Well, you see I dwell upon that matter of luxury, which is really the sworn foe of pleasure, because I don't want workmen even to look at luxury. It is a most difficult thing for us to look from out of their poverty and squalor to a life of real and manly pleasure; but I ask them to think that the good life of the future will be as little like the life of the past as that life be: that life of the rich is only the wrong side of their own misery; and surely since it is the cause of the misery, there can be nothing enviable or desirable in it. When our opponents say, as they sometimes do, that they could not think of preserving the luxuries of life under a social society! answer boldly, we could not do so, and we don't care, for we don't want them and won't have them: and indeed, I feel sure that not if we could all live free men, could we possibly lead simple lives and have simple pleasures: and if we shudder away from that necessity now, it is because we are not free men, and have in consequence wrapped up our lives in such a complexity of depend- ence that we have forgotten how to live or how to think of simplicity! Do you think by chance that I mean a row of yellow-brick, blue-slated houses, or a phalangtery like an improved Peabody tenement house; or the dinner-bell, or the use of the basins of broth with a piece of bread cut nice and square by each, with boiler-made tea and ill-boiled rice pudding to follow? No; that is the philanthropist's idea, not mine; and here I only note it to repudiate it, and to say, Vicarious life once more, and therefore no pleasure. No, I say; find out what you yourselves find pleasant, and do it. You won't be alone in your desires; you will get plenty to help you in carrying them out, and you will develop social life in developing your own special taste.

So, then, my ideal is first unconstrained life, and next simple and natural life. First you must be free; and next you must learn to take pleasure in all the innocent details of it all, for you, because, since others will be free, you will have to do your own work. That is in direct opposition to civilisation, which says, avoid trouble (which you can only have by following others), and it is the only way to a happy life.

Let us try to use that key to unlock a few of the closed doors of the future: and you must remember, of course, in speaking of the Society of the future, I am taking the indulgence of passing over too many transitional views—which may be the object present from the ideal; which, after all, we must all of us or more or less form in our minds when we have once fixed our belief in the regeneration of the world. And first as to the form of the position of people, as now Socialists—by which I mean their political position in society as we know it will have come to an end:—the relations between man and man will no longer be that of status, or of property. It will no longer be the selfish measuring of others by ourselves, but we shall be considered, as in the Middle Ages, nor his property as now, but his person. Contract enforced by the State will have vanished into the same limbo as the holiness of the nobility of blood. So we shall at once strike get rid of all that side of artificiality which bids us sacrifice each our own life to the supposed necessity of an institution which is to take care of the troubles of people which may never happen: every case of man's rights directed back upon himself, and with its own merits: which, is really, not and legally. Private property of course will cease to exist as a right: there will be such an abundance of all ordinary necessaries that between private persons there will be no obvious and immediately exchange necessary to be possessed, and no one will have a monopoly of any that have as it was grown to such and such an individual— which have become part of his habits, so to say.

As to occupations, we shall clearly not be able to have the same division of labour in as in man: e.g. vicarious serving, serving-emptying, butchering, letter-carrying, boot-blackning, hair-dressing, and the rest of it, will have come to an end: we shall either make all these occupations agreeable to ourselves in some mood or to some ends, which will take to them voluntarily, or we shall have to let them lapse altogether. A great many fidgety occupations will come to an end: we shall not put a pattern on a cloth or a twiddle on a job handle to sell it, but it will be prettier and to amuse ourselves and other interests. Whatever rough or inferior wares we make, we will be made rough and inferior to perform certain functions of use, and not to sell: as there will be no uses, there will be no use of making them, and the end will be out of the need. Machinery will probably to a great extent have served its purpose in allowing the workers to shake off privileges, and will I believe be much curtailed. Possibly the few more important machines will be very much moved, and the machinery will be put into disuse; and as to many or most of them, people will be able to use them or not as they feel inclined:—as, if we want to go on journeys we shall not be compelled to take them, but we are in the interests of property, but may indulge our personal inclinations and travel in a tilted wagggon or on the hind-quarters of a donkey.

The aggregation of the population having served its purpose of giving people all that interest opportunities, there will be nothing by the workers feel their solidarity, will also come to an end; and the huge manufacturing districts will be broken up, and nature heal the scars of those man's hands have left. Then there will be a market for it will no longer be a matter of dire necessity that cotton cloth should be made a fraction of a farthing cheaper this year than last, and we shall be in our own choice whether we will work a extra half-hour a day more to clean a golden branch and green fields; nor will the starvation or misery of thousands follow the same slight caprice in the market for wares not worth making at all. Of course (as I ought to
THE FROG'S MARCH.

That Maloney's death must be attributed to the circumstances attending his arrest. For a year and a half he was under close arrest, and for a period he was in the keeping of the police, therefore his persecutors (I must be permitted to call them such) themselves share the responsibility for his death. Of course there was no chance for fresh or independent observation and inquiry, but however, took quite a different view of the question. One juror was an eye-witness, and as a proof of the close attention with which he watched the case, when asked to state what officers had said to the policemen about "with his feet or hands," his reply was "Oh, anyhow." This very graphic description evidently satisfied the coroner. This intelli-
gent witness also "the man had been murdered, yes," is an idea which was corroborated by the still more intelligent coroner, who re-
marked that "That's what it looks like, "That's what it looks like" I think that this most intelligent juror did not bring in a verdict of "Suicide whilst in an unseemly state of mind." The secession of the coroner and the jury required further meetings; but the coroner ruled that "the march" should be discontinued. Superintendent Arnold remarked, "It cannot be discontinued because it is not satisfactory." A jury proposed a vote of censure on the ---. A vote of censure was entertained by the coroner and Arnold, the jury proceeded to give another proof of their conviction and wisdom by signing the verdict without adding any censure on the police.

Any one making himself acquainted with the facts of the above case, may feel convinced of the innocence of the farmers. All rational minds will hold the four policemen concerned in this case guilty of murder; and a jury, not quite as thick-headed as the one that tried this case, would have acquitted them last Monday week by the Rev. David McQueen in the Peaceable United Presbyterian Church, Edinburgh.—Drum.

Matthews and Monro evidently approve of the "frog's march," and Monro would like to receive suggestions. The only suggestion which can be made is that Matthews, Monro, the coroner, and the jurors in this case should qualify by first going through a process of alcoholization, then have their brains examined generally by Dr. Monro. What is proposed is to be treated to a "frog's march" from Shorelitch Church to the police-station. If they don't commit suicide on the way, they will then be able to speak authoritatively on the merits and demerits of this vexed question.

VIGOROUS SPEAKING IN A SCOTTISH PULPIT.

It is not often that the erumenic hypocrites sit upon the judgment seat of God and receive an ignominious burial at the hands of the law. The case of Mr. W. R. C., the Australian conscientious objector, which last Monday week was tried by the Rev. David McQueen in the Peaceable United Presbyterian Church, Edinburgh,—Drum., provides a welcome relief from the usual torpor of our pulpit oratory. Mr. W. R. C., being a man of the strong religious faith, would not have consented to the execution of his fellow-citizens, if he had been convinced that the ends which his countrymen were serving were just. Such a man is a veritable friend of humanity, and it is to be hoped that he may succeed in his argument that the institution of the death penalty is a moral and social anachronism.

The case of Mr. W. R. C. is of especial interest, as it is the first time since the Reform Act that a conscientious objector has been brought before a Scottish jury.

Mr. W. R. C. was tried on the charge of having assisted a fellow-citizen in the execution of his duty. The witness, a man of strong religious faith, stated that he had been employed by Mr. W. R. C. to assist him in the execution of his duty, and that he had been paid for his services. The prosecution contended that Mr. W. R. C. had been guilty of murder, and that he should be hanged. The defence, however, contended that Mr. W. R. C. had been only assisting a fellow-citizen in the execution of his duty, and that he should be acquitted. The jury, after a short deliberation, found Mr. W. R. C. not guilty of murder, and acquitted him.
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