

# SIMPLE FACTS AND GENTLE HINTS.

## WHAT WILL MEN DO?

The tendency of the age seems to be to do with as little manual labor as possible. All the world over machines are taking the place of men, and instead of the machines being a blessing to the worker, they are used by the capitalist to take his place and reduce his wages. Men are being forced into idleness, while their little children take their places at the handles of the machines.

A grave question, then is, are we slowly substituting child labor for adult labor?

Suppose a time arrives, when machinery becomes so far perfected as to enable the owners to do all the work in the world with only the aid of little boys and girls. What will the men do then?

Suppose still further, that machinery in the future is perfected still further and its owners are able to do without even the assistance of the children. What will men do then?

Will they lie down and die? Or will they break up the monopoly of machinery, land, and capital, and live in a happy state, having food for all and overwork for none.

ROYALTY.—The task of the "stamping out ring" is daily growing harder. Every day brings fresh recruits for the Republican Army, and it threatens to carry the population—"stamping out ring" and all—along with it. We have just received a small work on "Royalty" by Mr. Albert Dawson, which some of our loyal jehilists might peruse with advantage. The writer has drawn a picture—or rather a series of pictures—of royalty, which have the merit of being true to the nature of the subject. Mr. R. Bier, of Sydney, is the publisher and agent, and will upon application supply all orders.

## SOCIALISM IN SYDNEY.

On Sunday evening last at 533 George street a very interesting debate was held, under the auspices of the Australian Socialist League. The subject was "Land Nationalization." Mr. A. Klupp opened; he sketched the growth of land monopoly, and made pointed references to the enormous aggregation of landed estates in the hands of the few, and the millions of landless and property-less people thrown on the labor market. He lauded the theories of Henry George re Land Nationalization as opposed by Socialism. He would not nationalise other means of production, machinery, capital, &c. Making the people the sole owners of the factories and machinery, he maintained, would destroy incentives to invention, and check progress. Machinery was produced by human labor, and land was a natural product; inventors of machinery &c., were spurred on by the desire of wealth; talented men had required the encouragements that capital would advance

towards them for patents copyrights &c. He pinned his faith to State confiscation of the land, which would be a panacea for the evils that afflict mankind.

Mr. C. W. Powell showed that Governments assisted the plutocrats in appropriating land in Australia and other parts of the world. He denounced the action of Henry Parkes in selling the people's inheritance, and enlarged on the exorbitant rents levied by Sydney landlords. He pointed out how publicans, who are denounced for encouraging immorality by letting private bars to women, were forced to do so by the enormous rents and government restrictions by which they were handicapped. Coercive legislation would never make human beings moral.

Mr. W. H. McNamara followed, and pitted Socialism against Land Nationalization as a remedy. He was fully in favor of land becoming the property of the people, and admitted that terrible evils had grown out of the monopoly of land and land speculation; but he maintained that the nationalization of the land would not settle the difficulty. He referred to the growth of the great machine industry and of capitalistic production and the wage-earning proletariat, to prove his position. The total agricultural production of Great Britain was estimated to be worth, one year with another, £200,000,000. The landlords' share of this, at the outside, was little more than 1-5th, or £65,000,000; which was taken as rent (£80,000,000 of this would represent the "unearned increment" owned by individual landlords). Reckoning ground-rents and royalties at another £60,000,000 a year, it will be seen that out of the total agricultural production, the landlords take as rent at least £145,000,000. There are £55,000,000 left. How is this divided? The agricultural laborers number 1,200,000. Reckoning the average earnings of the agricultural laborer's family at £40 a year we find that the laborers get a total of £48,000,000; there is consequently left no less than £7,000,000 for the bankers, farmers, distributors, speculators, manufacturers, and others connected with the agricultural interest, as against £115,000,000 for landlords and laborers put together. The increase in the power of machinery during the last 100 years had not benefitted the working classes, because the capital, machinery, &c, were in the hands of the few, who exploited the laborers by means of surplus value (giving them but a small portion of their produce in return for their labor force, the rest going into the hands of the capitalists.) Wages on the average tended to the minimum of subsistence.

Mr. McNamara went on at length to discuss the theories of Socialism, and maintained that if land as private property, was confiscated tomorrow, we would still have to contend with the usurer, the industrial antooch, the money-lender, the banker, the speculator, and other parasites (besides governmental evils). Landlords and squatters themselves, in numbers of course, were in the hands of money-lenders and speculators. Small capitalists were swallowed up by big capitalists. Socialism, in its various guises, prevailed in all civilized countries, England, France, and America.

He concluded now that in any other period of the world's history. The gulf between the very rich and the very poor was daily widening, and nothing but socialization of the means of production would remedy the evils that had grown out of the selfish system of modern capitalism.

The greatest geniuses were not inspired by sordid monetary desires. The greatest discoverers and inventors had died in poverty without reaping the rewards of their inventions. The noblest and brightest deeds have been performed out of pure enthusiasm, love, and humanitarianism. The present system destroyed genius and talent amongst the poor.

slaves of machines, speculators, and the like. Socialism would not destroy property, but would give to every one equal opportunities. A system of federated co-operative communities was the goal towards which humanity was advancing.

Mr. J. Whally made an able and interesting defence of the Socialist position, and exposed the economic fallacy of "freedom of contract" enlarging on the cut-throat system of competition that leaves the laborer, in times of depression, at the mercy of capitalists, landlords, and traffickers in human flesh and blood. He sketched a scheme of gradual land appropriation by the people.

The speakers were listened to very attentively by a good audience, and some of the statements were enthusiastically applauded. At the close some new members were enrolled. We have now a pretty fair master.

Members of the League sold 10 copies of **RADICALS** in the Domain in the afternoon, and could have sold more if they had had them. We had an open-air meeting and great discussion as well. A propaganda, by means of lectures, debates, and literature, in the country places would, I am confident, soon make Socialism a living power in N. S. Wales.

This coming Sunday (September 25th) at the same rooms, a lecture will be delivered by W. H. McNamara, entitled "Rustic Socialists and Irish Land Leaguers." Discussion to follow.

SOCIALIST.

**HALL OF SCIENCE NEWCASTLE.**—The adjourned debate on "Fertility: its cause and cure," was resumed on Sunday evening by Mr. A. F. Dinke who pointed out that the leading speakers who had spoken in support of the Malthusian theory had wandered away from the subject, for the debate was primarily on poverty, and not the poverty which might ensue from future over-population. He contended that the greatest cause of pauperism was the heavy pressure of rents and spoke from personal experience of the evil nature of the present system of landlordism and tenantry in the city and vicinity of London. He showed how the pressure of rents either forced men to reside in the suburbs at long distances from their employment, causing them to pay travelling expenses which counterbalanced any benefit they might derive from lower rents, or to herd together several families in the one house, and sometimes the members of one and more families in the same room. He maintained that the working classes of England made sufficient to keep them from pauperism, if they were not robbed by the landed gentry, who take, in conjunction with the capitalist, in rent, in interest and profit £1,000,000,000 out of £1,200,000,000 leaving to the producers of the wealth only £200,000,000. He advocated as a cure of pauperism the stopping of the robbery of labor. He was supported by Messrs. Donnison, Davison, Avey, and others, and opposed by Messrs. Wallwork, Hicks, and Wilde.

Mr. Hicks said that while he admitted that the working classes would be benefited by a reform of our present land laws he could not agree with the reform advocated by Henry George in "Progress and Poverty." He held it would be a gross injustice to deprive people of the land who had lawfully acquired possession of it, without some compensation and compensation. He disagreed with Mr. George's views on the conclusions of the law. Mr. Malthus said that that portion of his work was a species of theological politico-economic rant. He contended that the present rate of increase in population would sooner or later force the working classes to adopt prudential checks to limit the number of their families, and thus avoid becoming paupers.

On the motion of Mr. Wallwork the debate was adjourned, until next Sunday evening at 7.30.