

ceive of a law resting on any other. It seems an elementary proposition that a free people can deal as it thinks fit with its common stock, and can prescribe to its citizens rules for its enjoyment, alienation, and transmission. That 50 or 100 gentlemen, or even 1,000, should have a right, by agreeing to shut the coal mines, to stop the manufactures of Great Britain, and to paralyse her commerce, seems unspeakably absurd. And again, as to perpetuities, no man can give what he did not receive, and as no man can himself have a perpetuity, so he cannot give it to anyone else. It would indeed be difficult, in the face of bills passed by the hundred every year through both Houses of Parliament, to deny that private property may be rightly interfered with for the public good. But then it is said you have no right to do it except on proper compensation. What is the exact meaning of these words, especially "right" and "proper?" Is the absolute right—right, not power, for that no man questions—is the absolute right of the State intended to be denied to deal with the common stock with or without compensation? And by "proper compensation," is it meant that the compensation is to be proper in the opinion of the person compensated, or the person compensating, or whom? Men to whose personal loss the law is altered are, as matter of common fairness, to be considered in every way, and nothing should be done to their detriment that it is possible to avoid, but it has been decided for centuries that they most certainly have no claim—no legal right—to compensation. All the laws of property must stand upon the footing of general advantage: a country belongs to the inhabitants: in what proportion and by what rules its inhabitants are to own it must be settled by the law, and the moment that a fragment of the people sets up rights inherent in themselves, and not founded on the public good, "plain absurdities" follow. Property is not inherently in this class or in that, or in this man or in that, but laws of property are, like all other laws, made by the State for the State, and are the expression of what is from time to time the judgment of that cultivated intelligence which in a free country controls and leads the opinion of the State upon the various subjects of the laws. Every change should be made with care and tenderness, without unnecessary disturbance, with compensation satisfactory, if it may be, even to the persons unfavourably affected by the change, and doing no violence to the great principle that right must not be compassed by wrong, nor evil done that good may come of it; but, it is not wrong to change the law on good reason of fair terms; it is not evil to vindicate the supremacy of the State over that which is being employed for its destruction. It would be well that all owners of property, from the largest to the smallest, should recognise distinctly that their title to the enjoyment of it must rest upon the same foundation—law, whether positive or presumptive; law, which is practical and intelligible; not upon anything sacred or mystical and transcendental, and that the mode and measure of their enjoyment of the common stock of the State, if it injures the State, can no more be defended, and will no more endure, than can any other public mischief or nuisance, be it criminal or be it civil. It is no doubt often said that to change laws of property involves, as a rule, an interference with free contract; but freedom of contract implies that both parties to it are really and not nominally free. There can be no free contract between a slave and his owner; none with a little child; none where one party to a so-called contract can impose, and the other party to it must accept, its terms, however burdensome, however inherently unjust. Let those who idolise freedom of contract remember what they generally forget, that they must, in consistency, denounce every statute which allows of and regulates bankruptcy, from James VI. of Scotland to Mr. Chamberlain.

Those who rabidly attack Socialists should ponder these utterances of one of the greatest lawyers of the age. To him who reads aright it can but be evident that here a great mind has been weighing the subject without bias, and has spoken upon it as one anxious to aid in its being understood, though he is no partisan of a particular interpretation.

To the Socialist it shows that the ideas for which he fights are making way not alone in the street and in the study, but in every place in which the minds of men are formed or their energies put forth.

H. HALLIDAY SPARLING.

FATHER M'GLYNN AND THE VATICAN—NEW YORK, June 23.—The officers of the Organised Labour party, after the mass meeting held in Union Square on the night of the 18th inst. to do honour to Father M'Glynn, sent a cablegram to Cardinal Simeoni declaring that 100,000 Catholics denounce the threat to excommunicate Father M'Glynn, and protest against ecclesiastical interference with the rights of Americans.—ROME, June 24.—A few days have still to elapse before the term of 40 days assigned to Father M'Glynn for submission to the Papal See expires. It is not believed in clerical circles that he will now obey the Pope's summons to Rome; and if he continues recalcitrant, the sentence of formal excommunication will be pronounced.

HOW IT IS DONE NOW, AND WHAT MAY BE THE FUTURE.—*First Year*:—Labourers (humbly): "Please, Mr. Capitalist, give us a little better wages; our homes are a little better than dog-kennels, our families are starving, our—" Capitalist (sternly): "Oh, get out! You people are always whining! Do you want the earth?" *Second Year*:—Labourers (respectfully): "We cannot work longer for such small wages; we must live and have decent houses for our families." Capitalist (ironically): "You needn't work for me if the wages don't suit you. This is a free country, and you are at perfect liberty to leave and go somewhere else." *Third Year*:—Labourers (angrily): "We cannot and will not stand this oppression any longer. We produce the wealth and we propose to have it." Capitalist (terrified): "What is this? Police! Socialists! Anarchists! Communists!" *Fourth Year*:—Labourers: BOOM!!! No capitalists henceforth heard from.—Cato, in *Denver Labour Enquirer*.

HOW WE LIVE AND HOW WE MIGHT LIVE.

(Concluded from p. 208.)

To what extent it may be necessary or desirable for people under social order to live in common, we may differ pretty much according to our tendencies towards social life. For my part I can't see why we should think it a hardship to eat with the people we work with; I am sure that as to many things, such as valuable books, pictures, and splendour of surroundings, we shall find it better to club our means together; and I must say that often when I have been sickened by the stupidity of the mean idiotic rabbit warrens that rich men build for themselves in Bayswater and elsewhere, I console myself with visions of the noble communal hall of the future, unsparing of materials, generous in worthy ornament, alive with the noblest thoughts of our time, and the past embodied in the best art which free and manly people could produce; such an abode of man as no private enterprise could come anywhere near for beauty and fitness, because only collective thought and collective life could cherish the aspirations which would give birth to its beauty, or have the skill and leisure to carry them out. I for my part should think it much the reverse of a hardship if I had to read my books and meet my friends in such a place; nor do I think I am better off to live in a vulgar stuccoed house crowded with upholstery that I despise, in all respects degrading to the mind and enervating to the body to live in, simply because I call it my own, or my house. It is not an original remark, but I make it here, that my home is where I meet people with whom I sympathise, whom I love. Well, that is my opinion as a middle-class man. Whether a working-class man would think his family possession of his wretched little room better than his share of the palace of which I have spoken I must leave to his opinion, and to the imaginations of the middle class, who perhaps may sometimes conceive the fact that the said worker is cramped for space and comfort—say on washing day.

Before I leave this matter of the surroundings of life, I wish to meet a possible objection. I have spoken of machinery being used freely for releasing people from the more mechanical and repulsive part of necessary labour; and I know that to some cultivated people, people of the artistic turn of mind, machinery is particularly distasteful, and they will be apt to say you will never get your surroundings pleasant so long as you are surrounded by machinery. I don't quite admit that; it is the allowing machines to be our masters and not our servants that so injures the beauty of life nowadays. In other words, it is the token of the terrible crime we have fallen into of using our control of the powers of nature for the purpose of enslaving people, we careless meantime of how much happiness we rob their lives of.

Yet for the consolation of the artists I will say that I believe indeed that a state of social order would probably lead at first to a great development of machinery for really useful purposes, because people will still be anxious about getting through the work necessary to holding society together; but that after a while they will find that there is not so much work to do as they expected, and that then they will have leisure to reconsider the whole subject; and if it seems to them that a certain industry would be carried on more pleasantly as regards the worker, and more effectually as regards the goods by using hand-work rather than machinery, they will certainly get rid of their machinery, because it will be possible for them to do so. It isn't possible now; we are not at liberty to do so; we are slaves to the monsters which we have created. And I have a kind of hope that the very elaboration of machinery in a society whose purpose is not the multiplication of labour, as it now is, but the carrying on of a pleasant life as it would be under social order; that the elaboration of machinery, I say, will lead to the simplification of life, and so once more to the limitation of machinery.

Well, I will now let my claims for decent life stand as I have made them. To sum them up in brief, they are: First, a healthy body; second, an active mind in sympathy with the past, the present, and the future; thirdly, occupation fit for a healthy body and an active mind; and fourth, a beautiful world to live in. These are the conditions of life which the refined man of all ages has set before him as the thing above all others to be attained. Too often he has been so foiled in their pursuit that he has turned longing eyes backward to the days before civilisation, when man's sole business was getting himself food from day to day, and hope was dormant in him, or at least could not be expressed by him.

Indeed, if civilisation (as many think) forbids the realisation of the hope to attain such conditions of life, then civilisation forbids mankind to be happy; and if that is the case, then let us stifle all aspirations towards progress—nay, all feelings of mutual goodwill and affection between men—and snatch each one of us what we can from the heap of wealth that fools create for rogues to grow fat on; or better still, let us as speedily as possible find some means of dying like men, since we are forbidden to live like men.

Rather, however, take courage, and believe that we of this age, in spite of all its torment and disorder, have been born to a wonderful heritage fashioned of the work of those that have gone before us; and that the day of the organisation of man is dawning. It is not we who can build up the new social order; the past ages have done that for us; but we can clear our eyes to the signs of the times, and we shall then see that the attainment of a good condition of life is being made possible for us, and that it is now our business to stretch out our hands to take it. And how? Chiefly, I think, by educating people to a sense of their real capacities as men, so that they may be able to use to their own good the political power which is rapidly being thrust upon them;

to get them to see that the old system of organising labour for individual profit is becoming unmanageable, and that the whole people have now got to choose between the confusion resulting from the break up of that system and the determination to take in hand the labour now organised for profit, and use its organisation for the livelihood of the community: to get people to see that individual profit-makers are not a necessity for labour but an obstruction to it, and that not only or chiefly because they are the perpetual pensioners of labour, as they are, but rather because of the waste which their existence as a class necessitates. All this we have to teach people, when we have taught ourselves, and I admit that the work is long and burdensome; as I began by saying, people have been made so timorous of change by the terror of starvation that even the unluckiest of them are stolid and hard to move. Hard as the work is, however, its reward is not doubtful. The mere fact that a body of men, however small, are banded together as Socialist missionaries shows that the change is going on. As the working class, the real organic part of society, takes in these ideas, hope will arise in them, and they will claim changes in society, many of which doubtless will not tend directly towards their emancipation, because they will be claimed without due knowledge of the one thing necessary to claim, equality of condition; but which indirectly will help to break up our rotten sham society, while that claim for equality of condition will be made constantly and with growing loudness till it must be listened to, and then at last it will only be a step over the border and the civilised world will be socialised; and looking back on what has been, we shall be astonished to think of how long we submitted to live as we live now.

WILLIAM MORRIS.

SOCIALIST FEAST IN COPENHAGEN.

DURING all the years in which the political conflict has been going on in Denmark, the 5th of June has been a field-day for the parties. The Social Democratic workmen party also has made that day a feast, not exactly in memory of the charter of the constitution (for to this the working-men are not very much indebted), but a feast which gives us an opportunity for encouraging ourselves to fight for our rights. Year after year the partakers in the feast have grown in number. Last year it was evident that the feast-place was too small; therefore, this year it was enlarged from 21 to 35 acres of land. As in 1886 it was a part of the place for exercising soldiers.

The show was arranged at 1 o'clock in "Norre-Boulevard." 135 unions with their (mostly red) ensigns and banners were present, and 18 bands of music were distributed throughout the procession. All the partakers wore red ribands on the breast; many of them had a red paper, with the words "liberty, equality, brotherhood" in white, on their hats; some carried little red banners with the same words in gold. Foremost in the show walked the Council of the Social Democratic Federation and the Redaction of the *Social Democrat*; after them followed the members of the Federation with the old ensign of "Internationale," which the Hussars in vain tried to capture at the first great workmen's meeting in Copenhagen. At 2 o'clock the show proceeded from the rendezvous through the main streets; along the road were large masses of people standing to see it pass, and from most houses it was saluted with cheers and flowers. The show was greater than last year, and especially should be noticed 500 women, who with their own ensigns formed a separate division. About 30,000 men and women took part in the show, and it had a length of two English miles, the ranks marching very near each other. It lasted more than two hours before the foremost reached the festival place, the entrance to which was marked with flags and the inscriptions, "Liberty, equality, brotherhood;" "The people's will is the supreme law." The place was enclosed by green branches, and from the enclosure waved the flags of all nations. Upon a hill was raised a decoration of flags, and on a pole 70 ft. high, from which an electric light at night enlightened the place, was hoisted a red flag with the inscription, "Welcome!" As a union arrived at its platform, it stopped and planted there its ensigns and banners. It was a magnificent appearance that of the large show with its many, and for the most part valuable, silken banners, among which red was the prevailing colour, entering the place.

Before the procession arrived, about 20,000 men and women were gathered in the feast-place, and more entered with it, so that at 6.15 o'clock about 70,000 people were assembled around the platforms. At a given sign all the bands played, and the partakers in the feast sang a song glorifying Liberty, and then the speeches began.

The smith Hurup, the joiner Berg, and the cigarmaker Olsen were in the three chairs, while the painter J. Jensen, the secretary Hordum, and P. Holm, M.P., spoke courageously and stoutly about liberty; and after a song for Socialism, the secretary of the Federation, P. Knudsen, the joiner C. C. Andersen, and the treasurer of the Federation G. C. Olsen, spoke about Socialism. At last a song, "To the worker," was sung, and then the partakers, who had enthusiastically cheered the speakers, spread to the different refreshment-tents, while dancing began upon the places set apart for it, which were illuminated by coloured lamps. At midnight the feast ended, and it was again made evident that the working-men themselves keep the best order, and that the constables had nothing else to do beside listening to the speeches, and seeing how the working-men succeeded in celebrating their annual liberty-feast. To the feast telegrams of congratulation arrived from 24 Social Democratic Unions in the country. In most of the towns the workmen party also held liberty-feasts. Especially should be mentioned the feast in Aarhus, the second town in Denmark. Fourteen

unions and about 8,000 men and women were present there, and the speeches of Marott, editor of the *Demokraten*, of Harald Jensen, and the typographer Nielsen, were highly applauded.—With Socialistic greeting,

Copenhagen, June 11, 1887.

P. KNUDSEN, Sec. S.D.F.,
Norregade 5.

NORTHUMBRIAN NOTES.

THE masters in some cases are preparing to boycott the Socialist Federation branches. At Broomhill the notices stuck up at the pit heap were taken down by order of the managers, although all kinds of notices are usually placed there. The men, however, are not easily cowed, and a little of this kind of action will be useful to the movement.

The dissatisfaction of the men at the action of the Miners' Union agents is getting stronger, and there is a growing settled conviction that a thorough reorganisation of the union is necessary. It is rather discouraging to hear that many miners intend to leave the union. This action is decidedly wrong, and if persisted in will mean the practical smash up of the union. The men have certainly been shamefully used by their leaders, whose action cannot be excused and should not be tolerated, but there is another way of looking at the matter.

In the past the miners, just like all trades' unionists, have been very regardless of the business of their organisation. As long as things went with seeming smoothness they were quite careless of what the officers did. Now when a crisis is at hand it would be cowardly as well as foolish to desert the union. The men have the power to make their society what they wish, and the fault is very much their own that hitherto they have had no definite ideas as to how things should be done, and what aim should be kept in view.

The discussion on the Mines Regulation Bill is a fine example of the uselessness of the present labour M.P.'s. The excessively moderate proposal to reduce the working hours for boys from 54 to 48 per week, was spoken to by Mr. Burt in a way that put an excuse for pitching it out into Mr. W. H. Smith's hand. "I shall vote for this as a matter of policy, but I hope it won't be carried," was the very apparent meaning of what Mr. Burt said, and Mr. Smith, of course, pointed out that as the chief labour M.P. did not care for the amendment the Government would not accept it.

Mr. Bradlaugh fairly outdid himself when he opposed the attempt to put a stop to women working about the pits. As a matter of principle Mr. Bradlaugh objects to interfering with what he calls the "freedom" of labour. Under the present system women are set to do this and other degrading kinds of work because their labour is cheaper than men's; the present organisation of industry forces them to compete against their husbands and brothers, and the capitalists do all they can to encourage it. To ignore the fact that the women are forced into this work, and then to proclaim the wickedness of interfering with their freedom, is really too absurd.

There is a very able article by George Julian Harney (U.S.A.) in the Jubilee supplement to the *Newcastle Chronicle* for June 22nd, giving a sketch of the Chartist movement, and a useful reminder that the extended political liberty of the last fifty years has simply given more power to the capitalist as against the landlord, and not to the worker as against the employing class. J. L. MAHON.

One of the coalowners that insisted most firmly on the reduction—Potter—has just died. Curiously enough, Potter's father died immediately after a strike which terminated adversely to the men some years ago. Superstitious people might say that this was another solemn warning to the Potter family against grinding down the wages of the workers.

In an article in the *Co-operative News* G. J. Holyoake says that J. Brailsford Bright's article in the *Commonweal* is the first sign of a disposition on the part of Socialists to regard co-operation with a friendly eye. It is a pity that a representative man like Mr. Holyoake should know so little of the present Socialist movement and its relation to other progressive movements. In spite of the fact that some Socialists, by no means of a representative standing, have railed against co-operation, the party generally is in sympathy with the aims of co-operators. Sometimes unfortunately mere dividend-hunting arrogates to itself the title of co-operation, and then it deserves condemnation not because under present conditions it is wrong for workmen to get dividends when they can, but because they put forward their dividend-hunting as a remedy for the present system of exploitation.

A. K. D.

"O'Brien is a MAN. Honour and praise to that courage that refuses the protection of the capitalist troops, even when his life is menaced.—*Denver Labor Enquirer*. Well, "you can't most always sometimes tell." This same O'Brien sought the protection of the "saviours of society" in New York, June 4, and he successfully escaped being publicly worshipped by the hero-worshipping workmen. He was horrified to think that the "mudsills" want to abolish private property in land. He wants none of that, and yet he has been lauded as an Irish patriot! D'ye call that a man?—*Workmen's Advocate*.