Finally, the jails are for those who have become thieves because of the existence of the philanthropist. As this gentleman lives without work, others are forced to work for, and to keep him and his class in luxury, to get and hard when got. In a society founded upon theft, where he that steals the most rides in his carriage amid the cheers of thousands, while the worker is looked upon with contempt by all, I am not persuaded that he should be some who endeavour, though humbly and at a great distance, to imitate the exploits of our philanthropist and his brothers! Our philanthropist fosters this danger, and therefore he insisted the jailers and prison officers should be... times he used to drive his slaves to work. But this is an age of humanity, and the prison and workhouse are quite as effective in forcing men to work as any whip has been in the past.

Our friend is also a great believer in expensive and even profitable philanthropy; he will seldom lay up any treasure in heaven or give any order for the erection of heavenly mansions, unless he can get at least five per cent interest. He thought he could do this if he had the sure guarantee of a little more, but he does not take from the rich to give to the poor, but professes to benefit the human race by taking from the poor and giving to the rich, no better.

It was a gentleman resembling our friend that wrote to the papers soon after Riot Monday, suggesting the distribution among the poor of all the waste and leavings of middle-class households, and stating that he had always found the poor very grateful for the scrapings from the plates of the respectable classes. His letter was entitled "A Timely Suggestion." Another relative of the amiable man who is the subject of this article, said that the workers should become vegetables, so that their masters might lower their wages and thus be enabled to compete against the capitalists of the world. For cheap living means cheap wages, cheap wages mean cheap goods, and cheap goods drive out dearer ones. Thereupon, he held up before us the delectable picture of the heathen Chinese who live upon fat pork and rice; possibly in time he may urge them to better that bright example, and then the world will be full of pork; hence, indeed, the British capitalists be able to have the worst of it and yet keep their book.

Men of this philanthropic type are not unknown to history. There was the rich man in the parable who allowed the poor one to eat the crumbs that fell from his table. He was quite sure of his good name, and needed no further help than the beggar's delicate attentions, and Foulon, who in the time of the French Revolution, advised the starving people to eat grass. These men never paid a poor return for their goodness, the rich man went to hell, and Foulon was hung by a misguided people! Let us trust that philanthropists of the same kind may meet with their reward. When one hears these men jabbering, one is tempted to exclaim with Marot to the people, "O Nation of babblers, why will you not act?"

D. J. SCOLL

SOCIALISM IN DUBLIN AND YORKSHIRE.

I have to say a few words of another lecture tour, which I hope may be of some interest to our readers. I started on the night of Thursday 5th April, made memorable by the introduction of the Home Rule Bill and Mr. Gladstone's speech, more than by the one I found awaiting us on our platform in the Musical Hall, the very same night. I heard an audience mostly of "ladies and gentlemen" at the Moseley Hall, on the "Arts of Art." There were a few workmen scattered among the audience, and I noted not only the "ladies and gentlemen," but one, two, I think, spoke in the discussion which followed. But that the "ladies and gentlemen" were disappointed with what I was forced to lay before them, which, as a matter of course, included advocacy of socialism as a means for the amelioration of the condition of the working classes.

The next day I attended the "Saturday Club," and opened a debate on "Socialism: what it is." The audience, mostly of working men, was a large one, and naturally somewhat excited by the affairs of the week. I had no reason, however, to complain of my reception. Plenitude of attendance and expression was exercised, with cheering vigour on both sides. I spoke for some forty-five minutes, and was well listened to. One slip I made was to say "we are" instead of "you are," and was allowed to go on, with cheers. A rather poor debate followed, by speech, for the attackers of socialism didn't know anything about it, and the first would-be defender claimed it as the "crystallization of Christian ethics," which opened the debate, and "a blind faith," and all sorts of other nonsense. But I seemed to excite the audience considerably, and brought out the bigotry which one certainly expects to find in an Irish audience. An incident happened to me in regard to this, as it was magnified by some of the papers as a "riot," I may as well explain. It was difficult to prevent those who interrupted the lecture from shouting "God Save Ireland," and finding the chairman, they quieted down in about a quarter of an hour, and listened peaceably enough, though in a way shorter than it otherwise would have been. Whatever disturbance there was, it was not directed against the representative of Socialism.

On the Sunday I met the members of the Branch at comrade Schumacher's rooms, and had a very satisfactory evening. It is clear that at present the religious matter is the difficulty; but I cannot help thinking that when Home Rule is established the Catholic clergy will begin to act on their kind, and try after more and more power, till you Irish gorse rises and resists them. The Protestant religious feeling being dormant, is not a permanent one, since it is not possible for us in Dublin—at least till we are much stronger in numbers. The Branch has taken action very quietly, through the month of April, with a view to the importation by the masters on false pretences of Danish workmen, who have behaved very well in the matter, and shown all appreciation of the solidarity of labour.

I left the hall of the Branch on the "Political Outlook." The audience, mostly working men again, seemed for the most part heartily with me, and the meeting turned out quite a success.

Of course, though I saw many people in Dublin (and many of them, by the way, not far from Socialists), my short stay in one place in the country could not add much to my power of judging of our chances of success there. If I may not, as some of my friends say, get a rule they will learn to nothing else, and equally so that as soon as they get Home Rule they must deal with the land question. As a whole, I have been struck that so few seemed to notice the diurnal demand of peasant-proprietorship before they get to anything like Socialism; and that road, in a country so isolated and so peculiar as Ireland, may be a long one. On the other hand, it will lead them straight to ruin unless they can keep out of the world-market—which they can scarcely do. Undoubtedly the Irish are bent on doing all they can to further Irish manufactures, however artifically, and to that end are sure to drive new railways through the country, and so to stimulate that production for profit which throws the peasant into the hands of the usurer, and makes peasant-proprietorship a miserable make-shift—a piece of reaction leading nowhere, save down the hill. So much for the Irish journey. On Saturday the 17th, I went by invitation of the Leeds and Bradford Branches to Shipley, and there lectured at the "Opener of Town." The audience was about 600. So much for the Irish journey. On Saturday the 17th, I went by invitation of the Leeds and Bradford Branches to Shipley, and there lectured at the "Opener of Town." The audience was about 600. No such thing should have been, considering that Shipley is a very Radical place; I was unlucky, probably, in tumbling into the middle of the Bradford election; amidst such an audience also, a rational view of the Parliamentary system was not likely to catch on so popular. However, I was well listened to, and with a good deal of assent. I gave myself up as a walking-home to some Radical rhetoric at a "free-and-easy" after the lecture, not much success. The fancy, however, of Saint George and the Dragon (as the able of these gentlemen's remarks!) nor were they so anxious for any information that I could give them as for the enunciation of the venerable platitudes that made the Rock-in-trade of a Radical becoming a Whig by the force of circumstances.

The next day, Sunday, I lectured at the Temperance Hall in Bradford to a full audience, very attentive, and who caught the points well, and seemed pleased by the attack on Bourgeoisisme. A few questions were put, but, as usual, clearly not by those who were thinking most of the lecture. In the evening we had a meeting of the Leeds and Bradford Branches, partly convivial and partly business, where I had to try to clear up a few difficulties as to principles and tactics which had occurred to two or three members, though everything went in the friendliest manner possible.

At the Moullin Hall in Leeds, and found the audience rather heavy to "spring," partly, perhaps, because though there were a great many people present, over 600 I should think, the hall was too large and too stuffy. I moved a resolution in the House of Commons, and cheered heartily at the necessary expulsion of one gentleman (said to be an employer of labour) who (or rather the alcohol in whom) tried to prevent my being heard. Once more those who really wanted to ask questions were prevented by the sheer or cavilling speeches, quite outside the four corners of the lecture.

I took leave of the Branches in the committee-room here, and had no difficulty in accepting the assurance that though they had not a very numerous membership, their numbers were all real, and did actual work; indeed, they were clearly working very hard, and in spite of all drawbacks with much success.

Dealing with the apprehensions of the great industry, one is apt at first to be disappointed with the reception of Socialist principles, but it is to be remembered that those that one comes across personally in a hurried visit are the would-be progressive leaders who generally belong to some aristocracy. The labouring people are not so prejudiced, like, who as to their material needs are comfortably off, and suppose that it will last for ever; such men, unless they have special intellectual objects, and aspirations, are of no use. This is sufficiently shown by the constant weight of dirt in these highly organised industries has necessarily limited the intelligence of the men, and dejected their individuality, while the system is so powerful and searching that the least aberration is fatal. It would be other than human machines. Nevertheless, the average intelligence is high, and when they once find time to understand what the stealing of their means, the subversion of their local customs, the divestment of them,—then, Mr. Self-made Man, you must turn to and work once more, an equal amongst equals.

Meanwhile, we are really getting on in these places. Two years ago, while I lectured in Bradford, I was so wrapped in hopeless to me; there were two or three converts whom I—will not say made, but perhaps helped on that occasion, in conjunction with one or two at Leeds to make, be congratulated on the results of their steady courage and hard work.

WILLIAM MORRIS