CORRESPONDENCE

"MUDERN MONEY-LENDING."

Bombay, Feb. 24, 1886.

Enclosed is a cutting from a Bombay newspaper of this week, showing how the money-lender is being regarded in India.

"The rate of interest is fixed at 7 per cent per month, but as he secures his interest in advance, he really leads. Rs. 1,700 to be repaid Rs. 3,000 in eight monthly installments in 20 months. If the Rs. 1,700 advance is added to the sum called for, the interest would amount to 42 per cent, per annum, but it is to be repaid in equal installments, so that by the 10th installment, the annual sum of money amounting to 84 per cent, per annum. Notice that he will only lend upon 'good security,' i.e., some one in good position is expected to back the bill. I presage for what I believe that person will find good provender a public or official military."

D. GODFREY.

A correspondent has sent us the following characteristic letter which he has received from a money-lender in a neighboring town: in reply to an inquiry as to the interest, the agent replied: 'I don't feel like it, that's all about the matter, the rate of interest is 20 per cent per annum, unless you can produce some security."

"In the castle of Labour dwells Riches." True, but why does not Labour dwell in its own castle? Because at the gate of the Castle Riches has placed two gendarmes, Custom and Law. How can the gendarmes of Labour dwells Riches in Labour's castle, Labour must needs find shelter in Poverty's hovel."

There is far too much, even in our own ranks, of the worship of so-called "enlightened" and leading men. We think it a great thing when one of this class can fall a few words which are the first words they are not so much trouble to find the remedy. It is the lethargy of the masses, besmeared by some fatal spell, that makes the administration misrule.

Capital like fire and water is a very good servant but a most cruel master. Capital is the creature of labour and so long as it holds a subordinate position to the State—or no position at all—so long will it remain a cruel master. But when this natural order is reversed—when capital becomes the master of the State, as we should now—then look out for trouble. Biblical:

D. F. C:"-

"INTERNATIONALISM.

In claiming so emphatically to be nothing but 'international,' I beg to raise the question whether English Socialists have arrived at a scientific conception of internationalism. The word 'internationalism' utterly excludes 'nationalism;\textsuperscript{4} as is founded upon and depending upon national considerations, common to all social evolution. The cohesiveness or 'solidity' implied in internationalism must be based upon social justice, and must depend upon the differentiation or 'heterogeneity' involved in national characteristics. This means clear upon theoretical grounds, and it opens up the way to that respect and sympathy which is the basis of international morality."

B. "The whole picture is so strikingly clear in my imagination I can conceive upon considerations of are as well as mode of life mutually.

Humanity without the picturesque traits of national character would be an unbeautiful monstrosity, and at the same time, by losing the mutually attractive influences, the individual is deprived of a portion of his whole character. The nation is the cognate of solidarity itself. Sameness is not solidarity. Racial hatred is accursed of commerce, but let us not destroy or despise the local colour and the charm of nationalism.

Rather let the nations say to each other frankly, 'We are distinctly Dutch, or English or Scotch or Irish, but we are the more brothers. We have been estranged when I have made clear the plea for nationalism, which arises from the necessity of discovering and respecting 'the principle of good in things,' I think the plea is good in reason and am sure it is good in fact.

J. B. THOMSON.

CONCERNING THE "COMMONWEAL.

A comrade writes to us, on the naming of the Commonweal the official organ of the League, a letter which he himself summarizes thus:

'1. While agreeing with most that appears in the Commonweal,' I (and I doubt not many others) absolutely decline to be held, responsible or to be expected to accept all the opinions expressed in that paper.

2. The public invariably hold the whole League responsible for all that appears in their organ.

3. It is impossible for any man to be responsible for the utterances of another, unless he has previously fully instructed him, which is clearly impossible in the present case.

4. Therefore, the title should be changed somewhat in this fashion: The Commonweal, an exponent of Socialism and of the League of Labour.

The propositions 1, 2, 3, 5, I would, mean with general consent from the members of the League. I beg to remind our correspondent that all articles are signed, and therefore those that write them are the only persons fully responsible. The League itself, however, is responsible for their appearance in the paper. The Commonweal is called the "official" organ of the League, because the Editors are responsible to it for the whole conduct of the paper, are appointed by the League, who have the power of making rules for it, or in the name of the League anything that seems to unite against our principles. Undoubtedly the Editors would not insert any matter with the opinions of which they would be in disagreement without some sign of their disagreement. I must add that it seems to me that the difference between the "organ of the League" and "official organ," is of words only.

W. M.

Society is barbarous until every industrious man can get his living without dishonesty. We have no right to study the arts of production when we cannot produce. Many politicians are in the habit of laying it down as a self-evident proposition, that no people ought to be till they are fit to use their freedom. They are in the old story, who resolved not to go into the water till he had learned to swim.—F. B. Moonday.

THE PEOPLE'S PRESS.

(Include this heading will be found a collection of witty paragraphs culled from various journals published in the interest of the working classes, compiled by Mr. J. W. Jones from English and translations from foreign labour journals.)

Mr. Chamberlain was much exercised at the anti-nationalist nature of the Home Rule Bill at Birmingham the other evening. Nor are we Socialists at all inclined to defend or denounce this measure any more than when he said that it was ridiculous to suppose that the Irish people would accept it, it is really strange that he was not met by a shout of laughter even by so few of the audience that his arguments were either anything but perfectly clear. Radicals are deficient in a sense of humour, and Mr. Chamberlain has the right to be met with them as the teller of a Joe Miller story when one of his audiences requests a return. Mr. Chamberlain knows perfectly well that the Irish people have accepted the Home Rule Bill. People say they are not. If they are not, you may be in it, it is intended to give them the management of their own affairs. Mr. Chamberlain considers ought to know, and do know unless they are fools, that this is the very reason why Mr. Chamberlain opposes it. W. M.