

they give several quotations. The first, extracted from a report on "Diet in Prisons," and next, an extract from the *Manchester Weekly Times*, all showing, or rather pretending to show, the superior nutritive qualities of oatmeal, peas, and beans, etc., etc. Then follows some "Practical Illustrations," from which it appears that "in 1840 some experiments were instituted in Glasgow Prison on the diet of a selected number of inmates." This fare consisted of: "For breakfast each had eight ounces of oatmeal made into porridge, with a pint of butter milk; for dinner, three pounds of boiled potatoes with salt; for supper, five ounces of oatmeal porridge, with half-pint of butter milk. At the end of two months they were all in good health; each person had gained four pounds weight, and they liked the diet, the cost of which, including cooking, was *twopence three-farthings per day*." (The vegetarian capitalists charge sixpence for a dinner of three courses.) On the above diet they gained two pounds of flesh in the two months. "Twelve others were fed on the same allowance of porridge and milk for breakfast and supper as the first ten, but for dinner they had soup containing two pounds of potatoes to each, and a quarter of a pound of meat. At the end of two months they had lost in weight one and a quarter pounds each, and they all disliked the diet; the expense of each daily was threepence seven-eighths." They take the above from (where do you think, reader?) a 'Book of Scottish Anecdotes.' Then we get the following:

"*Experiment at the Boys' Home, Southwark.*—As was previously our custom, the boys are allowed to have porridge, cocoa, and bread *ad libitum* at these meals. For dinner they have haricot beans, baked potatoes, and jam turnover; pease-pudding, baked Spanish onions, and a lump of dates; lentil soup and tapioca pudding; or savoury pie and bread-pudding, with figs, apples, etc., occasionally.

"The night before our first month's trial began we weighed the boys on an accurate machine in their shirts, and we must confess we somewhat anxiously awaited the result at the end of the month, when they were weighed again. Out of the 150 boys in the Home only two had lost weight (about $\frac{1}{2}$ lb. in each case) and in one instance—a crippled youth—this could easily be accounted for. All the others had put on flesh even up to the amount of 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ lbs. in the month. This was very satisfactory, but not less so has been the very noticeable fact that a kind of after-dinner *ennui*, observable formerly on certain days, is now replaced by a healthy spontaneity every afternoon, both in work and study.

"This change has been introduced without the least friction, because all the boys know that we would not sanction a dietary unless we believed it was adapted for nourishment and contentment. Many of them, of course, retain their British confidence in the strength-imparting power of beef-steak, and good-humouredly twit us in their own funny way, but they are being surely convinced *propria persona* that one can be hearty and strong without animal food.

"The economical aspect of the matter is most important for one like myself, upon whom, under God, 250 boys are depending for all they need in life. We can give our elder lads in this branch—many of them big fellows of 15 and 16, wolfishly hungry after recent hardships on the streets—a nutritious and palatable dinner (as much as ever they care to have) at a cost of 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. per head."—J. W. C. FEGAN, from *The Rescue* (March, 1885), Organ of the Boys' Home, Southwark, London.

This is the latest capitalist dodge with which to gull the workers into lowering their already scanty standard of living. We are told we can save something if we become systematic vegetarians. Of course, while a few individuals take the advantage of a cheaper diet they may save a little, *if they are very economical*. But if the workers as a body were to do so, the "iron law" of wages would intervene, and then, alas! the old tale. They would find out that they had only made larger profits for the capitalist, and would only get as wages sufficient to enable the most skilled to buy vegetables; for the workers, as a body, what small portion of meat they are able to obtain now, would be a thing of the past.

Let the workers ignore these philanthropic twelve and fifteen per cent. capitalists, in the assurance that "he who would be free himself must strike the blow," and that it will not be struck by the very being whose interests are diametrically opposed to those for whom the blow must be given.

H. DAVIS.

FEASTING THE EXPLOITERS IN DUBLIN.—Our Colonial visitors have had a "high old time of it" here lately. Railways, that never gave poor school children's excursions better terms than return tickets at single fares, and then crammed them into the worst of third-class carriages, have placed saloon carriages and special trains *free* at the disposal of opulent Parsee, Buddhist, and Christian. Tramway companies gave special cars free who never gave a trip to a children's school. Special steamers, free hotels, "banqueting and junketing," and excursions, by exploiters to exploiters, have been the rule of the day. When will half-starved workers who supply all and get nothing open their eyes?—J. E. M'C.

The great millionaire and monopolist of South America (says the *Woman's Journal*, Boston,) is a woman, Madame Isadora Cousino. She owns vast tracts of land and the richest coal-mines in Chili, besides smelting-works, brick-kilns, and agricultural plantations of every description. She owns the whole of the town of Lota, and nearly all Coronel (seven or eight thousand inhabitants), and pays from 100,000 dols. to 120,000 dols. a month in wages in these two towns—most of which, however, comes back into her pocket through supply stores, where she sells food and clothing to her own people. In one of her plantations, a superintendent's time is occupied "in teaching the natives on the place how to operate labour-saving machinery." (How eagerly folk learn to sew their own shrouds!) Farming in Chili is feudal in nature, each estate having its retainers, who are given houses, etc., and are paid for their labour, and who are subject to their landlord in time of war. Madame has no taste for art, and no love of dress; horse-racing and diamonds are her amusements. She is, of course, an acute woman of business, and it is scarcely necessary to say that of all the beautiful places in her domains, she prefers as a pleasant abode the mining town of Lota, as dirty and smoky as any of its counterparts in Pennsylvania.—M. M.

SOCIALISM FROM THE ROOT UP.

CHAPTER X.—POLITICAL MOVEMENTS IN ENGLAND.

DURING the French Revolution, especially during its earlier stages there was a corresponding movement in England. It made some noise at the time, but was merely an intellectual matter, led by a few aristocrats—*e.g.*, the Earl of Stanhope—and had no sympathy with the life of the people; it was rather a piece of aristocratic Bohemianism, a tendency to which has been seen in various times, even our own. For the rest, there certainly was in England a feeling, outside this unreal republicanism—a feeling of which Priestly the Unitarian may be looked on as a representative; this feeling was of the nature of that felt by respectable and thoughtful Radicals of later days, and was distinctly bourgeois, as the other was aristocratic.

The French Revolution naturally brought about a great reaction, not only in absolutist countries, but also in England, the country of Constitutionalism; and this reaction was much furthered and confirmed by the fall of Napoleon and the restoration of the Bourbons in France. We may take as representative names of this reaction the Austrian Prince Metternich on the Continent and Lord Castlereagh in England. The stupid and ferocious repression of the governments acting under this influence, as well as the limitless corruption by which they were supported, were met in England by a corresponding progressive agitation, which was the beginning of Radicalism. Burdett and Cartwright are representatives of the earlier days of this agitation, and later on Hunt, Carlile, Lovett, and others. William Cobbett must also be mentioned as belonging to this period—a man of great literary capacity of a kind, and with flashes of insight as to social matters far before his time, but clouded by violent irrational prejudices and prodigious egotism; withal a peasant rather than a bourgeois—a powerful disruptive agent, but incapable of association with others. This period of Radical agitation was marked by a piece of violent repression in the shape of the so-called Peterloo Massacre, where an unarmed crowd at a strictly political meeting was charged and cut down by the yeomanry, and eleven people killed outright.¹

This agitation, which was partly middle-class and partly popular, was succeeded by the Chartist movement, which was almost exclusively supported by the people, though some of the leaders—as Feargus O'Connor and Ernest Jones—belonged to the middle-class. Chartism, on the face of it, was as much a political movement as the earlier Radical one; its programme was wholly directed towards parliamentary reform; but as we have said, it was a popular movement, and its first motive power was the special temporary suffering of the people, due, as we said in our last chapter, to the disturbance of labour caused by the growth of the machine industry; and the electoral and parliamentary reforms of its programme were put forward because it was supposed that if they were carried they would affect the material condition of the people directly: at the same time, however, there is no doubt that the pressure of hunger and misery gave rise to other hopes besides the above-mentioned delusion as to reform, and ideas of Socialism were current among the Chartists though they were not openly put forward on their programme. Accordingly the class-instinct of the bourgeoisie saw the social danger that lurked under the apparently political claims of the charter, and so far from its receiving any of the middle-class sympathy which had been accorded to the Radical agitation, Chartism was looked upon as *the enemy*, and the bourgeois progressive movement was sedulously held aloof from it. It is worthy of note that Chartism was mainly a growth of the midland and northern counties—that is, of the great manufacturing districts—and that it never really flourished in London. In Birmingham the movement had the greatest force, and serious riots took place there while a Chartist conference was sitting in the town. The movement gave birth to a good deal of popular literature; and it must be remembered that the press was very strictly controlled by the Government. No paper was allowed to be issued without a stamp, the expense of which prevented the issue of cheap papers; and one of the incidents of the struggle was the determined opposition to this law kept up by some courageous agitators, who published unstamped papers in the teeth of the certain imprisonment that awaited them.

The Chartist movement went on vigorously enough till the insufficiency both of its aims and of knowledge as to how to carry them out found out the weak places in it. The immediate external cause of its wreck was the unfortunate schism that arose between the supporters of moral force and physical force in the body itself. The fantastic folly of supposing that there can be any "moral force" in matters political which does not rest on the resolution of a party to attain their end by the use of what "physical force they may have, if it should become necessary to use it, does not call for much comment here; although some thoughtless persons may even at present *think* that they believe such a "moral force" exists. On the other hand, it is clear to us now that a Chartist revolt had no chance of success at that time, and but for self-deception would have been clear to both leaders and rank and file of the party then.

It may here be mentioned that the trump-card which the Chartists were always thinking of playing was the organisation of an universal strike, under the picturesque title of the Holy Month. In considering

¹ The readers of *Commonweal* will find an article on this subject in the first number (Feb. 1885), by our comrade E. T. Craig, who was in Manchester at the time, though not an eye-witness. It is interesting to note that the scene of the massacre, St. Peter's Fields, is now a mass of streets in the very centre of the city of Manchester.

the enormous difficulties, or rather impossibilities, of this enterprise, we should remember that its supporters understood that the beginnings of it would be at once repressed forcibly, and that it would lead directly to civil war.

The truth is that there were two distinct groups in the party, one of which went about as far as our ultra-Radicals of the present day; and another which was at heart Socialist, only deficient in knowledge, and consequently without definite principles on which to base action; and these two groups pretty much corresponded to the division between the supporters of moral and physical force.

From 1842, when the schism came to a head, Chartism began to die out. Its decay, however, was far more due to the change that was coming over the economical state of affairs than even to its incomplete development of principle and ill-considered tactics. Things were settling down from the dislocation caused by the rise of the great industries. The workers shared in the added wealth brought about by enormous expansion of trade, although in an absurdly small proportion to the share of the middle-classes; but those classes tended ever to become more numerous and more contented. The trades' unions began to be powerful, and improved the prospects of the skilled workmen. So-called co-operation began to flourish: it was really an improved form of joint-stockery, which could be engaged in by the workmen, but was and is fondly thought by some to be if not a shoeing-horn to Socialism at least a substitute for it; indeed Chartism itself at this time became involved in a kind of half co-operative half peasant-proprietorship land scheme, which of course proved utterly abortive.

As this improvement in the condition of the working-classes weakened that part of the life of Chartism which depended on mere hunger desperation, so the growing political power in the middle-classes and the weakening of the mere Tory reaction swallowed up the political part of its life.

Chartism, therefore, flickered out in the years that followed 1842, but its last act was the celebrated abortive threat at revolt which took place in April 1848. And it must be said that there was something appropriate in such a last act. For this demonstration was distinctly caused by sympathy with the attacks on absolutism then taking place on the Continent, and Chartism was always on one side of it a part of the movement which was going on all over Europe, and was directed against the reaction which followed on the French Revolution, and which was represented by the "Holy Alliance" of the absolutist sovereigns against both bourgeoisie and the people.

On the fall of Chartism, the Liberal Party, a nondescript and flaccid creation of bourgeois supremacy, a party without principles or definition, but a thoroughly adequate expression of English middle-class hypocrisy, cowardice, and short-sightedness, engrossed the whole of the political progressive movement in England, and dragged the working-classes along with it, blind as they were to their own interests and the solidarity of labour. This party has shown little or no sympathy for the progressive movement on the Continent, unless when they deemed it connected with their anti-Catholic prejudice. It saw no danger in the Caesarism which took the place of the corrupt sham Constitutionalism of Louis Philippe as the head of the police and stock-jobbing régime, which dominated France in the interests of the bourgeoisie, and hailed Louis Napoleon with delight as the champion of law and order.

Any one, even a thoughtful person, might have been excused for thinking in the years that followed on 1848 that the party of the people was at last extinguished in England, and that the class-struggle had died out and given place to the peaceable rule of the middle-classes, scarcely disturbed by occasional bickerings carried on in a lawful manner between the two parties to that false free-contract, which is the lying foundation on which Commercial Society rests. But, as we shall show in a future chapter, under all this, Socialism was making great strides and developing a new and scientific phase, which at last resulted in the establishment of the International Association, whose aim was to unite the workers of the world in an organisation which should consciously oppose itself to the domination of middle-class capitalism. The International was inaugurated in England in 1864, at a meeting held in St. Martin's Hall, London, and at which Professor Beesly took the chair. It made considerable progress among the Trades' Unions, and made a great impression (beyond indeed what its genuine strength warranted) on the arbitrary Governments of Europe. It culminated in the Socialistic influence it had, in the Commune of Paris, of which we shall treat in a separate chapter. The International did not long out-live the Commune, and once more for several years all proletarian influence was dormant in England, except for what activity was possible among the foreign refugees living there, with whom some few of the English working-men had relations. From this connection sprang, however, a new movement, which we must barely mention, though it cannot yet be considered a matter of history. In 1881, an attempt was made to federate the various Radical Clubs into a body, with a programme which, though for the most part merely Radical, had an infusion of Socialism in it, and which took the name of the Democratic Federation. The Radical Clubs, however, that had joined soon seceded, mostly from disagreement with the revolutionary attitude taken by the Federation on the Irish question. In 1883, the programme became more definitely Socialistic, and the next year the title was changed to that of the Social Democratic Federation; but in the last days of 1884 differences of opinion which had been developing for some time, chiefly centering on the questions of Parliamentary Opportunism and Nationalism, ended in a secession which founded the Socialist League as a definite Revolutionary Socialist body early in 1885.

At the present time the Socialist bodies, though relatively small, tend to attract various elements to them; the discontent of the workmen with an outlook of ever increasing gloom; that also of the Ultra-Radicals unable to make any real impression on the dense mass of mingled Conservatism and Whiggery, which really governs the country. The aspirations of thoughtful people who have studied the works of the great Socialist thinkers; the permeation of Socialist feeling from its centres on the Continent; and lastly and chiefly the steady march of events towards a new state of Society, which is making itself felt even amongst those who are unconscious of the advance of Socialism, or hostile to it—all these causes combining together, are forcing even England, the stronghold of middle-class domination, to pay attention to the subject, and will certainly before long form a new and powerful Party of the People, whose outlook will be far more hopeful than that of any of those we have told of; since its aim will no longer be partial or one-sided, but will be the realisation of a new Society with new politics, ethics, and economics, in short, the transformation of civilisation into Socialism.

E. BELFORT BAX AND WILLIAM MORRIS.

(To be continued).

CORRESPONDENCE.

MARSHALL & CO.

If a man hits me in the dark with a loaded bludgeon, he is scarcely justified in saying that it is not a personal attack, because he only strikes at me as a type of a class which he considers objectionable, and all whose members he may equally wish to attack.

Yet this is, morally, what your correspondents J. L. M. and T. M. have done in your issue of July 10. Their weapon is their pen, and it is loaded, though they may not know it, with falsehood.

They have put together a statement respecting the firm of Marshall & Co. in which (with the exception of one paragraph, the fourth, treating of a very small matter) every figure is erroneous, some to a ludicrous extent, and nearly every so-called "fact" about the firm is false.

The last paragraph of your correspondents' is a purely personal one. In these days it would be idle for any man who expresses an opinion on public affairs to complain of newspaper criticisms, or even to feel aggrieved by mis-statements of his views, actions, or intentions. Nor is it likely that even the kindly wishes of J. L. M. and T. M. will induce my brother to expatriate himself.

JOHN MARSHALL, Leeds.

[We shall be glad to print a statement from Mr. Marshall of the way in which the firm *did* deal with their work-people. This would be the best way of confuting our correspondents' statement.—EDITORS.]

RIOTS AND REVOLUTION.

In one of the last numbers of your paper one of your writers condemns riots as means of propagating our ideas and as a waymark for the coming Revolution. Likewise in the meeting on Friday in Arlington Hall one of your speakers spoke in the same sense, without giving any other reason than this, that the riots will not bring the revolution, which is as illogical as if any one would refuse to build his house with bricks or stones because one brick or one stone is not sufficient. It is a matter of historical fact that riots or other acts of force have been the precursors of all great social or political changes, and—what is of greater importance—that such acts and only such acts are what indicate to the people the way they have to go. If you condemn riots, who can say when the revolution will come that people shall take part in, or what is the mark or sign to distinguish between these two things? And what is revolution if not a series of revolts against the tyranny, which leads to one riot which is more important, and brings the cause to final victory? The bomb at Chicago has robbed us of eight of our best comrades, but has advanced us ten years nearer to the Revolution. You are right to say that one riot does not bring the Revolution, but it is your duty to make them oftener.

RUSSIAN ANARCHIST.

A DISGRACEFUL OUTRAGE AT A PUBLIC MEETING.

SIR,—Whilst standing amongst a large and orderly crowd which was being addressed by Socialist speakers on Sunday evening last at Clerkenwell Green, I was struck heavily on the upper part of the cheek by a thick piece of glass. The blow came with such force that for half a minute I was so stunned as to be conscious only of the sound it made, and became aware that I was hit only by feeling a dull pain, and by finding blood on the hand which I had raised in dazed fashion to my cheek. Had the missile struck me a half an inch higher up my eye would have been cut out; as it is I am glad to say that a slight shock and the loss of a little blood sums up the injury done.

Now, sir, I wish not to occupy your space with further reference to my own inconvenience, but to proceed to the most important consideration arising out of this matter, viz., that from the force with which the missile was thrown, and from the fact that it appeared to have been aimed at the speakers, near whom I stood, it is extremely probable that it was an attack on the Socialists themselves, made, probably, by some cowardly scoundrel in the employ of still more cowardly paymasters who fear the Socialists, cowardice, sir, being nearly always cruel and brutal. Putting aside the question of Socialism entirely, I must indignantly protest against such a contemptible and criminal assault on the right of citizens meeting together to discuss political questions—a right that, as that able historian, John Richard Green, has emphatically pointed out, dates among Anglo-Saxons back to the days of their primitive civilisation in their German homeland. In other words, the act I speak of is an attack on free speech. But a word of warning in the ears of the skulking hirelings who are the instruments of such attacks (I use the plural because word has since reached me of another such outrage), if they be once caught throwing stones at any English crowd earnestly bent on listening to a public speaker—be he Socialist, Liberal, or Conservative—it will go extremely hard with them. The real honest English temper is apt to rise fiercely against this method of tampering with public debate.

AN INDEPENDENT RADICAL.