A. CONSTITUTIONAL

Mr. Foote says similar remedies to Socialism have been offered by society for the last 2000 years. Mr. Foote does not mean to say that 2000 years ago Society was altogether different from what it is to-day— that land nationalisation was not asked for, because the community was not univerally rich and wealthy in one place. The great increase in population and overwork in factories did not occur, because there were no factories; and exchange gambling did not exist because there were no stock exchanges. The reign of capitalists has existed little over a century; but the changes in our social conditions are in human progress. It is possible that much may have come before its time. Had social doctors advocated Socialism 2000 years ago, they would have had 2000 years in advance of the age, and of Mr. Foote's observation.

Mr. Foote writes: "Even if the ultimate form of Society will be Socialism, we shall fail to see much use in anticipating it." I fail to understand the sentence, but must point out that Socialists don't profess to know what Socialism is, or what the next form will be. What they do say is that the next form will be Socialism, and that the men and women who live under that regime will be happier than the present generation, because their "eloquent" and "learned" critics tell us that they can produce a commodity of greater value at less cost." Put intelligibly, the object of the capitalist is to make profit, and the way it is done is by getting men to work and paying them for only a portion of their labour; the balance is retained, and this balance is profit. Socialists assert that as the workers have a portion—how much does not matter—of their labour taken without payment, they have been robbed of it. The writer Mr. Foote deals with the argument as follows:—We deny it, and protest that calling names will not settle an economical problem.

Mr. Foote is surprised at the statement that the portion of labour unappropriated to the worker is the clue to the essence of Socialism. Mr. Foote says the figures given are simply preposterous, and backs up the assertion by telling us that Mrs. Besant confesses capital with skill. After this, Mr. Foote tells us "that the value of our society is what is not irremediable; and so the "able editor" goes on stringing words together. We are supplied with the Socialist's estimate of Mill: "He is an eccentric person, who may be forced to the barrel. What should be done with an "able editor" that goes on like this? Later on we are told that drawing a razor across the throat would cure small-pox! This kind of stuff may suit some of Mr. Foote's "Freethinking authorities" but will not do for Socialists.

We have a considerable part of the critique dealing with competition. Mr. Foote tells us life is a battle. The Socialist is quite awake to the fact that interest is a necessity of life, and hence he advises his fellows not to fight one another, as well as Nature. Let them rather co-operate and procure with the least possible expense.

Here are two definitions of civilisation given by Mr. Foote: (1) "Life is a battle, but civilisation consists, and must long consist, in transferring the battle from the bloody field to the brain." (2) "Civilisation is cooperation; we believe in it, and we wish to see it extended." These definitions show conclusively that the "able editor's" thoughts are confined to an unusual extent. What is Socialism but universal cooperation? Here, then, can Mr. Foote believe in cooperation? Perhaps he can. After all, the word cooperation is used by Mr. Foote in the second definition evidently in the wide sense of the word that makes it synonymous with Socialism. Not forced cooperation, however, but a free co-operation—this can be a mixed simile taken from the hot-house; a forced plant has to grow just as much as one that is not forced, the only difference being in the greater or less rapidity of the growth, and Mr. Foote may note that if theforced plant grows rapidly, they will all do in spite of the fact that he prefers "co-operation that grows."

Mr. Foote is a Land Nationalist and an anti-Monopolist, and thinks that he can be so logically without being a Socialist. I understand that with Mr. Foote's talent for drawing inferences, his grounds for believing in Land Nationalisation may be rather queer. The usual argument is that as land is necessary for man's existence, the community should prevent anyone appropriating the soil, because by doing the appropriators have in their power the lives of the landless men. It is a necessity like land, those who appropriate it have a similar right to the other. This was claimed by the Jacobins, who at first only had a right to use the land, but when dealt with, man's freedom is but partly realised; to complete it, capitalists must be dealt with in a like manner. There is no logical backing-ground between land nationalisation and Socialism.

Mr. Foote's arguments are rather weak, throws out some insinuations as to the sincerity of Socialists. "Socialism is the evangel of the 'sweet by-and-bye.' Probably some will be content with that, but not great men. They cannot glymph of the present day. They can preach their Gospel without any sacrifice." I merely point out this piece of innuendo as an illustration of the kind of stuff that does duty as a criticism of Socialism.

In conclusion, I must not fail to note a very curious saying of Mr. Carlyle, preserved by Mr. Foote, which, somehow or another, he thinks applies to Mrs. Besant: "We see what we bring eyes to see with.

When Carlyle made this remarkable observation Mr. Foote does not say. Perhaps when he was a baby, but how it applies to Mrs. Besant I fail to see. I think Mr. Foote should stick to the subject. Mr. Foote and Aaron hear not the wonderful yarns that are told of them, and so Mr. Foote has no fear of an exposure; but when he talks nonsense about Socialism he will find that Socialists are still in the habitude of the living.

A. K. DONALD.

Chapter VII—The French Revolution: Constitutional Stage.

The bankruptcy towards which France was staggering under the regime of an untaxed privileged noblesse drove the Court into the hands of Jacobi, who, after some years, with the aid of the Cortes, made efforts to carry on the old corruption by means of mere financing operations, under Calonne and others, aided by an assembly of the noblesse, the existing tax-collectors. But in 1758, on the 4th of May, summoned to the States-General, a body which was very much analogous to a Parliament of our medieval kings, that is a kind of tax-making machine, but which attempted to sell its granting of taxes to the king for redress of certain grievances. This States-General had not met since 1614. Bickering between the three houses, Clergy, Noblesse, and Commons, immediately began, but the latter, which was middle-class in spirit though including some of the lower nobility, gave tokens of its coming predominance from the first. On the 20th of June the Court attempted a coup d'état, and the Third Estate held its celebrated session in the Tennis Court, and this was followed by the votation and the elevation of the Third Estate into the National Assembly," the Court making but a feeble resistance at the time.

It, nevertheless, was contemplating forcible measures against what had now become the National Assembly; when on this 14th June came the first stroke of the popular insurrection which the bourgeoisie began by accepting as an ally of its revolution, which so far had gone only on constitutional lines; this was the taking of the Bastille by the people of the Rue St. Louis; and the next day the National Assembly selected the Provost of the merchants. The Court gave way at once; the king visited Paris as a sign of submission, and certain of the higher nobility fled the coming ruin. The monarchy was so weakened by the example of the people that a smashing blow fell upon the feeble Bourgeoisie of the country, and armed peasants everywhere burned the chateaux or country-houses of the gentlemen, and hunted away their occupants. The support of the people was necessitated by the great confiscation of all industry, and the scarcity was bitterly felt everywhere.

In the midst of this the Court, recovering from the first blow of the taking of the Bastille, began to plot counter-revolution. A rapporteur was sent from Versailles to Rouen or elsewhere, and putting him at the head of a reactionary army and an opposition reactionary assembly. A banquet given by the Court to a regiment supposed to be loyal, practically an army against the victorious assembly, the Provost of the merchants, the king went to Paris and took up his abode at the Tuileries. In this affair the mere Sansculotte element became very obvious. It was stirred up by the artificial flame caused by the financial and stock-jobbing operations of the Court and of the financiers; the popular middle-class Ministers, had been reduced to the immediate cause of it by his issue of small paper money. And it was opposed by the Bourgeois soldeiy, the National Guard, headed by Lafayette, who was the very embodiment of the Constitutional Revolution. The further growth of the National Guard, and its higher bourgeoisie from France, which, as it were, gave a token of the complete victory of Constitutionalism over the Court party.

By this time the king was again an object of the strongest bourgeois, apparently unconscious of its extreme hopelessness; while the bourgeoisie Government for its part was quite prepared to put down any popular movement, all the more so it gave a formidable army of the Sansculottes. But by this time there had arisen a kind of People's Parliament outside the Assembly, the famous Jacobins Club and the Cordellier Club to war, and the sky was darkening over for triumphant Constitutionalism.

That triumph was celebrated by the great feast of the Champ de Mars, July 13th, 1790, when the king in the presence of delegates from all France swore to the Constitution. But this was not the same, and to the Hungarian. The picture of the flight of the king to the northern frontier, where were the remains of what regular army could be depended on, with the threatening Austrian and Spanish armies at their back. And as a last blow, which came as far as St. Cloud, announcing his determination as a matter of course; but he was stopped by a mixed crowd not wholly the bourgeoisie, though Lafayette did his best to help royalty turned respectable, in the pinch. At last on the 20th June, the king and queen finally made the
THE DEAD TO THE LIVING.

(From Ferdinand Fizelle, Translated by J. L. Jones.)

With bullets through and through our breast—our forehead split with spike and spear.

So bear us onward shoulder-high, laid dead upon a blood-stained bier; 
yea, shoulder-high before the crowd, and let them see that bade us die.

Our dreadful death-distressed face may be a bitter curse for ever.

That he may see it day and night, or when he wakes, or when he sleeps,

That ever like a scorching brand that sight his secret soul may burn; 

That he may never escape its curse, nor know to whom for aid to turn;

Nor give it to the fool or wise, but let it be the scorn of all mankind.

And brood above his blood, and curse all his blood with fear;

That every soul which round his bloodrove may curse it in reprobate,

And every clenched and stiffened fist be shaken o'er his dying head—

Yes, if he lay down to die as other folk are used to do,

Or if for him a seafold high be sprinkled with a dreadful dew—

Yea, thus, with bullets in our breast—our forehead split with spike and spear—

But hence, the grandest of our grandsons, 

Theirs is the true act of Whig and Tory government... —Leeds Times, July 1900.