SOCIALISM IN SYDNEY

The Socialist League is making itself felt to some purpose in this colony. The principles of Socialism are being discussed in one way or another by some of the prominent newspapers, while others are preaching the doctrine of Land Nationalization. Amongst local papers that have noticed the Sydney Socialists, I might mention the Daily Telegraph, the Bulletin, the Evening News, and the Echo. The Bulletin is rapidly developing into a Socialist paper, only it relies too much on parliamentary aids and restrictive legislation. The Australian Christian World has also been looking on Socialism with favourable eyes; I might instance an article it published on chapman, Huxley, and the English Socialists.

The Heberley Chronicle (Windsor) by one of the ablest and most radical journalists in New South Wales,

Mr. G. E. Johnson, has in its last issue devoted a leading article of over three columns to Socialism and the Socialist League. The Editor publishes the Manifesto of the League and criticises it clause by clause. His verdict is unfavourable, but he deals more fairly with the subject than does Mr. Joseph Symes in the Literatxu. Mr. Symes, in an address to Mr. Thomas Workman (in the Leader of Sept 25th) criticized what he pleased to term Socialism rather severely. He set up a phantom of a man of straw, and then proceeded to violently demolish it. He did not attempt to deal with the real thing itself, although he admitted a good deal of what Socialists contend for. I wrote a long article in reply, in which I attempted to deal with the system of Socialism itself and not with some wild Middle-class ideologues. Mr. Symes penned an article in reply last week, but he does not deal with a single one of the arguments I brought forward.

He talks of a great deal out of the sentiment of ambition, and assumes that Socialism would destroy all ambition, aspiration, and desire for excellence, which seems to show he has little knowledge about the subject he is attacking. He moves up in a wild manner to an Anarchist Assembly with Communitarian socialism and Anarchism, and says that Anarchists and Socialists are "amongst the worst mistakes of mankind," and the most absolutely connected too. They recognize no good in existing social arrangements.

What can one say to such a trash and absurdity as that? It may be that we are not so good in existing social arrangements, but what they say is this: that the system of society instantly overbalances the good, and that these evil conditions are poisoning human nature and the preaching

of Athens have got rid of the old sculler and total depravity of mankind and set up a horrible passion of some rational interest and the whole society is more than a machine and cruel than the Omniscient Father whom Shelley anathematized as "Que view." Mr. Symes too Prussianizes the world, which he evidently does not think genuine beings are to deprave a soul of his. The question is more bright and hopeful still. I contend that he would have to work himself into the bosom of the Church and live on the same foots, as bad as those of man's to-day. Finally, the question is this: Mr. Symes should not be allowed to foster the Fellows of old Political Anger and should not doomsday war inspired by the noble Ponsonbys. I must say that the thought, dare to follow whenever the honest judgment leads and not into a monstrous sham the present social and political framework of society.

W. H. M. NAMARA
SYDNEY, OCT. 13th, 1887.

SYDNEY NOTES
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