H. Saunders and P.—Articles in type, but crowded out.

To Correspondents.

NOTEs on NEWS.

In Mr. Morley's speech the other day, while talking about the subject of labour legislation, he said that though State Socialism was a bad thing, yet it had this advantage, that it might save us from Revolution. Such was a &ververse view. Political men are so sloppy in their public talk, that they probably seldom recognize the meaning which their words bear to the ordinary intelligent person; and probably all Mr. Morley meant by this phrase was to temporize with the tendency toward labour legislation while at the same time he declared himself opposed to Socialism. But what he has actually done is to ticket himself a reactionary before the world, and a stupid one at that.

For the plain meaning of his phrase is this, "These measures you ask for will do you workers more harm than good, that I know; but in order to amuse you, and prevent your looking into your own affairs too closely, I will yield with a good grace to your injuring yourselves; it will at least help in keeping things as they are." Isn't this politics all over? That is, the completest development of charlatanism.

In the same spirit the House of Commons and the Liberal press have been dealing with the question of profit-sharing; the Star especially publishing an article on the subject, which is simply reactionary, and is a very weak and shilly-shally would with one hand forward laisses-faire, with the other State Socialism, and always working the practical-polities witt, the shut-your-eyes-to-anything-that-is-not-before-Parliament platitude, which one would think too stale for even a daily paper by this time.

The Star says, "We dismiss from our consideration all proposals which look to the twenty-first century for their realization. This is not new; but the much platitudeinerious of the debating-club borer, in the mouth of a writer in the Star it is either a dishonest evasion of the point at issue, or it is the result of the "invincible ignorance" of a reactionist masquerading as a Progressive Radical. I can only say that those who will not look to the essential profitable of a serious subject are (I speak gravely) trifles and fools, and very dangerous fools too. Those who with all opportunity of learning what the true classes of labour are, do not learn to understand them, and who do not state them openly and simply when they have understood them, are doing their best to prepare for us a period of violence and misery in the twentieth century, or not improbably in what is left of the nineteenth.

The real question for all people not professed reactionaries is how can we speediest make an end of all this, and rehabilitate the most classes? How can we speediest take the resources of nature out of the hands of the monopolists? And I assert that this profit-sharing business is not even an advance, however small, towards the answering of this question.

Here is a plain question or two on profit-sharing which every worker must understand. Will the workers who share in the profit have to pay rent to an individual for the land on which the factories stand? Will they have to pay interest to an individual for the capital which they use? Or, to put it in the language of the land, will the factories which they build, standing on the land which their labour has made valuable, be their property, or the property of their masters who looked on while they were toiling?

Or, shall we say, What shall be the workers' share of profit? Will his employer claim extra shares,—first, because he is a manager; secondly, because he is a gambler in the world-market; and thirdly, between the owner of land or the instruments of labour?

Again, how many workers are to share in the profits? The dockers, the brickmakers, the navvies, the tram-men, the railway-men, the field labourers, the women and children whom the curse of commercialism has driven from their homes (when they have any) into the Factory Hell? Is the fringe of labour (i.e., nine-tenths of it) to be left out in the cold then?

There's the rub; for, in short, my practical friends, the meaning of these schemes is an attempt to avoid the consequences of the class-war which commercialism is fast bringing to a point where it will break the "modern society;" an attempt to manufacture a new class of privileged persons (though their privilege will be but a little one) in order to keep those wicked lower orders in order. My practical friends, the present strike-war, though they are not so useful and as fatuous as the above twaddle. In the first place, it is the only way of compelling the master class to share any of the profits with the men; and in the second, it will lead to the sweeping away of profits, masters, and all—and that long before the twenty-first century.

By the way what is the matter with the Star? Amongst other smaller sins, mostly of omission, it indulged in a sin of commission in publishing a moreore of twaddle far out-doing the debating-club bore of two or three months ago, for that admirable thing, the Teutonic "Vindication of the Nations" of Modern Times."