CORRESPONDENCE.

ABOUT METHODS.

As Socialists, we must look to that sectarianism does not get amongst us. We all have practically the same ideal, but there is room amongst us for homogeneity. Those who are acquainted with the specious arguments about "penny wittles" or "not being able to see beyond one's nose." This kind of horse-play is apt to lead to worse.

With our aim acknowledged to be the same, why cannot each throw himself into the work that lies nearest to his hand, remembering that the work of others may not be the same as his? If he must gain recruits for his own branch, he must be ready to move to his own detriment. Instead of preaching to his fellow Socialists, let him visit the surrounding heathen, and work all the more to apply to each.

We all seek the most effective way of realising our ideal. "Politically" say that to do this we must send men to Parliament; that though they be not its members they may act as "propagandists." Those who believe the disadvantages to be more outweigh than this. The fact of such a difference of opinion existing proves that the time is not yet ripe for practical action upon a large scale. Before there can be a real social revolution, is the nearest way to our common goal, then it is not the nearest way for us. Socialists must acquire a proper political instinct.

Reforms have every opportunity to assist in, their capacity of citizens and voters, and such reforms will be more readily attained if Socialism is kept out of sight. Numberless reforms have been failures, and there is no reason why Socialism, as such, should interfere, perhaps to its discredit, with what is really not Socialism at all. Though we are reformers, we are revolutionists first, pure and simple; afterward, and only after self-sacrificing agitators ceaselessly, there is a large field of work before us. Then when we find that parliamentary action is clearly and unconditionally the shortest course to our goal, there will be no need to urge Socialists to political action.

Those in their prophetic vision see no place for parliamentary action, do not, I think, think about the various aspects of our problem. They forget that mere evolution can never bring health to the body politic. Disease is on us, and its evolution is Death. As evolution is not always an advance, so Socialism is not always a positive good. The conclusion drawn that legality must be thrown aside and only physical force can be effective is to be rejected; for, then ultimately a line of bayonets will be drawn and it will always try to capture the enemy in rear, and with a majority in Parliament we will simply get behind the line of steel, and by holding the positions we can make the force harmless. The final struggle will perhaps be in Parliament, and then the babble of legislators pretending to rule will sink into mire and we shall have our ends of this.

W. A. CARLILE.

[This letter must close the discussion.—Ed.]

CARDINAL MANNING ON THE WORD "PROLETARIAT"—STRA.

"There are some people who are trying to force into the mouth of Englishmen a very long word—the proletariat. I have no doubt you have heard it all and read it. When the cluse a book, e.g. a novel, you have heard it. When a man puts his name to it, I doubt whether he is an Englishman. Our old mother tongue has become a great many more unmeaning colloquialisms than polysyllables in it, and I love it all the same."

Mr. Thomas Kirkup: AND FREE ENQUIRY.

"Certainly if this description holds good it should not be a difficult matter to hit on a word already formed, or the matter of that coin one, which, including the word in meaning within our own tongue would like the form of them. Perhaps some comrade may be able to give another and a different description of the abstract proletariat, in case the Cardinal has missed the meaning of the word;"—E. W. Andrews.

"It seems to us that the Cardinal has proved too much for his own case. Is not the present system forcing the working-class into the position which he describes as that of the proletariat?—Eds.]"