Meanwhile, the Pall Mall is still behind, and cannot quite come over to the truth; talks of the anti-Chinese precautions of the colonies, deluges in half-hearted for the like here.

A little while ago it will be remembered that two girls were imprisoned with hard labour, because they were poor enough to be considered to sleep in the open air and resented the tortures of the night. The full force of power was used to the rich men, consume, the poor men produce, and the remedy is to be found in a reorganisation of society wherein the rich of to-day shall labour for what they consume and the poor of to-day shall consume what they produce by their own labour. All the riches of labour must be seized, mixed and transferred to the common property of all—land, the mines, factories, machinery, etc., all these must be under the full control of the workers; then they would be regulated so that every one shall have an equal opportunity of working, and the full fruits of his labour when he has worked.

This speech produced a marked impression on all present, and was followed by Mr. Cocking, who, venturing forward, talked of all uncultivated lands, royalties on minerals to go to the State, and reduction in the hours of labour to eight per day.

The discussion was continued by Mr. Staveley Hill, Q.C., M.P., who pointed out that Mr. Juggins failed entirely to put forward any remedy, whilst with Mr. Homer he strongly agreed. As for Mr. Cocking's proposals he expressed his abhorrence, and regarded nationalisation of royalties as confiscation, and contended that Parliament had no right to interfere with private property. As for taxing uncultivated land, the fact was it would not pay to cultivate. With regard to Socialism, Mr. Hill seemed powerless to cope with, for he admitted that all the workers were equal in the sight of God and in the sight of men, and wisely left comrades Sanders severely alone.

In response to an invitation of the chairman for any of the audience to take part in the discussion, Mr. Graham, a delegate from the Commonwealth, gave an account of severely criticising Mr. Staveley Hill, M.P., pointing out that Parliament had interfered with private property to the tune of confiscating 40 per cent. of landowner's rents in Ireland during the last few years, and that during the last century the dominant class had confiscated from the people no less than ten million acres of common land, and pointedly asked whether it was not a fact that the rent paid by the farmers was the true rent paid by land to the cultivators? It would grow grain, etc., for the people, but not keep an idle class; and the people when they got common sense would be very unlikely to continue the payment of rent. Labour was the source of all wealth; as the wealth belonged to all, so the right of all to be fed and clothed and living men to organise for the purpose of asserting their rights. This could only come through Socialism, and Socialism would come to dispose of the present system as surely as past systems had given way to the present.

Mr. Hill, in reply, evaded the points raised; and in closing the meeting Lieut.-Col. Thornycroft expressed himself pleased with the information elicited, and heartily invited all delegates to be present at the next gathering in a few weeks' time, when our comrades will not fail to attend.

T. D.

SOCIALISM FROM THE ROOT UP.

CHAPTER XXIII (continued)—SOCIALISM TRIUMPHANT.

It remains to say something on the religious and ethical basis of which the life of Communal Society may be called an expression, although from another aspect the religion may be said to be an expression of that life; the two together forming an harmonious whole.

This word religion is still more full of meaning, and is connected with supernatural beliefs, and consequently the use of the word has been attacked as unjustifiable where this element is absent. But, as we shall proceed to show in a few words, this is rather accessory to it than essential.

In the first instance religion had for its object the continuance and glory of the kinship—Society; whether as clan, tribe, or people, ancestor worship forming the leading feature in its early phases. That in such an epoch religion should have been connected with what we now call superstition is inevitable, since at that time no distinction was drawn between the human and any other form of existence, and the theory of communistic masters being life was considered conscious and intelligent.

Consequently, with the development of material civilisation from the domination of these three elements to the stage of the consequence following assaulter of Society into two classes, a possessing and dominant class, and a non-possessing and dominated one, arose a condition of Society which gave leisure to the possessing or slave possessing and dominated class, the result of this being a reflection amongst the upper class. As a consequence of this a process of reflection arose among this class which distinguished man as a contemplator, free from the rest of his fellow beings, and the motive power which acted on them from behind, which was conceived of as manlike in character, but above mankind in knowledge and power, and no longer a part of the things themselves, but without them, and moving and conducting them.
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Another set of dual conceptions arose along with this, firstly the
distinction between the individual and Society, and secondly within
the individual the distinction of body and mind. It is true that body
now became definitely supernatural, and at last superstitious, as far
as the cultured class was concerned, since they had gradually lost their
old habit of belief in it.

However, there arose a conflict not only of belief but also of
ethico-religious conceptions; the ceremonies and customs based on the earlier
ideas, on a nature conceived of beings who were all conscious, became
meaningless, and therefore to the leaders of the advanced minds of the
epoch, hence arose a system of esoteric explanation and the Mysteries.

1 An importance began to be attached to the idea of a future
life for the individual soul, which had nothing in common with the
idea of a reincarnation, founded on any positive doctrine,
based on the impossibility of an existing being conceiving of its
non-existence; an idea naively expressed, for instance, in the burial
ceremonies, which were accordingly performed with food, drinks, armament,
and barbed with the dead man as a provision for his journey to the unknown
country. These ideas and the ceremonies and ceremonies embodying
them, grew in number and body as the stream of history brooded
till they finally fused in the universal or religious religions (as
opposed to the tribal or nature-religions) of which Buddhism and
Christianity are the great historical examples, and in which the original
ceremonies and their meaning have become fused with each other, and
with the new ethics of these religions, and are supposed to express
these ethics more or less symbolically. An illustration of what has
here been said may be found in the fusion of the ancient notions of
sacrifice and the cult of the dead.

We have said that with the rise of civilisation tribal society became
divided into classes, owing to the growth of the individual ownership
of personal property. Classes, therefore, of the rich and of the poor,
of persons to society were thus destroyed, and with them much of
the meaning of the old ethical ideas. In the tribal society, the responsi-
bility of the individual to the limited society of which he formed a part
was less felt. The class feeling, which had given birth to the first
concept of morality which now arose he, it is true, dutiful to all men as a man, irrespective of the community to
which he belonged. The material, not the moral, in the life of the
community however limited, and the universal or introspective ethics, or
responsibility to a diversity in which humanity was but a means of
triumph, was therefore, to change, the classes were of secondary importance — are the two ethico-religious
poles. But though the tendency was in this direction from the beginnings
of civilisation, it took historically many centuries to realise itself, and
only reached its final development in the European society of the
ancient world, which has now under the influence of competitive economies taken the final form of
the devil-take-the-hindmost doctrine and practice of modern society.

As regards the future form of the moral consciousness, we may
certainly predict that it will be in a sense a return on a higher level to
the ethics of the older society, with the difference that the limitation of
scope to the kinship society in its narrower sense, which was one of the
great features of ancient society, will be abandoned. The identification
of individual with social interests will be complete

so that any divorce between the two will be inconceivable to the

We may say in conclusion that this new ethic is not longer a mere
theoretic speculation, but that many thousands of lives are already
under its inspiration. Its first great popular manifestation was given
in the heroic devotion of the working-classes of Paris in the Commune
of 1871 to the idea of true and universal freedom, which was carried on
by the less complete devotion of the little band of Russian
revolutionists who made so little account of their individual lives in their
engrossing passion for the general life of humanity.

Everywhere the same feeling is spreading, and even in England,
the chosen home of bourgeois bureaucracy, which, with the instinctive
hating of a business country, gives every opportunity to well to
persons for forgetting the general welfare in that of the individual, it
is getting more irresistible every day. This wave of ethical feeling is
not confined to the ranks of the class struggle nor rapidly approaching to the crisis which will dissolve the
classes: in the hopes ever growing nearer to realisation, of an economical change
which will make life easy and refined for all, is what has made this ethical
feeling in the working classes. All the members of the old industrial
will engender will make any other form of ethics inconceivable; since
onces for all a change in the economical system of society must always be
accompanied by fresh ethical ideas.

1 The mysteries were nothing but a practice of the ancient rude ceremonies
now treated as revelations to certain privileged persons of this hidden meaning
which has been discovered. The natural value of a thing is applicable to the
idea of a human life, is always considered out of the question: in which
as explanations of natural events now appeared to be incredible prepared up
mythology. The ancient idea of a myth, a myth, became a myth, and
turned into an allegory of the soul and the body, their relative
positions within the ideal life, higher and lower.

2 See article "Sacrifice" in the "Encyclopedia Britannica" (9th Edition), by
Professor Robertson Smith.

We may be asked, since we have been putting forward the doctrine
of evolution throughout these columns, whether we can make the
answer that Socialism denies the fallacy of
human progress, and that any system of which we can now conceive
as Socialism must necessarily give way to a new development,

But the development of Socialism is necessarily a never-ending
struggle in which we live, in which for us the supreme goal
is the Socialism we have been putting forward. Nor do we repine at
this limitation of our insight; that goal is an ideal to which
the whole of the people, not only to a certain extent at the expense of the

The cheapest market.

We deny in toto that saying which is taken as an axiom in our devil-take
the-hindmost system of political economy to the effect that a man has
a right to "buy in the cheapest market." He has no right to do any such thing.
He employs the labour that produces the goods that he buys; the "cheapest
market" means slavery and exploitation. When an employer "buys" in the
cheapest market" thereby asserts that he has a right to employ slave labour
and perpetual slavery, and, as we said before, he has no right to do
such things.

The man who employs labour, whether directly as a so-called employer, or
indirectly as a consumer, owes a duty to labour which he employs—a duty
which he may not discharge without violating his own conscience, or
as a member of the body politic; either in his own person, or by
having his sins visited on innocent children. It is his duty to lift the labour
which he employs up to a higher standard of social and intellectual—up to
a higher degree of freedom.

As a good and easier to fail with others' short-comings than it is to keep ourselves free from sin in this direction. We apply the epithets
of "heartless," "grasping," "soulless," and the like to men who are directly
employing slave labour; but when we own a business, we often
your best figures" "Can't you let me have that just a few cents cheaper?
are equally grasping, and heartless, and soulless, for every cent's
difference between the 50c. and the 48c. shirt means a cut of 24 cents per
dollar to the wretched sweated men who stitch them to you for 10 hours a day in the misery of the death
of so many workingmen.

Far from having the "right to buy in the cheapest market," it is the
duty of every man to buy the goods that pay living wages to labour.
Leisure

must cooperate with labour instead of competing against it. If every
man who buys asks for goods with square label, and no more.

will be protected in receiving living wages, and no need of tariff
to help it along either. — Cleveland Workman.