



"HAVE YOU NOT HEARD HOW IT HAS GONE WITH MANY A CAUSE BEFORE NOW: FIRST, FEW MEN HEED IT; NEXT, MOST MEN CONTEMN IT; LASTLY, ALL MEN ACCEPT IT—AND THE CAUSE IS WON!"

**Communications invited on Social Questions.** They should be written on one side of the paper, addressed to the Editors, 13 Farringdon Rd., E.C., and accompanied by the name and address of the writer, not necessarily for publication.

**As all articles are signed, no special significance attaches to them because of their position in these pages.** None to be taken as more than in a general manner expressing the views of the League as a body, except it be so explicitly declared by the Editors.

**Rejected MSS.** only returned if a stamped directed envelope is forwarded with them.

**Subscriptions.**—For Europe and United States, including postage, per year, 6s.; six months, 3s.; three months, 1s. 6d.

**Business communications** to be addressed to Manager of the COMMONWEAL, 13 Farringdon Road, E.C. Remittances in Postal Orders or halfpenny stamps.

### TO CORRESPONDENTS.

O'B. (Cork).—"The Fenian Song" was published, with music, by H. M. Higgins, 117, Randolph Street, Chicago, in 1864. Whether it can still be procured we do not know. We have never seen it for sale in this country. "The Rallying Song" ("Shouting the Battle-cry of Freedom") is included in Boosey's "Musical Cabinet," No. 88, 1s.; "Garryowen" is in No. C93 of Boosey's "Universal Music."

Periodicals received during the week ending Wednesday May 25.

ENGLAND		Seattle (W T) Voice of the People	SWITZERLAND
Jus	Albina (Orig.)—Weekly Courier	Albina (Orig.)—Weekly Courier	Zurich—Sozial Demokrat
Norwich—Daylight	Cincinnati (O.) Unionist	Cincinnati (O.) Unionist	Geneva—Bulletin Continental
Londoner Arbeiter-Zeitung	FRANCE	Londoner Arbeiter-Zeitung	SPAIN
Brotherhood	Paris—Cri du Peuple (daily)	Brotherhood	Madrid—El Socialista
Die Autonomie	Le Socialiste	Die Autonomie	Cadiz—El Socialismo
INDIA	Le Revolte	INDIA	PORTUGAL
Bankipore—Behar Herald	L'Insurge	Bankipore—Behar Herald	Lisbon—O Protesto Operario
Allahabad—People's Budget	Lille—Le Travailleur	Allahabad—People's Budget	Voz do Operario
UNITED STATES	Guis—e Devoir	UNITED STATES	HUNGARY
New York—Freiheit	BELGIUM	New York—Freiheit	Arbeiter-Wochen-Chronik
Truthseeker	Brussels—L'Avant-Garde	Truthseeker	ROUMANIA
Der Sozialist	Liege—L'Avenir	Der Sozialist	Jassy—Lupta
Leader	Antwerp—De Werker	Leader	DENMARK
Boston—Woman's Journal	HOLLAND	Boston—Woman's Journal	Social-Demokraten
Denver (Col.) Labor Inquirer	Hague—Recht voor Allen	Denver (Col.) Labor Inquirer	SWEDEN
Chicago (Ill.)—Vorbote	ITALY	Chicago (Ill.)—Vorbote	Stockholm—Social-Demokraten
Labor Enquirer	Milan—Il Fascio Operaio	Labor Enquirer	NORWAY
Milwaukee (Wis.)—Volksblatt	Naples—Humanitas	Milwaukee (Wis.)—Volksblatt	Kristiania—Social-Democraten
Fort Worth (Tex.)—South West	AUSTRIA	Fort Worth (Tex.)—South West	GREECE
New Haven (Conn.)—Workmen's Advocate	Vienna—Gleichheit	New Haven (Conn.)—Workmen's Advocate	Athens—Ardin

### NOTES ON NEWS.

THE Coercion Bill is being slowly dragged through committee, and attacks are being made on its details with more or less success, so that there are not wanting genuine anti-coercionists who are beginning to feel elated at the prospect of the bill coming out of the mill something quite different from what was intended. I would remind these persons that it will in any case still be a coercion bill for Ireland; that is to say a bill for the manufacture of special crimes in that country, which do not exist in England, Scotland or Wales, and that the Tory Government and their Liberal allies will be quite satisfied with it in that form: a few words more or less, what do they matter?

In fact this struggle over the bill in committee illustrates very well the impotency of minorities in Parliament, even when they are important, respectable, and numerous, and the futility of attempting to use that body as a means of safeguarding the people from oppression. The bill becomes law after all this sifting out of parts of it that are any ways siftable; nor, as the division on Sir W. Harcourt's amendment shows, can the Opposition get rid of any of its principle; nevertheless anti-coercionists, and those as aforesaid, not of the mildest, are already beginning to look with a kind of complacency on the altered bill, are considering it to a certain extent as the work of their own hands, as indeed it is or will be; the effect of their guardianship of the liberties of the people will be visible in it, and will take the edge off the resistance of moderate opponents of the measure, or timid people, who will say, we have done all we can do in the matter—through our representatives in Parliament—and it isn't so bad after all: now let us go eat our dinners and forget the Irish question.

That is of course just what all Governments reckon on in such cases; they don't expect to carry a measure condemned by the democracy by the mere force of the accidental majority of that odd jumble of a body, the voters of the United Kingdom; they have always the fraud of Parliamentary representation to help that force, and can depend on the juggle of "determined opposition in committee" to do all they want for them and enable them to pose as persons who are carrying out the will of the people and are trying, so far as is possible, even to satisfy the perhaps not unreasonable prejudices of the minority.

How different a figure the bill would have cut if instead of going night after night to fight the air in committee, the real opponents of coercion had said after the second reading: Well, the force of the majority is yours and the bill is carried; we have opposed it as well as we could, and henceforth will have nothing to do with it, there is none of our handiwork in it; the whole measure is yours, face the public with it in your hands as the only persons responsible for it. If they had said that and then gone home till the business was over, would not anti-coercion have been by now in a better position than it is? Possibly in that case the Government might have put forward the bill in all its hideous nakedness and so have courted open revolt, thereby shocking the moderates into serious opposition: more probably they would have felt extremely nervous under their ill-omened freedom from opposition, and would not have ventured as far as they are venturing now under opposition; but in that case the public would have understood clearly enough that their forbearance was caused by cowardice, whereas they now suppose that they have yielded to reason as expressed by the Opposition. In either case the Coercion Bill would have been much more obvious for what it is, an impudent attack on the most elementary liberties of the country. The Parliamentary sham-fight of compromise and expediency has once more served the purpose it is sustained for, that is keeping the people down; and that in spite of the thoroughly organised and sincere opposition of the Irish members, who have done everything that they could have done—as a Parliamentary party. For the kind of abstention I have alluded to could not be done by a Parliamentary party.

Something has already been said in the *Commonweal* about the case of the pit-brow women; but owing to Mr. Burt's amendment to the Mines Regulation Bill the matter is again before the public, and is now put before them with sentimental and even theatrical embellishments which tend to obscure the real question at issue, which is briefly this: Are these women to be used for doing work which is unfit for women for the purpose of reducing the wages of working people? The capitalists very naturally answer "Yes," the working men as naturally answer "No." The public, confused as it well may be by the fact, amongst others, that the women engaged in this beastly work (also quite naturally under the present muddled slavery of labour) do not wish to lose their employment, doesn't know what to say. It may therefore be explained to them once more that the women would not be employed unless at lower wages than men would have to be paid, and that this is the case whenever women are employed on work which they are not especially fitted for. Whatever boon, therefore, may be conferred on the women by allowing them to work amidst filth for a small wage, it will be no boon to the working people in general.

A word may here be said to the "women's rights" group. They are far too apt to put women forward as competitors with men, and thereby injure the cause of the emancipation of women which every Socialist is bound to further. They are therefore blind to the fact that the capitalist employment of women for the general cheapening of labour is founded on that very dependence of women which they (and we) want to get rid of. Under reasonable conditions of society every woman will be free to earn her own livelihood as every man will be, but for that very reason there will be no competition between the sexes; and women will neither get nor seek employment in work which man can do better than they can. Capitalism forces them to accept such work now—at starvation wages; just as it forces males to accept work which is not fit for human beings. As long as men are slaves, women can be no better. Let the women's rights societies adopt that last sentence as a motto—and act on it.

The East-end people may be congratulated on the new "palace" they are getting, though the word is an unsavoury one in the mouth of the people. But what a number of East-enders there will be whose poverty will prevent them from using it! People too ragged, dirty, ignorant—in a word, too degraded to use it. And even those of the workers who can use it, can they do so with due pleasure and content? Surely not, when they contrast its magnificence with their own narrow, inconvenient, sordid dwellings and their wretched surroundings. Until their private houses are roomy, comfortable, and pleasant, they cannot really enjoy splendid public buildings; they have got to go back again to their narrow, shabby lodgings, and beastly workshops—and live there. Surely when true society takes the place of false, we shall raise beautiful and magnificent halls with their surroundings for the use of all. But the contrast will not then be between splendour and sordidness, but between splendour and special beauty and the due simplicity of the dwelling of a private person which is quite consistent with beauty and convenience.

WILLIAM MORRIS.

SHORT DRAMA IN TWO SCENES.—First scene: Millionaire seated in an easy chair; by him stands a Poor Man in a supplicating attitude.

Millionaire: "Ahem! Very sorry, my young friend, that I can do nothing for you. But I can give you a word of good advice—economise!"

Poor Man: "But when a man has nothing to—"

Millionaire: "Nonsense! Under such circumstances a man must know how to save."

Second scene: The Millionaire is drowning in a pond; the Poor Man calmly regarding him from the shore.

Poor Man: "Sorry, my friend, that I can do nothing for you, but I can give you a word of good advice—swim!"

Millionaire (choking): "Bub-bub-but wh-when a man can't swim!"

Poor Man: "Nonsense! Under these circumstances a man must know how to swim."—*Newcastle Chronicle*.