unbroken testimony against usury, which it aptly compares to "the bite of a serpent." All the early Fathers of the Church vehemently denounced it. Let me instance first some of the sacred texts bearing on the matter.

"If thy brother be waxen poor and fallen in decay with thee, then thou shalt relieve him; yea, though he be a stranger, or a sojourner, that he may live with thee. Take thou no usury of him or increase, but fear thy God, that thy brother may live with thee. Thou shalt not give him thy money upon usury, nor lend him thy victuals upon increase."—Leviticus xxv., 35-37.

"Thou shalt not lend upon usury to thy brother; usury of money, usury of victuals, usury of anything that is lent upon usury."—Deuteronomy xxiii., 19.

"If thou lend money to any of my people that is poor by thee thou shalt not be to him as an usurer, neither shalt thou lay upon him usury."—Exodus xxii., 25.

"He that putteth not out his money to usury, nor taketh reward against the innocent; He that doeth these things shall never be moved."—Psalms xv., 5.

"He that hath not given forth upon usury neither taken any increase, . . . he is just, he shall surely live, saith the Lord God."—Ezekiel xviii., 8, 9.

"Thou hast taken usury and increase, and thou hast greedily gained of thy neighbours by extortion and hast forgotten me, saith the Lord.

"Therefore have I poured out mine indignation upon them; I have consumed them with the fire of my wrath: their own way have I recompensed upon their heads, saith the Lord God."—Ezekiel xxii., 12, 31.

Christ the Son of Man, the Heir of all the Ages—He of the perfectly-blended head, heart, and will—went even further:

"Give him that asketh of thee, and from him that would borrow of thee turn not away."—Matthew v., 42.

"If ye lend to them of whom ye hope to receive, what thank have ye? for sinners also lend to sinners, to receive as much again.

"But love ye your enemies, and do good, and lend, hoping for nothing again; and your reward shall be great, and ye shall be children of the Highest."—Luke vi., 34, 35.

Christ taught no formal system of politics or economics, but every system that does not square with His profound ethical doctrines is assuredly founded in error, and can lead to nothing but injustice and misery.

On the subject of usury the consensus of opinion of the Fathers of the Church is complete, but only one or two sentences from them need be given. Says St. Augustine:

"If you lend your money to a man from whom you *expect* more than you gave, not money alone, but anything else, whether it be wheat, wine, oil, or any other article, if you expect to receive any more than you gave you are an usurer, and in that respect reprehensible, not praiseworthy."

St. Jerome:

"Some persons imagine that usury obtains only in money; but the Scriptures, foreseeing this, have exploded every increase, so that you cannot receive more than you give."

St. Ambrose:

"Many persons, evading the precepts of the law when they give money to merchants, require the usury not in money, but take some of their goods in payment of the usury. Therefore let them hear what says the law: You shall not receive the usury of food, nor of anything else. The victuals are usury, the cloth is usury, whatever is added to the principal is usury—whatever name you give it is usury."

Is it not, then, with such a cloud of witnesses testifying to the truth, something astounding that in a professedly Christian country, all ranks and orders of men should practise this abomination of usury not merely

without compunction, but as if it were positively meritorious? You never hear *usury* even named. The vile thing gets disguised in a complete mask of cunning, delusive, heathenish terms—to wit, interest, consols, omniums, funds, debentures, securities, and God knows what not. The clergy and the Government encourage the workers to put their surplus earnings, if they have any, into savings banks, so as that they may join the ranks of the great army of fleecers, and exploit the labour of their fellow-workmen. A savings bank is, in reality, one of the most dangerous institutions in the country, because it teaches one class of workmen to prey upon the industry of their less fortunate fellows, and thus perpetuates the horrible social system under which the masses groan. Like insurance offices these banks are simply symptomatic of deep-seated social disease.

Of the effects of usury what need to speak? The great Unnational Debt we have already paid four times over, and, like the farmer with the squire's claret, we are "no forarder." It hangs like a millstone about the nation's neck.

"Usury," writes Tacitus, "was an early canker of the Commonwealth, the frequent cause of tumult and sedition. Laws were made to repress the mischief while yet the manners were pure and uncorrupted. . . . By a law of the Twelve Tables it (interest) was reduced to one per cent. More was declared illegal. In process of time a new regulation proposed by the Tribunes, lowered it to one-half; and finally it was abolished altogether." It unfortunately reappeared with the Empire, and eventually ruined the State.

"Usury," says Rollin ('Ancient History'), "has always caused the ruin of States where it has been tolerated, and it was this disorder which contributed very much to subvert the constitution of the Roman Commonwealth, and gave birth to the greatest calamities in all the provinces."

Says Gregory, of Nyssa:

"The usurer's life is both indolent and insatiable; the pen is his plough; the paper his field; the ink his seed, his rain and season for to luxuriate his money crops; he has barns and granaries to hoard up and thrash the property of the wretched; looks upon all men's property as his own; prays adversity to his neighbours, that they may have recourse to his refuge; he hates the affluent, and considers those his enemies that will not enter his books. He is for ever in quest of gain, yet always insatiable; he accommodates all borrowers, not through motives of charity, but excessive avarice. Let not gain be the mainspring of your good works, and God will repay you with interest."

Says Professor W. J. Beal, of New York:

"No blister draws sharper than does the interest. Of all industries, none is comparable to that of interest. It works all day and night, in fair weather and in foul. It has no sound in its footsteps, but travels fast. It gnaws at a man's substance with invisible teeth. It binds industry with its film, as a fly is bound in the spider's web. Debts roll a man over and over, binding him hand and foot, and letting him hang upon the mesh until the long-legged interest devours him. There is but one thing on a farm like it, and that is the Canadian thistle, which swarms with new plants every time you break its roots, whose blossoms are prolific, and every flower the father of a million seeds. Every leaf is an awl, and every branch a spear, and every plant like a platoon of bayonets, and a field of them like an armed host. The whole plant is a torment, and a vegetable curse. And yet the farmer had better made his bed of Canadian thistles than be at ease upon interest."

Usury, Aristotle pronounced *abhorrent to nature*; and so it is. It is at best the product of a product; the further fruit of labour already remunerated. It simply means that labour must both toil for its products and pay for their use, the payment in this country amounting to a total drain on industry of £250,000,000 per annum! Mr. Henry George, if I apprehend him correctly, holds that the lender has a right to share with the borrower in the increase towards which his capital in combination with nature's reproductive forces has contributed, but in no other case. Thus A lends B £2,000, with which B purchases a flock of sheep. At the end of two years the flock has increased fifty per cent. How many fleeces and lambs, or their equivalent in money ought B to give A, in addition to returning the £2,000 borrowed? The answer is obviously, "Neither fleece nor lamb," otherwise "the produce of labour is *not* the natural reward or wages of labour," inasmuch as B has had all the trouble of tending the flock.

Were the whole flock to die of the rot before the end of the second year, B would lose all his labour and still be responsible to A for the £2,000 which A would have wholly lost (his labour included) had he personally invested in the sheep. A's position is virtually that of a "sleeping partner" who makes money in his sleep, sharing profits but repudiating losses, in defiance not merely of justice but, in a measure, of law. By 28 & 29 Vict. c. 86, § 5, the man who lends to a partnership, the interest varying according to profit, in event of the firm's failure, can recover no portion of principal or interest until the claims of all the other creditors have been satisfied.

But A is not without his *natural* reward. B has acted as the custodian of his money,—no small service inasmuch as decrease not increase is the characteristic of all so-called capital,—and A has benefited along with the rest of the community in cheaper wool and mutton. The power of increase, animal or vegetable, is, in point of fact, a property of the land, and is, in justice, inseparable from the rent which Mr. George has so triumphantly demonstrated belongs inalienably to the whole people.

How, then, are we to crush this monster usury, or render him innocuous? The reply is—*Repeal all laws that guarantee the collection of usury in whatever form*. Put all such debts precisely in the position of gambling debts—"debts of honour," as they are called—and the fangs of the serpent will be effectually drawn. He may die hard, but he will die, and the world will profit a hundredfold by his decease.

J. MORRISON DAVIDSON.

# THE LABOUR STRUGGLE.

BRITAIN.

The furnaces of the New British Ironworks at Ruabon, the largest iron-works in North Wales, have been blown out in consequence of the continued depression in the Welsh iron trade. A large number of "hands" are thus thrown out of employment.

Following the example of the operatives in the small trades in the surrounding district, the jump-plate and spike-nail makers at Halesowen have commenced an agitation for a higher rate of wages. The operatives in this branch of the nail trade complain that their wages have recently been reduced to a miserably low point, and there being no organisation amongst them, they have not been able to withstand the repeated reductions enforced.

**STRIKES OF OIL WORKERS.**—The proposed reduction of oil workers' wages not having been withdrawn, the men employed at Uphall and Holmes are now on strike. It is expected that the men at these works will join the Miners' Union. At Holmes the miners have been ordered by the contractors to clear their places, a lock-out being expected. The Deans Oil Company having given notice that a reduction of 10 per cent. was to take place, the men have unanimously agreed not to resume work, and to resist the above reduction. In accordance with the resolution come to by the Oil-Works Association, a reduction has been announced in the wages at the Burntisland Oil-Works, the men to the number of 700 have consequently struck work.

**LANARKSHIRE MINERS.**—The reduction of miners' wages is only partial, being confined to the employers who are in the Masters' Association. The collieries affected, though extensive, do not include such wide-spreading concerns as are owned by Mr. Archibald Russell, Messrs. Colin Dunlop and Co., and several others. The men affected by the reduction are expected to resume work as usual; but, as a start to reopening of the late agitation, the Lanarkshire Miners' Central Board have resolved to ask the districts to send representatives to a conference to reconsider the advisability of starting anew the old restrictive policy.

**CLOSING OF IRONSTONE PITS.**—Kilbirnie and Dalry parishes, in the West of Scotland, are suffering severely from the depression in the iron trade. The Eglinton Iron Company have abandoned their clayband ironstone workings on the lands of Todhills, Kersland, and Brownhill, and are now removing their machinery from these pits, while Messrs. Merry and Cunningham, who a year ago abandoned Ryesholm Pit, have just given notice to their workmen that Highfield Pit will be closed in a fortnight. It is also stated that they intend closing their offices at the villages of Mossend and Barkip; and altogether it looks as if they were about to sever their connection with the district.

The *Daily Telegraph* of July 6 contains the following advertisement:

FOUR FEMALE SORTERS WANTED at once. Salary 6s. per week.—Apply at 112, Southampton Row, W.C.

This kind of advertisements completely answer the queries of hypocritical Chadbands who want to know why so many women are "on the streets." The Regent Street tradesmen perhaps know this; and want the ugly fact removed from their street. When these pure-minded tradesmen hold their next meeting, will they be good enough to state which particular street the women are to perambulate? The recent stir about "women" of a particular class is one of the most glaring pieces of hypocrisy conceivable in this age of shams.

A short time ago a signalman was found dead in his box on the Carnforth line. A correspondent to the *Manchester Weekly Times*, signing himself "Signalman," says: "I am surprised there are not more cases of sudden deaths in signal-boxes, considering the long hours and mental strain a signalman has to contend with. I am a signalman in the employment of the Cheshire Lines Railway. I am stationed at a junction box, and have to work 12 hours a-day without a single minute to call my own out of the 12. At the week's end I have 18 hours to work, from 6 p.m. on Saturday night to 12 at noon on Sunday. There are about 60 men on the same line that work 90 hours a-week, year in year out, without a Sunday to themselves, and nearly 200 trains pass the boxes on the main line in 24 hours. I would ask you if you think this sort of slavery is right and just?"

**BIRMINGHAM NAILMAKERS.**—A meeting of operatives in the local malleable nail trade has been held in Birmingham, to consider the following notice from their employers: "The masters find that the difference between the rate of wages paid in Birmingham and the rate paid at some other places mentioned at the meeting is fully 20 per cent.; in some cases the difference is found to be even more. To equalise this the masters therefore propose that the rate of wages now paid in Birmingham be at once reduced 10 per cent., and that the club at the same time use its influence to get the rate of wages paid at the other places advanced 10 per cent., thus bringing the whole of the yards to very nearly a level rate of wages. As soon as this is accomplished, the Birmingham masters will be willing, if the other yards go with them, to advance the general wage rate 10 per cent., bringing it back to the present level, and thus securing a uniform rate of wages throughout the trade." The men unanimously resolved not to accept any reduction, but to do all in their power to bring about the equalisation of the wage prices in the trade throughout the country, towards which end the men are prepared to spend £500.

**STRIKE AT THE MANCHESTER JUBILEE EXHIBITION.**—At one o'clock on the 5th a number of the attendants at the Exhibition gathered beneath the central dome preparatory to marching out of the Exhibition grounds, the object of the demonstration being to express the feeling of the attendants with regard to the charges made for refreshments. The attendants have for some time been agitating for a reduction in the refreshment tariff, but hitherto without success; and they determined that on Tuesday they would leave the place in a body and get their meals outside. In consequence of the dispute with the Committee the attendants struck work and the machines in the Machinery Section were, with one or two exceptions, at a standstill from the opening in the morning to the close of the Exhibition on the 6th. The machinery at the Exhibition was stopped throughout the whole of Thursday, in consequence of the absence of the attendants as the result of the dispute between them and the Executive Committee in connection with the supply of refreshments. This state of things is now, however, likely to be put an end to, for the committee of the Machinery Section met and decided to meet the wishes of the attendants to the extent of providing them with a building in which they can take their meals, and supplying them with hot water for tea and other purposes. The tickets of a number of the men who had taken an active part in the agitation had been stopped, but

these, we understand, will be returned, and it is expected that the machinery will now be run as usual.

**GLASGOW UNITED TRADES' COUNCIL.**—This Council met on July 6th, Mr. R. C. Grant in the chair. Discussion was resumed of the debate adjourned at a previous meeting on a motion by Mr. Carson: "That the present methods of maintaining and advancing the rights of labour by strikes, arbitration, and conciliation practised by the Trades' Unions of this country having failed practically to accomplish this object, this council is therefore of opinion that some other method better calculated to attain this result is necessary in the interests of labour, and for the due maintenance and advancement of its just and natural rights." Mr. Carson argued that no plan could be said to have done what was needed that did not secure a far greater share to the producer of the wealth produced, and showed how vastly capital had increased of late years, and as yet the working-man had got no advantage from it, for although they might get a rise of wages, that had at once been neutralised by a rise of rents and provisions. Trades unions, he maintained, had not been aggressive enough. Mr. McPherson, in seconding the motion, said that as a rule trades' societies had occupied too much of a negative position. Mr. Wilkie moved as an amendment: "That trades' societies had done as much for the object they professed to have in view as could be expected, when the number who did not connect themselves with them was taken into consideration. He thought Mr. Carson should have pointed out what would better effect the objects we had in view. Mr. Howie, in seconding, said he would have liked something more definite than the motion, and thought that were tradesmen better united and did more to raise up those lower than themselves great good would result. Mr. Hodge said it was not the unions that were at fault, but the men who did not give them a fair chance. After further discussion the motion and amendment were put to the meeting, when 17 voted for the amendment and 4 for the motion. The Council then adjourned till the 27th inst.

## SHORT TIME IN THE COTTON TRADE.

A large number of firms in all parts of Lancashire, Cheshire, and on the borders of Yorkshire are now running short time, with the object of defeating the cotton corner. The workers have volunteered to assist the producing capitalist to defeat the exploiting "corner" capitalist. This action simply means semi-starvation to thousands.

In the Yorkshire doubling trade are several mills running short time. At Bolton a partial stoppage of machinery at several mills is reported. At Oldham, Bamford, Bagslate, and Bury are many fustian sheds running short time.

Nearly all the mills in the Whitworth Valley are working short time. Three of the largest mills in Blackburn, and in which there are about 16,000 looms and 40,000 spindles, have been stopped for an indefinite period, and several hundred people are thrown temporarily out of employment. Messrs. Harrison and Sons have also stopped their three mills for an indefinite period, in order to defeat the cotton "corner." The mills contain some 1700 looms and about 35,000 spindles. Several other large mills in the town and district are running short time, and it is not improbable that others may follow the example set and close altogether.

## THE BOLTON STRIKE.

A great number of the men arrested in connection with the recent rioting have been sentenced. Considering the gravity of the charges—far more serious than the charge against comrades Henderson and Mowbray—the penalties are very light. "Bound over," 14 days with the option of a fine, and for a month's imprisonment a policeman was nearly killed. Very few of the persons arrested were strikers.

Last Saturday, all the imported hands in the employ of Messrs. Dobson and Barlow, about twenty-two in number, left the works and returned to their own homes. Messrs. Dobson and Barlow decided to close the works for a week, to afford an opportunity for the necessary repairs to be carried out. This decision will throw a large number of workmen out of employment.

The money voted by the Masters' Union is not exhausted, so the conflict goes on merrily.

A large number of additional importations are expected in Bolton daily, notwithstanding the recent outburst of popular feeling against the admission of "strangers" to the iron foundries. Every precaution is taken by the police against the recurrence of rioting, as many as thirty policemen being stationed in each of the four large works where provision has been made for "knobsticks." To relieve the monotony of the life of the importations at Messrs. Hicks and Co.'s Soho foundry, a smoking concert was recently given upon the premises. A piano had previously been standing in the works for the benefit of the men.

On their side the strike hands remain in capital spirits, placing their reliance in what they term the justice of their case. They have support from every hand. So healthy, indeed, is the state of their funds that the Strike Committee are taking a census of the children under ten years of age of the men on strike (society and non-society alike) with a view to granting a weekly sum per child, in addition to the ordinary strike pay.

The Strike Committee have issued a manifesto, in which they say:—"We wish to draw attention to the unscrupulous manner in which our employers, who are all magistrates, with one exception, have done their best to implicate our men in the various disturbances which have taken place in the town through their own action in importing knobsticks. They have also closed our public houses, and for what reason. Simply because they find that the publicans have thought fit to do as they like with their money—namely, support the men. Our public park has been changed into a military camp, just to please the employers, to the inconvenience of our townspeople and their children. The town has also been packed with county police and private detectives, who so far have done their best to implicate some of our men, but without avail. Up to the present our action in this justifiable strike has commanded the respect of all parties save the employers."

## FRANCE.

The glass bottle makers at Montluçon are still on strike and they seem well determined to hold out to the utmost of their power. Last week, James Hunter, General Secretary of the Glass Bottle-makers' International Association, sent to the strikers in the name of the General Council, a letter expressing their warmest sympathy and best wishes for success in their struggle, and a hearty invitation to join the International Union. At the same time comrade Hunter asked his fellow-workers to forward an account of their financial position. We are not yet in possession of the answer of the Montluçon strikers. We are very glad to see that the International Union makes every effort to develop its organisation, and we may rest confident that the union will become one of the strongest associations in the British Isles.—D.

## BELGIUM.

The Socialist printer, Joseph Hubez, who in January last was sentenced at Frankfort-on-Main to four months' imprisonment because he belonged to a prohibited association, and who went afterwards to Belgium, has been expelled from that country. The Catholic Minister of Justice, M. de Volder, becomes more and more the servant-of-all-work of M. von Bismark, and, in fact, for fifty-seven years Belgium has not had so miserable a Minister as this de Volder. It is the same scoundrel who has allowed comrades Neve and Gross to be extradited to Germany without any legal form at all. As our readers know, only one of them, Gross, has been released.

The General Council of the *Parti Ouvrier* has issued a manifesto to all worker's associations in Belgium, inviting them to an extraordinary Conference to be held at Mons on the 14th and 15th of August next. The order of the day will be: *General Strike*, discussion and organisation. It is apprehended that the debate will bear a very acute character, and that the Conference might come to some important resolutions both for the *Parti Ouvrier* itself and for the special question of the *black strike*.—D.

## AUSTRIA-HUNGARY.

At Villach, a new Socialist paper has been issued since the 3rd of June under the title *The Labour (die Arbeit)*. The first number was allowed to pass unmolested, the second has had three different issues, the first and the second were confiscated by the police; the third issue was permitted to circulate. It is a very good paper, and we wish it every success.

Comrade Bleicher who was sentenced to eight years' hard labour in one of the former Austrian trials, died in the prison of Stein, where one of his friends of the same trial, F. Schreiblechner, died also some weeks ago.—D.

## GERMANY.

The Hamburg police have succeeded in confiscating a considerable amount of literature which our comrades intended to send to Berlin. The trunks contained 100 copies of Bebel's 'Woman in the Past, Present, and Future'; 800 copies of a text-book of German Socialistic songs, and several thousand copies of the paper *Sozial Democrat*.

At Weimar, the cabinet makers' trades' union (*Fachverein der Tischler*) has been dissolved by the police. The reason was that the chairman of the union is a Socialist, hence, all the members of the union cannot but be Socialists! That is the logic of the police in the ancient city of Goethe!

The ghost of Lieske has returned on earth and visited last week M. Frohsee, the imperial attorney who asked so bitterly for the head of the Anarchist, although he was obliged to admit afterwards that he was not quite convinced of his guilt,—and, in fact, all those who are somewhat acquainted with the affair of police-councillor Rumpff, know for certain that Lieske was not the man who dragged Rumpff to death! M. Frohsee has been confined in an asylum, the execution of Lieske "having worked like madness in his brain." Nemesis! goddess of the vanquished, soon may thy reign arrive, for innumerable are those who all over the world have committed the same crime as M. Frohsee!

Eight Socialists who assisted at the secret Conference held recently at Haidhausen, near Augsburg, have been arrested. At Nuremberg, five Socialists have also been imprisoned on a charge of "anarchical conspiracy!" What does that mean? Surely some police joke!—D.

## ITALY.

The Italian democrats are working up a popular agitation in that country, manifested at present by a series of deliberative meetings in Rome, Naples, Perugia and elsewhere, to discuss the condition of the working-class and its possible amelioration, the various working-men's associations sending delegates, and the working-class generally being invited more especially to take part in the "popular congress" of their district.

That the workers should be taxed for their holidays and festivals, which they can scarcely be said to enjoy, as well as for every conceivable necessary of life (directly or indirectly) is a refinement on the noble art of taxation indeed. A certain "maritime captain" of Marsala on being subjected to such a grievance writes to the *Nuova Età* of that town to proclaim the same, which was that when having occasion to pass through the *dazio* (local taxation) a quantity of wine, beyond the official tax of the tariff an extra tax of two centesimi the *litre* was imposed for the festival of St. Giovanni, which was about to take place. This taking advantage of a public holiday to extort money when more poor folk are on the move than usual, reminds one of the conduct of most of the omnibus and tram companies in the Jubilee week here in London (may I be forgiven for "raking up old bygones" as Mark Twain says!) when the workman out in holiday attire, bodily and mentally, found that all fares were raised and that any journey in tram or bus would involve an extra expenditure he had not counted on.—M.

## SPAIN.

The congress of workers in metal held at Madrid in June has issued a manifesto addressed "to the exploited classes," stating at some length the position of the workers and calling upon them to rise in the cause of their own emancipation and replace Authority, Property and Religion by Anarchy, Collectivism and Science. I may say in passing that Collectivism in Spain has a different meaning from that which we give it, the Anarchists maintaining that they retain the original meaning of the word, which has, they say, since been usurped by the "authoritarian" Socialists. Yet the modern Collectivist says "organise," and the Anarchist says "organise," so that in one important point at least they are at one.

A serious riot broke out at Aloira on the 10th, against the octroi duties. The rioters attempted to set fire to the doors of the barracks, whereupon the Civic Guard fired upon the crowd, killing four persons. Reinforcements were despatched to restore order.—M.

A Newcastle correspondent says: "In a letter just received from my brother, who is a large employer of labour in Canada, the following remark on the scarcity of hands occurs . . . He says: 'I wish some of you good, poor people would come out here. My sister cannot get a woman to work for less than a dollar (4s. 2d.) a day,' etc.—*Reynolds*." Everyone must feel sorry for the sister; but if the emigration of good poor people means the reduction of the wages of the Canadian workwoman, the good poor people had better stay at home.

## WHAT ARE "AMERICAN INSTITUTIONS" ?

I AM sending this across the ocean, to seek information I cannot gain in my own native land. I have enquired of leading journals and been quietly ignored; I have asked eminent literary people and received only looks that questioned my sanity and civilised citizenship; I have interrogated working-men, and they simply become terrified. I have decided to enquire of a "blasted furriner." I only want to know—what are "American institutions"? Or rather, what are the characteristics of American institutions which distinguish them from English, Russian, German, or French institutions? So much seems to depend on a proper attitude toward these revered mysteries, that I am anxious to be informed.

"If we would preserve the integrity of our American institutions, we must put a stop to all this anarchistic talk from the labouring classes," shrieks the great American press. "If we would preserve, etc., etc., we must prevent the foreigners from crowding to our shores," scream the lesser lights of journalism in grand responsive chorus. "If we would p. t. i. o. o. A. i.," yells the Citizens' Association, "we must hang the men who find any fault with them." And then the solos and duets come in from the states: "Kansas cries, 'Imprison those who marry themselves without a priest, and guard the morals of our people by laws—Sunday laws, prohibitory laws, plenty of laws of all sorts.' Pennsylvania and Ohio sing together, 'Arrest the agitators—let no anarchists be heard.' Virginia cries, 'Shut up that earnest old woman who is shocking society with unwelcome truths'; and Illinois, bolder than all the rest, disarms her citizens, forbids the discontented to murmur, makes it a crime to tell of the people's wrongs, passes "conspiracy," "boycott," and "strike" bills, forbids the singing of the song that thrills all Europe with its liberty tones, disperses meetings of citizens at her pleasure, and enforces her commands with an army of Pinkerton brutes, regiments of State militia, the most powerful police system in the world, and the dark shadow of the gallows in the background; growing in the meantime continually, "We are preserving the integrity of our American institutions."

During the great trial and since, somebody is always saying "Spies, Schwab, Engel, Fischer, and Ling, coming from a foreign land, and seeing poverty existed here as elsewhere, and not understanding our American institutions, became anarchists and iconoclasts—wanting to destroy society merely because they could not comprehend its organisation!"

I am as American as a person can be who is not a full-blooded, copper-coloured Indian. My forefathers were here before we had any "institutions," and helped to fight a foreign institution that we might have some of our own. I am as near civilised as my fellow-workers, and have average intelligence, and yet at this date I do not understand our "American institutions." I once thought I did; I believed the ballot was one of them. I have seen working-men carried to the polls and voted like so many cattle by their employers, when they knew and cared nothing about the two candidates offered them. I have seen a struggling labour party beaten again and again by fraud and trickery; and I have been told that in England and Germany popular suffrage is really a power and the people make themselves felt through it. So that the privilege of ballot is not peculiar to America surely.

One time I believed equality was one of them. But when I see a nabob drawing an income of seven dollars a minute, living on the greatest luxuries of earth and holding at his beck and call the services of ten thousand men, and know that because of him there are a thousand paupers in the land, I must give up that idea. "Free homes" figured in my imagination as one. But it costs the best years of one man and woman's life and banishment from all they have held dear to win a home, at best; and usually it costs years of toil and deprivation just to try; while the mortgage-holder and usurer gets the "home" in the end.

But to the last I fondly dreamed that free thought, free speech, and free press were certainly American institutions. My experience as a citizen of Chicago has dispelled that illusion. In the whole world outside of Russia there is not a more oppressed, authority-ridden city than Chicago. The police are feared as though they were demons. Meetings are broken up, Anarchists are forbidden to sit or stand in groups of two or three, the "Marseillaise" is forbidden, men can be hung without proof for what somebody else did, and working men have no rights which a capitalist is bound to respect. All this for the "preservation of American institutions." What are they? Our free school system? They have better schools in other countries for all the children. Our old chattel-slavery institution? That perhaps was peculiar to America. Our land-owning, "big-rent," speculating institutions? They are common as civilisation itself. Our wage-slavery system? Our "peasantry" works as cheaply and obediently as any in the world. Our "profit" system? Men can roll up bigger fortunes through unlimited profit when once they get the upper hand by vested rights, and this perhaps is particularly American?

Can our English friends inform us what American institutions are?

Chicago, June 18th.

LIZZIE M. SWANK.

## THE SOCIALIST LEAGUE.

OFFICES: 13 FARRINGTON ROAD, E.C.

**Co-operative Store.**—The Committee attend at the offices at 8.30 p.m. on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Saturdays. See advertisement on last page.

**Notice to Branch Secretaries, Members, etc., etc.**—The Librarians of the Socialist League are pleased to notify to Branch Secretaries, members, etc., etc. (including affiliated bodies), that the Exchange Papers for the first quarter of this year, including English, American, French, German, and other Continental papers, are now ready for sale, and the Librarians are willing to accept offers. The importance of the record of the International movement should not be lost sight of, and this is an opportunity which should not be missed. The proceeds will be acknowledged in *Commonweal*, and devoted to the Propaganda Fund. (See *Commonweal* for January, February, and March weeks for list of papers).—Wm. BLUNDELL and D. J. NICOLL, Librarians.

## "COMMONWEAL" PRINTING FUND.

K. F. (weekly), 1s. C. J. F. (weekly), 2s. T. B. (two weeks), 1s.  
Ph. W., Treasurer, July 12.

## THE NORWICH PRISONERS' AID FUND.

For Mrs. Mowbray—A Few Fabians, per Annie Besant (weekly), 10s.  
J. LANE, Treasurer.

## REPORTS.

**BLOOMSBURY.**—On Thursday last, F. Verinder lectured on "The Bible and the Land Question." There was a fair audience, and a slight discussion followed.

**CLERKENWELL.**—On Wednesday, July 6, Edward Aveling lectured on "Methods of Propaganda," and on Sunday, July 10, George Bernard Shaw on "Socialism and Radicalism." Excellent discussions followed each lecture.—A. T. and W. B.

**EDINBURGH.**—On Sunday evening, in the Queen's Park, Smith, Paterson, and Gilray addressed a large meeting. *Commonweal* and pamphlets were selling well, when we were informed by a park officer that no selling was allowed to go on within the park. It is even said that it is not permissible to present a tract to any one within the Queen's Park. We sold some more of our literature "without the gates," but the rain coming down rather heavily prevented us doing any more in this way for the rest of the evening.—J. G.

**GLASGOW.**—On Saturday afternoon, Paterson addressed a good meeting at Cambuslang. On Sunday forenoon, Glasier lectured on Socialism to the Cambuslang Branch of the Irish National League. There was a good audience, and our comrade had a hearty reception. In the afternoon at Paisley Road Toll, Glasier had a very large audience, and although the police were there in force no interference took place. In consequence of the Fair holidays, there will be no out-door meetings this week.—J. M. B.

**LEEDS.**—On Wednesday evening, a meeting in Meadow Lane was addressed by Maguire, Paylor, and Hill. On Sunday, Mahon delivered three lectures in the open-air, and was assisted by Mitchell (Bradford), Corkwell, Hill, Braithwaite, and Maguire. The evening lecture was attended by about 500 people, and the result was most satisfactory. We expect an acquisition of members as a result of the day's work. Sale of literature good.—T. P.

**NORWICH.**—On Wednesday evening last, Henderson and another spoke at Yarmouth. On Thursday, Henderson spoke at Dereham. Sunday morning Henderson and Rose spoke at Wymondham. A meeting was also held at Long Stratton by Morley and Houghton. In the afternoon Henderson spoke in Norwich Market-place. During the afternoon a meeting was also held at Lyng by this branch. All meetings even more successful than usual. Good sale of *Commonweal*.

**WALSALL.**—On Monday, July 2, several members of the Branch visited Dudley, and H. Sanders and Deakin addressed a meeting of about 500 persons in the Market-place. Another visit to the same town was made on July 9, Sanders speaking to a large gathering on the "White Knobs." On Wednesday, Sanders, Weaver, and Deakin spoke at Pelsall to a well-attended meeting, and on Saturday, Sanders spoke to large audiences in the Market-place, Walsall. On Sunday, July 10, we went on a propaganda tour to West Bromwich, Smethwick, and Oldbury, holding good meetings at each town, and disposing of a fair quantity of literature.—J. T. D.

**BOLTON.**—After having a pleasant chat with the comrades of the Lancaster Branch last Friday night, I took the train on Saturday to Bolton, to see how affairs were going on there after the late riots. I was supplied with a large bundle of *Commonweal* for free distribution. I spoke twice on Sunday, afternoon and evening, along with the comrades of the S.D.F. Two good collections were made for the strikers. Although it was raining at one time pretty heavily, our audience of between three and four hundred listened very attentively. Comrade Walkden made a splendid speech, his references to local affairs being heartily applauded. Judging from the impression made, I have not the least doubt that very soon Bolton will be a Socialist stronghold. After the meeting we retired to the club-room, where I said a few words in reference to working together and intending to do so. I then left, but not until three hearty cheers were given for the coming Revolution. I hope this week to be able to do some work in Derbyshire and Leicestershire, etc., on my walking tour to London.—CHARLES W. TUKE, Edinburgh Branch.

**NOTTINGHAM SECTION, SOCIALIST UNION.**—On Sunday, Waine and Proctor addressed meetings which were somewhat spoilt by the rain, in the morning in Sninton Market, and in the evening in the Great Market-place. 2s. 8½d. was collected and some leaflets were disposed of.—A. C.

## North of England Socialist Federation.

**Blyth.**—The delegate-meeting, owing to the amount of business that came before it, adjourned till next Saturday, when it is hoped all the delegates will be present. There is important business remaining to be considered.

**Consett.**—A meeting was addressed by E. R. Pease and Donald on Monday. After the meeting, the men who desired to form a branch held a private business meeting. It was arranged to take a hall in the course of the week for the purpose of an indoor lecture.

**East Holywell.**—A large meeting was addressed on Saturday by A. K. Donald. One or two speakers who appeared to oppose the Socialists previously have come round, and are now prepared to support the cause.

**Middlesboro.**—A branch of the Labour Federation has just been started. Our comrade who is working in the north is making arrangements to give a lecture there next week.

**Newcastle.**—The local branch of the S.D.F. have now got T. Mann back. He is energetically pushing the cause forward in Newcastle and district. A very successful meeting was addressed by him on Sunday

night at the Cattle Market. John Hall, Donald, and several local men addressed the meeting, which lasted till 10.30 p.m. Steady progress is being made here.

**North Shields.**—A successful meeting was addressed on Sunday morning by A. K. Donald. The Labour Federation, profiting by the vigorous example of the Socialist party here, propose to hold a series of open-air meetings on Sundays during the summer. In view of that, he advised all members of the Labour Federation to study Thomas Binning's valuable pamphlet addressed to "Organised Labour," and disposed of a large number that he happened to have with him.

**Seaton Delaval.**—A. K. Donald addressed a meeting at Harpers on Friday; a good deal of questions and discussion. Branch progressing favourably.

**South Shields.**—A large meeting was addressed by Donald in the Market Place on Sunday evening. An excellent speech in support of Donald was delivered by an advanced local Radical, Mr. Derby. Good sale of literature. Friends desiring to join the Society please address J. Wood, 105 Wood Street.

**Stockton-on-Tees.**—The Labour Federation are getting their branch into working order.

**Sunderland.**—Two meetings were addressed on July 6th and one on Sunday by Donald. Several members were made, and good quantity of literature was disposed of.

**Throckley.**—A meeting was addressed on Tuesday by A. K. Donald. Good lot of miners turned out to hear his address.

## LECTURE DIARY.

## LONDON.

**Bloomsbury.**—Communist Club, 49 Tottenham Street, Tottenham Court Road, W. On Thursday July 14th, at 8.30, Eleanor Marx-Aveling, "Socialism and Political Action." 21. W. H. Utley, "Malthusian Socialism." 28. Business Meeting and Social Evening, August 4. Edward Aveling, "The Value of Brain Work."

**Clerkenwell.**—Hall of the Socialist League, 13 Farringdon Road, E.C. Sunday July 17, at 8.30 p.m. Wm. Blundell, "A Few Words on Property Qualification." Wednesday July 20, at 8.30. H. A. Barker, "Evolution and Socialism."

**Croydon.**—Parker Road.

**Hackney.**—23 Audrey Street, Goldsmith Row. Club Room open every evening from 8 till 11.30; Saturday, 7 till 12.30; Sunday 11 a.m. till 12 p.m. Members Business Meeting every Tuesday at 8.30 p.m.

**Hammersmith.**—Kelmescott House, Upper Mall, W. Sunday July 17, at 8 p.m. Graham Wallas (Fabian Society), "Man and the State."

**Hoxton (L.E.L.).**—2 Crondall Street, New North Rd. Club Room open on Monday, Wednesday, and Saturday evenings from 8 till 11. Singing Class every Wednesday at 8.30. Sunday July 17, at 8, lecture by H. H. Sparling, "Old English Guilds." Meeting of Council and General Meeting on Saturday at 7.30. A full attendance requested.

**Merton.**—11 Merton Terrace, High Street. Club Room open every evening. Committee every Thursday. Discussions held every Sunday morning at 11.

**Mitcham.**—Corner of Merton Lane and Fountain Place. Club Room open every evening from 7.30 till 11.

**North London.**—Branch meets at 32 Camden Road, N.W., for reception of new members and other business, on Wednesday evenings at 8 o'clock, until further notice. H. Bartlett, sec.

## PROVINCES.

**Bradford.**—Morris's Dining Rooms, 114 City Road. Wednesdays, at 8.

**Dublin.**—Irish Labour League, Carpenters' Hall, 75 Aungier Street, every Thursday at 8 p.m. Discussion on all subjects connected with Labour Question.

**Edinburgh (Scottish Section).**—4 Park Street. Meets every Thursday at 7.30 p.m. to transact business. Class for the study of 'Das Capital' at 8.30. (See "Open-air" below.)

**Glasgow.**—Reading-room of the Branch, 84 John St., open from 10 a.m. till 10 p.m. daily. Meeting of Members in Rooms on Sunday evening at 7 o'clock.

**Hamilton.**—Paton's Hall, Chapel St. Every Thursday at 7.30.

**Hull.**—Address all communications to E. Teesdale, 20 Shakspeare Street.

**Leicester.**—Addresses every Sunday morning on the Quay Jetty.

**Leeds.**—17 Chesham Street, Sweet Street. Club and reading room open every evening. Business meetings every Wednesday at 8 p.m.

**Leicester.**—Office of Hosiery Union, Horsefair Street. Fridays at 8 p.m.

**Norwich.**—Gordon Hall, 5 Duke Street. Free Lectures every Sunday at 8 p.m. Members' Meeting, Monday at 8. Speakers' Class, Sunday mornings at 10.30 and Wednesday evenings at 8 p.m. Social Evening, Saturdays.

**Oxford.**—Temperance Hall, 25½ Pembroke Street. Thursdays, at 8.30 p.m.

**Shields (North and South).**—Meetings every Sunday, Quay-side and Market Place. Branch meetings on Thursday nights at the "General Gordon," Bath Street, Maxwell Street, South Shields. Secretary, J. Hearne, 32 Clive Street, No. Shields.

## OPEN-AIR PROPAGANDA.

## LONDON—Sunday 17.

11.30...Garrett—"Plough Inn".....The Branch  
11.30...Hackney—"Salmon and Ball".....Graham  
11.30...Hoxton Ch., Pitfield St. ....Barker  
11.30...Mile-end Waste .....Lane  
11.30...Mitcham Fair Green .....Johnson & Eden  
11.30...Regent's Park .....Mainwaring  
11.30...Walham Green .....The Branch  
3 ...Hyde Park .....Nicoll  
3.30...Victoria Park .....Davis  
7 ...Clerkenwell Green .....Graham

## Tuesday.

8 ...Ossulton Street, Easton Road...Nicoll, Graham

## Wednesday.

8 ...Broadway, London Fields .....Sparling

## Thursday.

8 ...Hoxton, Pitfield Street .....The Branch

## PROVINCES.

**Edinburgh.**—Sunday: Queen's Park, 6.30 p.m.

**Leeds.**—Sunday: Hunslet Moor, 11; Vicar's Croft, 7.30. Friday: Corner of Christ Church, Meadow Lane, at 8 p.m.

**Norwich.**—Sunday: Market Place at 3.

**Diss.**—Sunday at 11.

## NORTH ENGLAND SOCIALIST FEDERATION.

## MEETINGS—JULY.

Fri. 15—Backworth, near Market, at 6 p.m.

Sat. 16—Dudley, 5 p.m. Blyth, 8 p.m.

Sun. 17—North Shields, 11 a.m. Sunderland Garrison Field, 3 p.m. South Shields, 6.30.

Mon. 18—Consett, 7 p.m.

On Sunday 24th, Mrs. Besant will lecture at South Shields. Time and place will be announced.

**NORWICH BRANCH.**—It was arranged at a meeting of members to have an outing in August, on Bank Holiday, to Cromer. Tickets 4s. 6d. each, including railway fare, dinner, and tea.

**SOUTH-WEST HAM RADICAL ASSOCIATION,** Congregational Schoolroom, Swanscombe Street, Barking Rd.—Wednesday Aug. 24, at 8 p.m. H. H. Sparling, "The Rebel Poetry of Ireland."

**WOOLWICH.**—Arsenal Gates, Sunday at 7 o'clock, J. L. Mahon.

## SOCIALIST LEAGUE GROCERY.

13 FARRINGTON ROAD, E.C.

THE STORE is open on Monday, Wednesday, and Saturday evenings from 8.30 till 10.30 p.m. All Grocery Articles can be had at current store prices, or where possible, under. All orders over 10s. will be delivered carriage paid in London.

## COMMON SENSE.

16 pp., crown 4to. ONE PENNY.

Published on the 15th of each month at the MODERN PRESS, 13 Paternoster Row, London.

PAMPHLETS JUST ISSUED, BY J. SKETCHLEY.

**The Irish Question: POLITICAL AND SOCIAL.** 32 pp., in Wrapper. Price Threepence.

**The Workman's Question: WHY HE IS POOR.** 24 pp., in Wrapper. Price Twopence. 6 or more copies post free.

Birmingham: J. Sketchley, 8 Arthur Place Parade.

**The Manifesto of the Socialist League.**

Annotated by E. Belfort Bax and William Morris. An exposition of the principles on which the League is founded. . . . 1d.

**Chants for Socialists.** By William Morris. . . . 1d.

**A Plea for Socialism.** By J. L. Mahon. . . . 1d.

**The Rights of Labour according to John Ruskin.** By Thomas Barelay. . . . 1d.

**Organised Labour: The Duty of the Trades' Unions in Relation to Socialism.** By Thomas Binning (London Society of Compositors). . . . 1d.

**The Labour Question from the Socialist Standpoint.** By William Morris. . . . 1d.

**Useful Work v. Useless Toil.** By William Morris. . . . 1d.

**The Commune of Paris.** By E. Belfort Bax, Victor Dave, and William Morris. . . . 2d.

**The Woman Question.** By Edward Aveling and Eleanor Marx-Aveling. . . . 2d.

**Art and Socialism.** By Wm. Morris. . . . 1d.

**The Aims of Art.** By Wm. Morris. . . . 1d.

Bijou edition, 3d.; Large paper, 1s.

Bijou edition, 3d.; Large paper, 6d.

Socialist League, 13 Farringdon Road, London, E.C.

Printed and Published by WILLIAM MORRIS and JOSEPH LANE at 15 Farringdon Road, London