

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

FRANK FAIRMAN.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

REVIEWS AND NOTICES.

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

E. B. B.

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

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