

ditions which are advocated by the more thoughtful Socialists themselves, we find these very men still declaring that the aim and hope of Socialism is what they call "the emancipation of labour." One of the Labour Members, Mr. Hunter Watt, wrote recently to the *Times* a letter in which he repudiated the assertion that the animating motive of the Labour Party was any "greed" for material acquisition. He cited the case of an active Swiss Socialist, who, as foreman in a factory, enjoyed all material comforts, and yet was as active as any starving beggar in his efforts to overthrow the present industrial system. This man's case Mr. Watt cited as typical. His desire, said Mr. Watt—and that of the Labour Party generally—was not an increase of wages, but the abolition of what he called "wagedom," and the personal emancipation of the labourer. Emancipation from what? From the days of Karl Marx onwards, the Post-Office has been held up by Socialists as a type of socialistic institutions. Let Mr. Watt ask himself if the postman who brings him a letter, the transit of which has occupied three hours, is more emancipated than the messenger-boy who would have brought it to him in twenty minutes. Unless the Socialists mean by emancipation the resolution of society into independent labouring units—each of them, whether clever or stupid, making what he can for himself, according to his own devices—the emancipation of labour can mean nothing else than this: namely, the emancipation of the comparatively inefficient majority of average and inferior men from the control, the guidance, and the aid, of all whose knowledge, energy, and industrial talents in any way exceed their own. It must mean the emancipation of man from the influence of every power which has raised man above the level of savagery.

W. H. MALLOCK.