Mr. Gladstone's answer to the unemployed was, I suppose, what the warminess of the society was intended to convey. No doubt, the answer was a true one to the question of the numbers of workers out of work except at the expense of the workers in general. They would not if they could, and they cannot if they would, as long as the present system, that of capitalist and wage-earner, lasts. It is true that some Governments, Tory-Democratic or Radical in name, have attempted to alter matters. The old gentleman has either quite made up his mind to ignore the fact that there are people who are discontented with the present state of society, and have learned by study of their own dire conditions the use of words to which they are accustomed. That, indeed, is a talent for which the best of us have never been able to keep up with their own. Unless competition keeps down the wages of the masses of the employed it is neither highway nor byway to a better condition. The question of the masses, the capitalist class, cannot be answered by sitting at home with maps of the country. It is when we are busy that we are rich. The idea that the rich is to be made rich is the idea that the rich are to be made more rich. Just as there is no need to be rich to be rich, so there is no need to be more rich to be richer.
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The other day we had news that at Zanzibar, which for 25 years had been free from capitalist punishment (alias judicial murder), the Sultan had begun to instigate the foul deeds of English and American courts of "justice" by striking off the heads of four of the "native" Great. A journal was expressed in our papers about this outrage, and surely no greater was but due against the wretched tyrant who was such a fool as to copy the customs of civilisation.

But what now? Who is the civilised English Government copying now? Zengzib Khan or Tamerlane? Scarcely even these; for these destroyers had their ideas stirred and their blood heated by the atmosphere of personal war and violence in which they lived, and at worst they were no hypocrites. But our black-coated, smugg-waiger, dinner-party-giving, go-to-church "soures of God," who have not even the spirit to plead for themselves that they are curses and must act after their kind, who can one liken them to? For the sake of what one cannot even call a whim—for the sake of one knows not what, they must slaughter a number of innocent persons whom they are pleased to call "the enemy."

Consider too that this Massacre of Swakim, whatever the Gladstonian party (equally guilty with the others) may say, will be heartily applauded by the average Englishman. Nay, it will be considered by the politicians who are now governing us as a stroke of good luck which will help to stay their falling fate, and will probably win them a seat or two of those that are aging in the electoral scramble. This is the manner of the English nation, of which we have heard so much! Indeed, I admit that it is caused more by rank stupidity than by malicious soundness; though there is an element of both.

"The enemy?"—Yes; if they are the enemies of such a nation as ours, then must be some good in them. I think, since commercial patriotism has brought us to this pass. Yet, indeed, once more than a few weeks out, if we pass the test of the merest minds, by the simply callous action of the Socialists. By the instruction of the Council, the Secretary wrote to what the Socialist League holds that the present system necessitates the opposition of an army of unemployed, and that no palliative will get rid of it; and that any attempt that a capitalist government might make to satisfy the desires of the unemployed would mean nothing more than helping labour at the expense of labour. This disclaimer was supported by the Manifesto on the subject published by the Council, Oct. 29, 1887; but we are sorry to say Reynolds has not inserted the letter, and thereby has refused to correct its inaccurate statement.

Mr. Gladstone seems rather sore on the subject of election promises. No wonder; no gentleman seeking the suffrages of the "free and independent electors" has made more, which he has unfortunately been unable to keep. The references to the past labours of the Liberal party, "during the last fifty years, in setting free both capital and handicrafts of all kinds both from undue taxation and from restraints devised for the benefit of special interests at the cost of the people at large," might form a subject for laughter to the gods.

"These efforts," the honourable gentleman further informs us, "have resulted, not in a uniform, but in a very general and a large improvement of the condition of the working-community." What! are there, then, no savers' dens? no women compelled to sell themselves for a night's lodging? No East-end filled with swarming misery! How is it, then, that with all these beneficent labours of the Liberal party that in this great city alone there are 175,000 starving men crying for "work or bread"! Here are some questions for Mr. Gladstone to answer.

But "the cares and labours of the House of Commons embrace the whole empire." That is, our capitalistic masters are too busy butchering the blackmen to trouble themselves with "a case of local even though acute distress." Is this so, Mr. Gladstone! Well, the "local though acute distress" may trouble the House of Commons if it does not take care, for the day will come when the starving will resolve to starve no longer. Then the House of Commons and respectable politicians may look out for squalls.

What a sham is capitalistic philanthropy, whether it finds expression in charity mongering or in the mild State Socialism of the modern Act of Parliament! Some time ago there was a great fuss made concerning a new Act of Parliament which, according to its admirers, would protect the poor man's small belongings from the clutches of the rapacious house-farmer.

Would you be surprised to hear that this Act is a complete sham? At Marylebone Police-court last Monday, Thos. George, a broker, was summoned before Mr. De Rutzen for seizing the tools and bedding of a poor tenant contrary to this Act. It appears, however, from Mr. De Rutzen's decision that a landlord is not "sham," and also that if a landlord openly defines this Act of Parliament he incurs no penalty by so doing. Delightful, isn't it? I wonder if a man who did not belong to the property classes helped himself to anything that wasn't lawfully his own, whether the law could find no punishment for him? But against the property classes law is powerless. It only instituted to keep their slaves the workers in want and misery. D. N.