they give several quotations. The first, extracted from a report on “Diet in Prisons,” and next, an extract from the Manchester Weekly Times, is an account of the improvements made by the superintendent of the Penitentiary in Pennsylvania, for breakfasting, which had eight ounces of oatmeal made into porridge, with a pint of batter milk; for dinner, three pounds of boiled potatoes with salt; for supper, peas and potatoes with a glass of punch. At the end of two months they were all in good health; each person had gained four pounds of weight, and they liked the diet, the cost of which, including cooking, was tenpence three-farthings per day. (The vegetables were bought of the middle-class grocers for a hunger of the three courses, and the meat was supplied by the prison board.

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 the first ten days they were eating containing two pounds of potatoes to each, and a quart of a pound of meat. At the end of two months they had lost in weight one and a quarter pounds each, and they disliked the diet; the expense of one hundred and fifty pounds in that way, for a dinner of three courses, and the meat was supplied by the prison board.

(where you do, reader) a "look of Scottish Anecdotes." Then we get the following:

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

Right before our last 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. One hundred boys in the House had only two had lost weight (about 1 lb. in each case) and in one instance—a crippled youth—this could each boy account for. In the House the boys on this allowance gained flesh even at the rate of about 3½ 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, observably prevalent of late, is now broken by a healthy symptomity every afternoon, both in work and study.

This change has been introduced without the least friction, because all the boys knew 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 preferences in the strengthening course of beef and goose, and good-humouredly twist it in their own funny way, but they are being surely convinced proprius persona that one can be hearty and strong without unnatural 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. To provide for them 100 lbs. of beef, 15 and 16, wantonly hungry after recent hardships on the streets—a notorious fact, now the boys are not obliged to have bread, and 1 lb. of meat per head. —J. W. C. FROGAN, from The Times (March, 1850), 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 from half a皇冠 to one pound a week; but if the whole community were to do so, or to do 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 such as were the most skillful to the workmen 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 this philanthropist twelve and fifteen per cent. on their wages, and the assurance that he who would be free 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.

II. DAVIES.
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SOCIALISM FROM THE ROOT UP. CHAPTER II.—POLITICAL MOVEMENTS IN ENGLAND.

During the French Revolution, especially during its earlier stages it might perhaps be said that a corresponding movement was taking place in this country, but 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 Bolshewism, a mere effort to exploit the middle-class and retain the sway of the property. But if we look at what has been going on since the rest, there certainly was in England a feeling, outside this unreal republicanism—a feeling of which Priestly the Unitarian may be looked upon as representative; a feeling that felt that 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, uniting as it did the Reformers, the Radicals, and the Constitutionalists; and this reaction was much furthered and confirmed by the fall of Napoleon and the restoration of the Bourbons in France. M. Louis Blanc was as representative as names of this reaction the Austrian Prince Metternich; and the French government, as the Lord Conservatism. 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 Radicals. Burdett and Cartwright are representatives of the earlier days of this agitation, and later on Hunt, Carlos, Lovett, and others. William Cobbett must also be mentioned in connection with this period; he was a fine type of a practical politician, with a capital of a good heart, and with flasks of insight as to social matters far before his time, but clouded by violent irrational prejudices and prodigious egotism, which made him appear in the eyes of his contemporaries as a monarchist, 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 legal meeting was charged and cut down by the yeomanry, and eleven people killed outright.

This agitation, which was partly middle-class and partly popular, was succeeded, however, by the Chartism, which was 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 have said above, in the chapter, to the economic conditions of growth of the manufacturing 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 sufferings 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-institution 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 it had been met with. Chartism was looked upon as the enemy, and the bourgeois progressive movement was sedulously held aloof from it. It is noteworthy of Chartism that it was wholly a working-class movement, and it was led by the greatest 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 the government considerable trouble; 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 un-stamped papers in the teeth of the most 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 its structure. There was a certain strain among the Chartists, which 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 like this is as absurd as it does not really matter which end is put to 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 thoughtlessly supposed it may even of present think that they exist. 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 the followers.

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. 1850), by our comrades E. T. Craig, who was in Manchester at the time, though not an eye-witness. It is interesting to note that the Commetan movement, 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 may rather understand the beginnings of it would be at once repressed forcibly, and that it would lead directly to civil war.

It is true that there were two distinct groups in the party, one of which went 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 that these two parties corresponded to the division between the supporters of moral and physical force.

From 1842, when the Chartist came to a head, Chartism began to die out. There was a sort of lull, for a number of years, before a new series of events came over the economical state of affairs than even to its incomplete development of principle and ill-considered tactics. Things were settling down from the dissolution caused by the rise of the moderate middle classes which had been added to it by the dislocation of trade, and the agitation of the mass of the people, by the extension of trade, although in an abnormally small proportion to the share of the middle classes; but those classes tended ever to become stronger and more contented. The trade 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-stocking, which could be engaged in by the workmen, and was not only 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-operative half-pauperist-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 swelled up the political part of its life.

Chartism, therefore, flickered out in the years that followed 1842, but the Trades' Unions resolution that had been passed in 1840, and 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 fought 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. It 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 faceless creation of bourgeois supremacy, a party without principles or definition, is a thoroughly adequate and representative class which represents the division between the middle classes of the English working movement in England, and drugged the working-classes along with it, as they were to their own interest 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 was in no danger in the Cestrian which took the place of the corrupt show Constitutionalism of Louis Philippe as the head of the police and stock-jobbing régime, which dominated France in the interests of the hopelessly and muddily called 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 1848 that the party of the people would be suppressed, and the working classes of France which had died out and given place to the peaceable rule of the middle classes, scarcely disturbed by occasional bickerings carried on in a low key and far from the world, in which the middle classes were, 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 Organization, whose aim was to unite the workers of the world in an organisation which should consciously oppose itself to the domination of middleclasses, a movement which was inaugurated in England in 1851, at a meeting held in St. Martin's Hall, London, and at which Professor Beccy took the chair. It made considerable progress among the Trades' Unions, and made a great impression (beyond what is generally supposed) on the working movement in England and Europe. It culminated in the Socialistic influence it had, in the Commune of Paris, of which we shall treat in a separate chapter. The other socialists were, of course, fighting 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 of the few English working-men had relations. Frederick Engels, near whom Beccy lived, told us he had an attack on the Socialists themselves, made, probably, by some cowardly assailed in the employ of still more cowardly papers; and, as such, was the result of the question. In 1883, the programme became more definitely Socialistic, and the next year the title was changed to that of the Social Democratic Federation. The action of 1851 had been followed by a voluntary union, the1883, which had been developing for some time, chiefly centering on the question of Parliamentary Opportunity and Nationalism, ended in a conference which founded the Social League as a definite Revolutionary Socialist body early in 1883.

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 Conservatives and Whigs, which governs the country. The aspirations of thoughtful people who have studied the works of the great Socialist thinkers; the permission of Socialism feeling from its centres on the Continent; and lastly, the steady march of events towards a new state of the world, 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 England of the middle classes, to become Socialists, and make their way. In the Socialists' aim will not be longer divided or unsatisfied, will be the realization of a new wave of new political, ethics, and economics, and in short, the transformation of civilization into Socialism.

William Morris and William Morris,

TO BE CONTINUED.

CORRESPONDENCE.

MARSHALL & CO.

If a man hits me in the dark with a loaded bleudgen, I am hardly justified in saying that it is not a personal attack, because he only strikes at me I may equally wish to attack.

Yet this is, morally, that your correspondents J. L. M. and T. M. have done, 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 showing 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 many rates are presented without the slightest reason.

The last paragraph of your correspondents is a purely personal one. In these days it would be fair for any man who expresses an opinion on public policy, to be forced to state his name; and, therefore, the wishes of J. L. M. and T. M. will undoubtedly be enforceable.

JOHN MARSHALL, Leeds.

[We shall be glad to print a statement from Mr. Marshall of the way in which the firm of Marshall & Co. will be the best way of confusing our correspondents' statement.—Eds.]

RIOTS AND REVOLUTION.

In one of the last numbers of your paper one of your writers condemned riots as means of propugating our ideas and as a way of bringing about 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 bring the revolution, which is as logical as if one would refuse to build his house with bricks or stones because one brick or one stone is not suitable. It is the fringe of revolution, since all its acts have been the precursors of all great social or political changes, and—what is of greater importance—that such acts only and such acts alone are sufficient to the people who have them—such as we have in Ireland—to say what will the revolution come that will cause the open rebellion and that will be the desired result of all the revolution, which is the sole means to the end of social revolution, and which will bring the one, which means the final overthrow of the old régime. These are the wishes of J. L. M. and T. M. and will undoubtedly be enforceable.

No.731, 87/-.

A DISAPPEARCE ORGATE AT A PUBLIC MEETING.

Sir,—While 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 wood or stone. The blow came with such suddenness that I was 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 self-defence 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 damage.

Now, sir, I wish not to occupy your space with further reference to my address, and only wish to protest against such disgraceful means of attacking those who were making a point 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 me, there was no question of civil war in the Volunteer, which was the last thing I intended, nor did I use any such language, nor did I cry out at the question of Socialist issues, merely Radical, had an infusion of Socialism in it, and which took the name of the Democratic Federation. The Radical Clubs, however, which had joined soon seceded, mostly from disagreement with the revolutionists, and the question was left to a new question. In 1883, the programme became more definitely Socialistic, and the next year the title was changed to that of the Social Democratic Federation. The action of 1851 had been followed by a voluntary union, the, which had been developing for some time, chiefly centering on the question of Parliamentary Opportunity and Nationalism, ended in a conference which founded the Social League as a definite Revolutionary Socialist body early in 1883.

An Exponent of Radical