

then? How, for instance, will a Liberal Government treat a no-rent manifesto in London? And why should a labourer be fined for wanting to sleep under a roof in London any more than in Tipperary? Will you say, the Irish cottar has laboured on his land, and has got just enough to keep himself and can pay no rent. True, but has not the English labourer done the same? Yet Lord! What a set of evasions the politicians will have to use to point out the essential difference between the two! And how easy it will be to clap Socialists into jail for doing the sort of thing that O'Brien has been doing and over whose fate the Liberals have been so indignant. W. M.

We are informed by a lady friend that a poor sewing-woman was lately employed by a clergyman's wife to make underclothing at a starvation price; for instance, for a night-dress sewn entirely by hand she received 1s., and was offered 9d., which latter price she refused. Any one who understands what work there is in hand-sewn linen, will appreciate this preposterous price—perhaps the pious lady threw in religion as a make-weight. The friend who told us the story said that she herself employed the woman to do some sewing for her, and on offering her what she considered a moderate price, the poor soul was so much taken off her guard with surprise, that instead of taking it without a word she exclaimed at the enormity of the pay, which was twice as much as her other patronesses would have paid her. And, indeed, it is not the poorer folk that beat down prices from sheer necessity, but often ladies and gentlemen from mere self-complacency at their power of bargain-making, and who, with all their cultivation and sensibilities, have got no nearer to justice and right dealing than this—beating down prices in the smaller industries with one hand, and with the other perhaps subscribing to a Mansion House Fund or a Dog's Home.

The lately published prospectus of the "Bellite Explosive" Company (Limited), gives far more prominence to the advantages this new explosive possesses in warfare than to those which recommend it as useful in mining operations. The company are confident of the greatest success; every scrap of news that points towards warfare, in whatsoever part of the world, will, one must think, cause directors and shareholders to rub their hands in glee over the newspapers at their comfortable breakfast-tables. It is nothing new, this trading and speculating in warfare—any more than is the trading on and coining human miseries of all sorts—but every fresh announcement of the sort, frank and impudent and brutal, renews one's disgust at the social order which endures, approves, and applauds the rage for money-making (without personal labour) at whatever cost to others.

Here we have more of the same sort. In a recent issue the *Star* says: "It is believed that a new industry is about to be started by the Birmingham Small Arms Company (Limited), who have lately fitted up a branch for the manufacture of drawn steel shells, the company having secured two War Office contracts which will keep them busy for the remainder of the year." M. M.

THE SOCIETY OF THE FUTURE.

In making our claims for the changes in Society which we believe would set labour free and thus bring about a new Society, we Socialists are satisfied with demanding what we think necessary for that Society to form itself, which we are sure it is getting ready to do; this we think better than putting forward elaborate utopian schemes for the future. We assert that monopoly must come to an end, and that those who can use the means of the production of wealth should have all opportunity of doing so, without being forced to surrender a great part of the wealth which they have created, to an irresponsible owner of the necessities to production; and we have faith in the regenerative qualities of this elementary piece of honesty, and believe that the world thus set free will enter on a new cycle of progress. We are prepared to face whatever drawbacks may accompany this new development with equanimity, being convinced that it will at any rate be a great gain to have got rid of a system which has at last become nearly all drawbacks. The extinction of the disabilities of an effete system of production will not, we are convinced, destroy the gains which the world has already won, but will, on the contrary, make those gains available to the whole population instead of confining their enjoyment to a few. In short, considering the present condition of the world, we have come to the conclusion that the function of the reformers now alive is not so much prophecy as action. It is our business to use the means ready to our hands to remedy the immediate evils which oppress us; to the coming generations we must leave the task of safeguarding and of using the freedom which our efforts shall have won them.

Nevertheless, we do partly know the direction which the development of the world will take in the immediate future; the evolution of past history teaches us that. We know that the world cannot go back on its footsteps, and that men will develop swiftly both bodily and mentally in the new Society; we know that men in general will feel the obligations of Society much more than the later generations have done, that the necessity for co-operation in production and life in general will be more consciously felt than it has been; that the comparative ease of life which the freeing of labour will bring about will give all men more leisure and time for thought; that crime will be rarer because there will not be the same temptation to it; that increased ease of life and education combined will tend to free us

from disease of body and mind. In short, that the world cannot take a step forward in justice, honesty, and kindness, without a corresponding gain in all the material conditions of life.

And besides what we know, a knowledge without which we should not take the trouble to agitate for a change in the basis of Society, we cannot help guessing at a great deal which we cannot know; and again, this guessing, these hopes, or if you will, these dreams for the future, make many a man a Socialist whom sober reason deduced from science and political economy and the selection of the fittest would not move at all. They put a man in a fit frame of mind to study the reasons for his hope; give him courage to wade through studies, which, as the Arab king said of arithmetic, would otherwise be too dull for the mind of man to think of.

There are, in fact, two groups of mind with whom Social Revolutionists like other people have to deal, the analytical and the constructive. Belonging to the latter group myself, I am fully conscious of the dangers which we incur, and still more perhaps of the pleasures which we lose, and am, I hope, duly grateful to the more analytical minds for their setting of us straight when our yearning for action leads us astray, and I am also, I confess, somewhat envious of the beatitude of their dreamy contemplation of the perfection of some favourite theory; a happiness which we who use our eyes more than our reasoning powers, for noting what is going on in the world, seldom or ever enjoy.

However, as they would and do call our instinctive vision dreaming, and as they almost always, at least in their own estimation, have the better of us in argument when we meet in friendly battle, I must be careful what I say of them, and so will for the present at least only deal with the visionaries or *practical people*. And one thing I must confess from the beginning, which is that the visions of us visionary or practical people differ largely from each other, and that we are not much interested in each others visions; whereas the theories of the analysts differ little from each other, and they are hugely interested in each others theories—in the way that a butcher is interested in an ox—to wit, for cutting up.

So I will not attempt to compare my visions with those of other Socialists, but will simply talk to you of some of my own, and let you make the comparison yourselves, those of you who are visionaries, or let you unassisted by me criticise them, those of you who are analytically given. In short, I am going to give you a chapter of confessions. I want to tell you what it is I desire of the Society of the Future, just as if I were going to be reborn into it; I daresay that you will find some of my visions strange enough.

One reason which will make some of you think them strange is a sad and shameful one. I have always belonged to the well-to-do classes, and was born into luxury, so that necessarily I ask much more of the future than many of you do; and the first of all my visions, and that which colours all my others, is of a day when that misunderstanding will no longer be possible; when the words poor and rich, though they will still be found in our dictionaries, will have lost their old meaning; which will have to be explained with care by great men of the analytical kind, spending much time and many words over the job, and not succeeding in the end in making people do more than pretend to understand them.

Well now, to begin with, I am bound to suppose that the realisation of Socialism will tend to make men happy. What is it then makes people happy? Free and full life and the consciousness of life. Or, if you will, the pleasurable exercise of our energies, and the enjoyment of the rest which that exercise or expenditure of energy makes necessary to us. I think that is happiness for all, and covers all difference of capacity and temperament from the most energetic to the laziest.

Now, whatever interferes with that freedom and fulness of life, under whatever specious guise it may come, is an evil; is something to be got rid of as speedily as possible. It ought not to be endured by reasonable men who naturally wish to be happy.

Here you see is an admission on my part, which I suspect indicates the unscientific mind. It proposes the exercise of free will on the part of men, which the latest scientists deny the possibility of, I believe; but don't be afraid, I am not going into argument on the matter of free will and predestination; I am only going to assert that if individual men are the creatures of their surrounding conditions, as indeed I think they are, it must be the business of man as a social animal, or of Society, if you will, to make the surroundings which make the individual man what he is. Man must and does create the conditions under which he lives; let him be conscious of that, and create them wisely.

Has he done so hitherto? He has tried to do so, I think, but with only moderate success, at any rate at times. However, the results of that moderate success he is proud of, and he calls it *civilisation*. Now, there has been amongst people of different minds abundant discussion as to whether civilisation is a good thing or an evil. Our friend Bax in his very able article on the subject, did, I think, really put the matter on its true footing when he pointed out that as a step to something better, civilisation was a good, but as an achievement it was an evil. In that sense I declare myself an enemy of civilisation; nay, since this is to be a chapter of confessions, I must tell you that my *special* leading motive as a Socialist is hatred of civilisation: my ideal of the new Society would not be satisfied unless that Society destroyed civilisation.

For if happiness be the pleasurable exercise of our energies and the enjoyment of necessary rest, it seems to me that civilisation, looked at

from the static point of view, as Bax phrases it, tends to deny us both these good things, and thereby tends to reduce man to a machine without a will; to deprive him gradually of all the functions of an animal and the pleasure of fulfilling them, except the most elementary ones. The scientific ideal of the future of man would appear to be an intellectual paunch, nourished by circumstances over which he has no control, and without the faculty of communicating the results of his intelligence to his brother-paunches.

Therefore my ideal of the Society of the future is first of all the freedom and cultivation of the individual will, which civilisation ignores, or even denies the existence of; the shaking off the slavish dependence, not on other men, but on artificial systems made to save men manly trouble and responsibility: and in order that this will may be vigorous in us, I demand a free and unfettered animal life for man first of all: I demand the utter extinction of all asceticism. If we feel the least degradation in being amorous, or merry, or hungry, or sleepy, we are so far bad animals, and therefore miserable men. And you know civilisation *does* bid us to be ashamed of all these moods and deeds, and as far as she can, begs us to conceal them, and where possible to get other people to do them for us. In fact, it seems to me that civilisation may almost be defined as a system arranged for ensuring the vicarious exercise of human energies for a minority of privileged persons.

WILLIAM MORRIS.

(To be continued.)

REVOLUTIONARY CALENDAR.

WEEK ENDING APRIL 6, 1889.

31	Sun.	1867. Fight at Kilclooney Wood; O'Neill Crowley killed. 1882. N. Soukhanoff shot in Kronstadt for being a member of the Executive Committee and a very influential propagandist among his fellow naval officers. 1883. Sentries posted at new Law Courts, Somerset House, etc., hitherto unguarded. 1887. Three persons hanged for the attempt on the Czar of the 13th.
1	Mon.	1282. Sicilian Vespers. 1815. Bismarck born. 1820. Radical disturbances in Glasgow. 1826. First number of the <i>Ass: or, Weekly Beast of Burden</i> , London, 1d. 1848. Republican attempted invasion of Belgium. 1871. M. Thiers proclaims war against the Commune. 1872. F. D. Maurice died. 1878. Greek insurrection. 1878. First issue of <i>La Science politique</i> , Paris, monthly review by Emile Acolas.
2	Tues.	1793. Great slave-trade debate. 1794. Trial at Lancaster of Thos. Walker, William Paul, Samuel Jackson, James Cheetham, Oliver Pearsall, Benjamin Booth, and Joseph Collier, for "a conspiracy to overthrow the constitution and government, and to aid and assist the French (being the king's enemies) in case they should invade this kindgom." 1840. Emile Zola born. 1865. Richard Cobden died. 1871. Versailles open fire on Paris. 1878. Lord Leitrim executed.
3	Wed.	1854. Wendell Phillips and Theodore Parker tried for aiding runaway slaves. 1871. Gustave Flourens killed. 1882. Khal-tourin and Jevlakoff hanged in Odessa for killing Strielnikoff.
4	Thur.	1774. Oliver Goldsmith died. 1871. Revolt at Limoges: Duval and other Communards taken prisoners at Paris and murdered. 1871. Paris Commune abolishes State endowments of the Church.
5	Fri.	1794. Danton and Desmoulins guillotined. 1814. Napoleon banished to Elba. 1820. Battle of Bonnybridge. 1865. De Laveleye born.
6	Sat.	1593. John Greenwood and Henry Barrow hung at Tyburn for issuing seditious books. 1669. Jean Jacques Rousseau born. 1780. Commons vote that influence of the king should be diminished. 1809. Arrest of Sir Francis Burdett. 1887. Attempt on Alexander III.

Khaltourin was one of the most remarkable figures of the Russian movement from 1873 to 1882. Besides being known as author of two important terrorist deeds—death of procurator Strielnikoff and the explosion at the Winter Palace in Feb. 17th, 1880—he was certainly the most successful and popular leader of the St. Petersburg working-men. A cabinet-maker by trade, with the reputation of being the best polisher in the capital, he enjoyed confidence and popularity among a very large number of comrade workers. He joined the Social Revolutionary party in 1873, and worked well in it up to 1879, when he offered to the Executive Committee of the terrorist party to blow up the Winter Palace. He had tried almost all ways, open and secret, of propaganda and organisation in the Socialist cause, but always at the end of all his efforts met such obstacles in *politics* and *police*, that he finally decided on *regicide*. He was the originator of the first exclusively working-men's revolutionary organisation, the "Northern Workmen's Union," and also of the journal written, managed, and printed exclusively by workmen. This journal was printed in a special secret printing office, which also was founded by *Khaltourin* under such difficulties and troubles as are known only in Russia. All these results of enormous efforts of several years were hindered and destroyed by ever-watchful spies and policemen. After the unsuccessful attempt to blow up the Winter Palace, which failure *Khaltourin* himself ascribed to insufficient quantity of dynamite (120 lbs.) being stored in the basement, the police failed to discover his whereabouts until he appeared after nearly two years in Odessa, and heroically executed the order of his party, destroying the miserable life of a trained scoundrel and executioner, Strielnikoff. This important official had almost unlimited power over all political prisoners in South Russian prisons, and used against them all means of moral torture and physical hardship known to the modern inquisitors. At last the revolutionary party was tired of him and condemned him. *Khaltourin* with his assistant found him sitting upon one of the benches on a boulevard of Odessa, and shot him in the broad light of day. *Khaltourin* was arrested merely through the mistake of some mechanics passing by, who took him for a thief, and afterwards regretted bitterly that they had assisted the police in capturing him.—*TCH.*

It would be an unsound fancy and self-contradictory to expect that things which have never yet been done, can be done except by means which have never yet been tried.—*Lord Bacon.*

SOCIALISM versus INDIVIDUALISM IN LEICESTER.

THE second series of the Fabian lectures dealing with the organisation of society has now come to an end. They have been much relished. *Graham Wallas's* appeal at the end of his lecture was one of the most pathetic and eloquent we ever heard. *Annie Besant* was accompanied by *Herbert Burrows* and *Rev. Stewart Headlam*. All available sitting-room was occupied, galleries, platform, and all. The applause was loud and frequent. *Headlam* spoke in response to calls from audience; and *Herbert Burrows* being invited to follow, with an astonishing verbal rapidity and logical acumen, put the gist of the social problem inside twenty minutes. *Hubert Bland* succeeded in getting the Radical "dander ris." Indeed, the Radicals were the only people to square accounts with on this occasion, the Individualists having for some mysterious reason quitted the field. The Individualist lectures have alternated with the Socialist ones, and have been exceedingly lively. *Mr. Frederick Millar*, of the Liberty and Property Defence League, has a style and vocabulary that were much admired by some of us, though his abuse is apt at first to throw argumentation off its guard. Stale inanities, filthy literature, thieves, fools, and brats, are among some of the terms that *Mr. Millar* intended to pass for argument. He ended his discourse with a fine *Rule Britannia* outburst. Being ironically congratulated on his Jingoism, and on his being a fitting instrument of the society of aristocratic and plutocratic parasites and perpetual pensioners he represented, there came a challenge on the right of the word "perpetual," during which the Labour Emancipation League's leaflet, "The Liberty and Property Defence League, who and what are they?" was quoted to the audience and handed up to *Mr. Millar*, who hurled an abusive epithet at it, and refusing to touch it blew it to the ground. This the audience resented, and the lecturer was hissed.

Next came *Mr. Wordsworth Donisthorpe*, who at least kept us in good humour. Some of his paradoxical utterances left us wondering whether he could be in earnest. Liberty was so defined as to make no difference between it and Tyranny. Liberty included "liberty to do evil"; liberty of a strong man to knock a weak one down and rifle his pockets. As certain of the audience remarked afterwards, this kind of liberty involves slavery of the knocked down and rifled, and is too prevalent already. *Mr. Donisthorpe* threw himself unconsciously into the arms of Socialism by declaring that "Individualists accept the doctrine of Anarchy." He showed his ignorance of the Anarchic doctrine by stating that he was unaware that Anarchists advocated communisation of the means of production. The impression of the lecture and discussion on many of us was that *Donisthorpe* was recklessly inconsistent, like a man who feels his case is somehow bad. We feel that he didn't do justice even to his own side.

Lastly came *Mr. Alfred Milnes, M.A.*, who, though highly embittered against Socialism, showed himself the most reasonable of the Individualist lecturers. He played straight into our hands by asking, "How could there be such a thing as a contract except where the parties are equal?" There is no bargain, said he, where the advantage is all on one side, and where a man can say to another man, "Both of us shall observe as much as I please." Lecturer was asked whether this was not just the case between the capitalist and the labourer? He did not answer. Quoted the Abolitionist's saying to slave-owners, "Show us from God your authority for holding your slaves." Was again asked could not we put this test of authority to the landlord about his land? Did not answer. Thought in cases of "Adulteration of food," State interference could be "excused"; as also in cases "where all are agreed on something, but none dare begin it." Resented anybody interfering with him to regulate how many hours a day he should work. "If A is forcing B to work eight hours, then jump on A," said the lecturer. Was asked by one of audience, "Supposing A's working fourteen hours resulted in B only getting six hours, should we not jump on A, or call on him to partly support B?" Lecturer was much concerned with the threatened break-up of the family institution by Socialists, and alleged that it was a Socialist proposal to "nationalise woman." It turned out in discussion that such proposals were only on paper, and belonged to the Utopian epoch.

The way it strikes a Socialist is, that all along the Individualists have done their best to conceal their views that no readjustment whatever of the ethical basis of property is necessary. Cases trivial and superficial, such as the opening of free libraries sans consultation of the assumed objecting minority, have been kept well in the foreground; but the giant grievances—the fundamental injustices inseparable from the private ownership of land and capital—these have been ignored in every lecture, and conveniently let slide if brought up in the discussions. Not a word in criticism of rings and corners; not a word about the unemployed, or the status of the crofter, cottier, and agricultural labourer. No, no! *Laissez-faire! Laissez-faire* for the benefit of landlord and factory-lord; and *Laissez-faire* too, in consequence, your own condition. We have nothing to propose by way of amelioration—no positive proposals whatever to remedy any evils arising from the present relations of capitalists and labourers. And we imprecate you not to be so wicked as to interfere in any way with things as they are, except it be to reverse the whole current of political events these many years past, that have been alas! so tyrannical to poor us, and so favourable every way to you. But, no again! All this legislation has not been favourable to you. It is a delusion, and you would be better back in the old days of the unmitigated play of capitalistic conditions. It need hardly be said this view does not agree with the Radicals here, who are consequently repelled by Individualism, however slow they may be in joining the ranks of Socialism.

THOMAS BARCLAY.

Says the *Rochester (U.S.) Chronicle*: "Over some of our schools such an inscription as this might truthfully be placed: 'All children are alike; if not, they must be made so. It is not our business to inform, inspire, enkindle, but to cram. Never mind perception, relation, analogies, the ordinary sequence of ideas, and the development of aptitudes. It is detached facts that we are after. Education means not the drawing out, but the filling up.'"

JOHN SWINTON.—All friends of the labour cause everywhere will be glad to hear of the renewed health of *John Swinton*. We see from an exchange that the operation on his eye has been entirely successful, and he has thus been enabled to resume literary work. He lost the hard-won result of a toiling life over the bright strong labour-paper, which left such a gap when it fell, but it is now said that recent events have placed him above pressing anxiety either in the present or future. Rumour speaks of a book soon to be printed, containing the varied reminiscences of his long and crowded life.—*S.*