NOTES ON PASSING EVENTS.

The impudence of the propertied class finds utterance after every Bank Holiday. A batch of letters appears in the newspapers complaining of the inconvenience that men and women are put to, because of the first-class railway carriages being filled with lads and lasses of the working class. The working-class folks are fools enough to allow the stocks to have the monopoly of the best carriages for 50 days of the year, and yet a plaintive wail is sent up because they have sometimes to share them the remaining six. These impudent letters will not fail to make the people understand the greed and selfishness of their masters. Another complaint of the letters is that the workpeople are ill-mannered. Perhaps they are; so are their employers; but manners is but one of the many things the people are robbed of.

The North Metropolitan Tramway Company have made a net profit of £35,074 during the past half-year. This, in a very true sense of the word, blood-money. A shareholder, Mr. Guesdon, stated the working hours of the men to be sixteen a day. The chairman said it was only thirteen and a half. The men, it appears, are Mongolian about the cars for the two and a half hours referred to by the chairman, so that for all practical purposes the statement stands good that the working hours are sixteen. Such a working man may have no time of any kind for recreation, and that ultimately they are sent to their graves before their normal time. The way the company conducts its business shows nothing but profit is its object. The public conceptions are not considered. On the line from Easton to "Nag's Head" they increase their fares on Sundays: no extra pay is given to the men or extra food to the horses. On the line from Archway, Highgate to King's Cross, Transfer tickets are imposed which means that the public has to pay two fares on Sundays. These are but a few of the samples how they take advantage. Does any one seriously believe that a company that slowly murders its employees and that perpetrates such petty meanness on the public should be allowed to continue in such a course? It is time that the tramways were run in the interest of all.

Our opponents tell us that Socialism is impossible. I would ask them to meditate on the results that are taking place in every part of the world, and ask them if things can remain much longer as they are. From France, Belgium, Holland, United States, and Italy comes the same news of the people's rebellion against the tyranny of their oppressors. The monopolists have been having a quiet time of it for a good many years past, but now they are beginning to shake in their shoes. We urge on the workers to join the Socialist party; not pacific riots, but a revolution. We can start with the monopolists; the rioters merely change them. Riots probably do more harm than good to the cause of the people. Only the revolution that abolishes capitalists and landlords, and makes an organized people in their place, will make a change good for all.

It is stated that every three years there is created in this country a limited liability stock to the amount of the national debt. Usury is of course paid upon this immense sum, so one hardly need wonder how it is that in spite of the enormous annual increase of wealth in this country the workers remain poor. The increase goes into the pockets of the usurers.

A. D.

On Wednesday appeared an abstract of the report of the Commission on the Depression in Trade, which, however, was repudiated the next day. In fact the report according to the account given was so bad, that it did look as if an embittered desire of the Socialist joker; yet it is by no means so sure that it did not contain the gist of the genuine report somewhat denuded of its raiment of verbiage. After all there would be nothing wonderful in the Somerton Commissioners being at the bottom of the people taking care never to study economy except from the point of view of the most worn-out bourgeois theories; ignorance is an essential of their position as Commissioners. Also as they confess they do nothing they think it matters little what they say. Yet for one item I wonder what this solemn farce costs the country!

It has been suggested that the Liberal members shall revenge themselves on Lord Randolph Churchill for his truculent address to the electors of Paddington, by raising and leaving the house in a body as soon as he begins to speak for the first time. This is a bad idea, but such protests might be organised in a more complete manner, each one, for instance, of these protesting members might be brought into business, turn, and a similar movement might be directed as the delinquency, rating, fighting, lying, or what not; which would make a lively time of it in the house. Perhaps the very best organisation would result in each member so protesting against himself, walking out of the house and not coming back again. There would be many dry eyes at these departures.—W. M.

SOCIALISM FROM THE ROOT UP.

CHAPTER IX.—THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION IN ENGLAND.

In our last two chapters we had to deal with a revolution which was as vivid in dramatic interest, and as obvious so, as any period in the history of the world. We have now to note a series of events the well-spring of which was Great Britain. This series is not usually connected by modern historians so as to be dignified by the name of Revolution; but such events might be organised in a more complete manner, each one, for instance, of these protestating members might be brought into business, turn, and a similar movement might be directed as the delinquency, rating, fighting, lying, or what not; which would make a lively time of it in the house. Perhaps the very best organisation would result in each member so protesting against himself, walking out of the house and not coming back again. There would be many dry eyes at these departures.—W. M.

In the last chapter wherein the condition of England was dealt with, we left it a prosperous country, in the ordinary sense of the word, under the rule of an orderly constitution. There was no need here for the violent destruction of aristocratic privilege; it was of itself melting into money-privilege, and all was getting ready for the most perfect and securest system of the plunder of labour which the world had yet seen. England was free in the bourgeois sense; that is, there were but a few chores, the survival of the saucer periods, to interfere with the exaction of the tribute which labour has to pay to property to be allowed to live. In a word, on the one hand exploitation was veiled; on the other, the owners of property had no longer to perform in return for the above-said tribute. Nevertheless, all this had to go on on a small scale for a while. Population had not increased largely since the beginning of the seventeenth century; agriculture soon lost its predominating influence as the means of life. Great Britain was a bad idea; it did look as if it might have been due to the conflict of the two worlds, England, the working-classes were not hard pressed, and could not yet be bought and sold in mass. There were no large manufacturing towns, and no large manufacturing towns were passed. So, the general principle of the main body of the working-class, was worked up, rather than the means for working it mechanically—fuel, to wit.—gave a manufacturing character to this or that country-side. It was, for example, the sheep-peasantry of the North of England, the Yorkshire hills; the North of England, the Yorkshire hills; the marriage of the neighbours of the northern Bradford a weaving country. Its namesake on the Wiltshire Avon was in those days at least as important a centre of the clothing trade, as the North of England. The docks of London were as great for the export of freight as the port of the Channel, and Hampshire kerrys, Whitney blankets and Chipping Norton tweeds, meant sweet grass and long wool, with a little water-power to turn the fulling-mills, and not coal, to which material to be worked up was to be brought from the four quarters of the globe. The apparent con-
dition of labour in these days seems almost idyllic, compared with what it now is: but it must be remembered that then as now the worker was in the hands of the monopolist of land and raw material; nor was it easier then to have the freedom of the individual for a hundred years without applying some system by which it could be made the most of. Between the period of the decay of the craft-gilds and the period of the growth of the liberal system of the trade unions, there had grown up an independent system of labour which could not have been applied to the medieval workmen; for they worked for themselves and not for a master or exploiter, and thus were masters of their material and their tools and their trade. The growth of this system began to be a power in the life of the community, the force of the working class, and the unit of labour is not an individual man, but a group, every member of which is helpless by himself, but trained by constant practice to the repetition of a set task. So the growth of the trade unions acquires great precision, and is seen in its performance. In short, each man is not so much a machine as a part of a machine. As, for example, it takes five men to make a glass-bottle: it is the group of these men that makes the bottle, not one man. It is clear that under this system the individual workman is entirely at the mercy of his master the capitalist in his capacity of superintendent of labour: in order not to be crushed by him, he must combine to oppose his own interests to those of his employer. It was by this system, then, that the demands of the growing world-market were supplied down to the end of the eighteenth century. The great political economist, Adam Smith, whose book was first published in 1771, marks the beginning of the revolution between this system and that of the great machine industries; but his work implies throughout the Division of Labour system.

The first stage was now to melt into the new one: the workman, from being a machine, was to become the auxiliary of a machine. The invention of the spinning-jenny by Hargreaves in 1760 is the first symptom of the beginning of this Industrial Revolution. From hence to 1800 a hundred years, and at the end of those days, the stream of invention has been continuous. The discovery that iron could be made with pitch-coal removed the seat of the iron manufacturers from the mineral regions and brought the old iron-works, called "bloomers," used to be carried on, to the northern and midland coal districts, and all manufacture of any importance flowed to the seat of fuel; so that South Lancashire, for instance, in 1790, had been made a manufacturing county with a few market towns and the ancient manufacturing city of Manchester, into a district where the "villagers," still so called, but with populations of 500,000, and 1,000,000, are quite as much continuous, and the country has all but disappeared. Of course a great part of this is the work of the years that have followed on the invention of railways; but even in the earlier period of this industrial revolution the change was vast. The factories were now spreading into the new manufacturing districts, and soon to be everywhere. For a very great, as no attempt was made to alleviate the distress that was sure to be caused by the change from the use of human hands to machinery. It had been made in a country governed by bourgeois constitutionalism until measures were actually forced on the government. In 1811 the prevailing distress was betokened by the first outburst of the Luddites. They were organized bands of men who went about breaking up the machinery, and which to a large extent were the immediate cause of their want of employment and consequent starvation. The locality where these riots were most frequent was the northern midland district, more especially the hackney-factories, and the towns of Manchester, as it is often called, which has been described as "the Manchester of the Middle Ages" by Carlyle. In 1816, the year which followed the peace with France, the results of all the war industries threw more people still out of employment, and in addition the harvest was a specially bad one. As a consequence, this Luddite insurrection was especially violent in that year. The riots were put down with considerable violence, and the rioters punished with the utmost harshness. But as times mended somewhat this insurrection, which, as we have said, a mere matter of hunger, was founded on no principle, died out, although for time riots having for their object destruction of property, especially of the plant and stock of manufacturers, went on through the whole of the first half of the century.1 In the middle of the Chartist agitation, may be taken for an example of these.

It was a necessary consequence of the introduction of elaborate machinery by children and women who were employed in factories to diminish the number of adult males. This resource for the development of the profits of the new system was used by the manufacturers with the utmost recklessness, till at last it became clear to the bourgeois government that the scandal created by its abuse would put an end to its use altogether, unless something were done to pollute its immediate evils; and accordingly a series of Factory Acts were passed with increasing stringency, and an incessant and despairing resistance on the part of the capitalists, who grudged the actual drawback to their trade, which resulted in the hampering of the "rearing trade" they were driving, even though it were for the ultimate benefit of their class. The first Factory Act was passed in 1833, after a struggle of years unrelieved by success, and they were consolidated finally in 1857. It should be understood that these Acts were not intended to benefit the great mass of adult workers, but were the outcome of the outcry of the philanthropists at the condition of the women and children so employed.

Meanwhile, in spite of all the suffering caused by the Industrial Re-
we have just noted, shall force them into a revolt against it. In the course of that revolt this great middle-class will in its turn be absorbed into the proletariat, which will form a new Society in which classes will have ceased to exist. This is the next Revolution, as inevitable, as inexorable, as the rising of to-day.

R. BELFORT BAX AND WILLIAM MORRIS

(To be continued.)

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE EMIGRATION OF CAPITALISTS.

Sin.—Rounding your article upon the exodus of Marshall and Co., of Leeds, to America, has caused me to indite this letter to you. Of course, as a capitalist, I do not sing the praises of the working-men in the latter of the two letters, or the work of the American capitalists in the former; but as I am now in a splenetic mood, in consequence of being cut out in business by an opposition firm, I will favour you with my views upon the acrimonious arguments of Marshall and the capitalist, in those other denominations, talk of taking themselves and capital out of the country.

Looking as though that of the British Empire, to which Burma has by Divine interposition been added, I was vastly and yet undeveloped field for the enterprise and business capacity of the British capitalist. Already the mild Hindoo has succeeded to "superior methods of production," and instead of letting his children waste their time in play, as they were wont before the advent of British civilization, they are now employed on the cotton mills, spinning the sole of the Lancashire before the detected Factor Act, the repeal of which I am now desirous of having your lordship nearly the same as in the case of the counties of the same description. Being heathens, moreover, they work on Sundays, and although, as a Christian, I must lament that they are foredoomed to eternal torments, they are indispensable as a labourer in a country where the supply of this commodity is simply enormous. Shaftesbury seriously nascent the stability of our commerce when he interfered in the matter. Happily he is removed to a better sphere, and prevented from introducing more harmful restrictions on the labour.

But to return to Marshall and Co. Now, next to the plastic, unresisting Hindoo, or the West Indian cooies and the patient rent-rendering Egyptian fellaheen, I place for docility the average British worker, and why a firm which I had occasion to come from as raw material should voluntarily emigrate to a country infested with strikers, Socialists, and boysters, posses my comprehension.

You, sir, could never have thoroughly studied the character of the English people, the essence of their being, but happily hopeless endeavours to stir up disunion between the workmen and the capitalist amply illustrate the spirit of local patriotism of the British worker, both past and present, I am lost in astonishment and admiration. Working 70, 80, and 100 hours per week, he has produced the wealth of which we are now in possession, and has voluntarily sacrificed all the results of our teaching and our wars, then has the British son of toil serving as soldier, marine, or sailor, bled and died for the advancement of the nation's interests, and the glory of this great Empire. In return he asks for little, satisfied with his scars and stumps he returns to a grateful country, from which he might as well a pirate from his bloody loot, or still better, the mildly apertent temperance drinks now offered him at a slight, far too slight, price, by religious and benevolent friends. He replies to his blunders theories of mad agitators with a simple blow of his sturdy mainhand, on buses with which his weight of iron common sense, if your pests point knowingly to the emporium, as of evidence of inequality in distribution, and the whole class; and if the complexion of the simple Londoner, France might also have never enjoyed the blessings of the Napoleonic régime, he had not thrown himself into the breach against the levelling Socialistic Republic, and if the flag of religion, he has in the exalting loyalty hated military etiquette, and killed and spoiled on his own account, he has his bare hand to the back, and bowed obediently to his pastors and masters.

To-day he adds Burma and Egypt to his laurels, and pays uncomplaining the cost of the imperial aggression of England, and the last battle of the British, the voluntary emigration of the Burmese and the Egyptians.

Now as a matter of fact, the existing distinction between a commonplace Conservative and a commonplace Liberal is one of name and name only. I defy any one to show me where the Conservative in his politics is not based upon the same principles as the Liberal, and where his principles are not based upon the same principles as the Liberal. We have here, Sir, the two forms of the same animal, the two forms of the same dog. Look upon these two, Sir, and see if you can find in them a point of difference other than name.

Admiral

THE COMMONWEAL

August 14, 1886.

Another Socialist Prosecution.

On August 6 Thomas E. Wardle and J. Allman appeared at Marylebone Police Court at two o'clock to answer to summonses taken out against them for an obstruction committed at the meeting of the Political League held in Soho Square on the 10th inst., and which was attended by the members of the League and others at the corner of Waltherton and Fornhead roads. They found the magistrate had gone to lunch and had to arrange the court-house lobby until "his wussup" had been fed. At last the defendants' names were called. The magistrate, Mr. Cooke, wished to put both defendants up, but, on a protest from Wardle, he was ordered out separately. There were four witnesses for the prosecution—two policemen, X 382 and X 10, a draper (Aptev), and a queer-looking little chemist (Lindsay). There was that it was a great occasion and as no Labour party could have consented to hear the defendant Wardle, although both foot-passengers and vehicles were able to pass by. The little chemist said the noise of the speaking voice was laughable, but the crowd of beggars had seemed to define an "open space." The constable glanced blankly at the defendant and after a few seconds' pause, then closed his mouth and answered X 10 to say that he could not do so. I was under the impression that prompting witnesses was not permitted, but from what I observed at Hoxton I see the police are willing to make an exception. The little chemist was a Mr. Lindsay whom we heard Wardle speak on 31st ult. Wardle, however, protested as he did not speak at the place on that date. The complaint of Aptev the draper was one of an obstruction of the exercise of public functions, a demand that they interfered with his trade. I am unable to see, even if an increase in the number of spectators and of people waiting in the crowd might be a public benefit, because what he did not sell some other dealer would, and it is as likely as not that the other drapers would give the public a quicker bargaining line, and perhaps a finer quality of linen, and a glance at the area of the space. This is clearly the most important part of the case, because if the space is 16,000 square feet, as stated by the counsel, and 399 policemen are required to keep order, it is not to be expected that the question would not allow the question to be put. It seems to me the lunch must have somewhat surprised that magistrat's mind, and that our witnesses have been alleged to have nothing to do with the case. Several witnesses appeared for the defence, and showed that there was no obstruction whatever that owing to their presence and the presence of a large number of persons would be required to fill up the roadway altogether. Mr. Cooke then adjourned the case, for the "public convenience"—which means one of two words, either the lunch hour or the arriving of the gentleman anxious to dine, or he thought he would wait and see the judgment on Mainstreet and the Middlesex Session. It may be found on either of these grounds I for one am at a loss to know. A. K. D. 
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