

THE
“Plebs” Magazine

Vol. II.

June, 1910.

No. 5.

Copyright Entered at Stationer's Hall.

EDITORIAL

ROCHDALE promises to be well supplied with educational facilities. The Workers' Educational Association have been in the field there for some time. At the beginning of this year the Central Labour College classes were opened, and **Rochdale's Education.** now another Richard enters in the shape of the Anti-Socialist Union of Great Britain. Each of these three organizations have this in common: They have for their object the welfare of the working class. Two of them, the first and the last mentioned, have one very interesting common characteristic in that *they are both non-partisan*. On looking through the list of councillors of this latest arrival, we are also struck with the close resemblance which their features bear to the “gentlemen” guarantors of the W.E.A. However, that may be simply a coincidence, or as the perpetual comedians of political economy would say, “a tendency.” In the absence of two birds to be killed with one stone, the idea may have suggested itself to the Wyndhams, Westminsters, and the other highly organized and cultured patricians, that it might be just possible to kill one bird with two stones. While both stones are hewn from the same “impartial” quarry, their different methods of despatch have necessitated certain structural differences. One is so smoothed and polished with the paste of sympathy that it is calculated to melt the hearts of the workers and soften their brains, and to so bewitch them that they may take the stone in their own hands and dispatch themselves. The other stone is of a more ungainly shape, its cut and general finish is of a more mediaeval character, and is only capable of dispatching straw dummies at short range. The training for this latter form of marksmanship, we are not surprised to learn, is quite a brief affair. Two

months or thereabouts at the Anti-Socialist windmills and the individual is armed cap-à-pie and fitted for the task of averting the awful prospect of "my lords" Llangattock, Hamilton, and Co., and their Dulcineas having to *work*. Truly a fearful thought to take with them to bed. But now they will sleep soundly, for the red rag which has irritated the clairvoyant *Bull* is to be torn in shreds infinitesimal.

漸 漸 漸

We are privileged to observe more or less closely the workings of these two non-partisan educational bodies in Rochdale. Both of them betray a feverish anxiety to explain away the economics of

Marx and the W.E.A.

Karl Marx. He is to them "the face at the window." They cannot let him rest peacefully in the grave of exploded things. They are not comfortable until they have buried him, and after the burial they seem to grow fearful that his remains may be carrying on some subterranean propaganda. The Death and Resurrection of Karl Marx has become for these educational regenerators quite a speciality, and for them the last state is worse than the first. So far as the W.E.A. are concerned, a knowledge of the economics of Capitalism is a truly fearful and wonderful thing. How far is it sympathetic and authoritative? That seems to be the standard of judgment. Whether the authority is determined by the sympathy or the sympathy by the authority, whether it is an authoritative sympathy or a sympathetic authority are questions which we leave the antiquarians of eclecticism to answer. Just as value has not one cause (that would be unsympathetic), but many causes—labour, capital, supply and demand, utility, scarcity, machinery!! &c., &c. (the more causes, the more sympathetic the theory), so economics can only be comprehended by a study of all the economists from Adam Smith to the latest economic pedlar. In that way we have a synthesis of sympathies. One must not dare to break in with such crude questions as to time or with any ridiculous references to the brevity of life. As that most sympathetic and authoritative of all the economists, Mr. Alfred Marshall, points out so optimistically: "That with patience, genius, and good fortune," the ordinary workman who commences as a small undertaker "is pretty sure to command a large capital before he dies!" So with all these estimable virtues we may succeed in mastering political economy before we die. To those who hold such views it is quite preposterous that anyone should dare to attempt to teach economics from one economist alone, *especially when that one economist is Karl Marx*. "And he has not read Hobson." Well, well! That is surely the sin against the Holy Ghost of economic eclecticism. For has not this Achilles finally interred the Marxian theory and triumphantly shown how the surplus

value explanation is a myth, and how that the whole difficulty consists in the fact that the working classes are in an inferior bargaining position? That difficulty will be removed by buying the capitalist out, paying a shilling with threepence or some other such ingenious scheme. This is so scientific, so precise, that we prefer to remain steeped in sin. We have no desire at the present moment to convert our brains into a junk store. This sort of thing may create decoy ducks, but certainly not that straightforward activity without which the working class cannot win the world.



THE policy of the Anti-Socialist Union is summarized in their own words :—"To organize, to combat, to educate." "The Union does not ask its supporters to subscribe to any fixed constructive policy

**Marx and the
Anti-Socialists.**

or to any declaration of principle except that of opposition to Socialism." No one is admitted within the sacred precincts until he has signed certain forms, declaring himself to be "an uncompromising opponent of Socialism." After that the candidate is educated! Here is a sample of that educational feast. "The Socialists are going to socialize the instruments of production; labour is the greatest instrument of production; this means that you and I are going to be socialized." What remarkable penetration! True, there is a suspicion that logic has not been brought to the notice of "I." It may be of course that the interchanging of "labour" and the *labourer* is justified by some new form of reasoning specially prepared for "uncompromising opponents of Socialism." The discovery, however, that the labourer is an instrument of production is by no means original, and we are at a loss to understand how it comes about that the Anti-Socialist Union should be heard making such crude statements about Capitalism. We do not think that "I's" lordly sponsors would care to hear such strong language. Still there does not seem to be any immediate danger of those members whose names appear upon the council list having to undergo the shocking ordeal of socialization.

Some beautiful dummy specimens of Marx are on view at the Anti-Socialist educational (!) store in Rochdale. They appear, however, to suffer somewhat from having been in stock for some time. There is one delightfully old straw-stuffed specimen which we have got heart enough to feel, deserves an Old Age Pension :—

All wealth is produced by manual labour.

If anyone should have the audacity to ask chapter and verse in Marx for this statement, or endeavour to show where Marx said something quite different, then these oracles answer by hauling out another dummy. This one is labelled :—

Marx contradicts himself,

Example given: Marx states that "labour is the source of all value" [meaning exchange value] while in another part of his work he says that "labour of itself has no value." This gem also deserves a place on the retired list. It is quite beyond the wit of these "trained speakers" to understand that those two statements so far from being contradictory are necessarily mutual and inclusive. They have no conception of what either "value" or "labour" really is. As an activity which creates value, labour can no more have any special value in itself than gravity can have any special weight. But it is enough for the Anti-Socialist Union prodigies that "Marx contradicts himself." And so they continue to complain about something which they have not the intelligence to comprehend.

According to the *Manchester Evening Chronicle*, which recently devoted a leader to "The War on Socialism" and in which the Anti-Socialist crusade was hailed as a kind of Holy War, "the whole essence of Marx's dreary work could be got comfortably on to half a sheet of notepaper while the remaining half would be sufficient to demonstrate its shallow trickery." We are quite convinced that "half a sheet of notepaper" would be a maximum area capable of containing all the intelligence either of the *Evening Chronicle* leader writer or the Anti-Socialist Brigade whom he is paid to patronize. Listen to the following sample of journalistic jiggery:—

"Marx's theory is just the old imposture of the thimble and the pea setting out to prove that the necessary labour used in the production of an article alone gives the article its value, he establishes his point only by asking you to ignore all the other factors that contribute to the result. Because all articles must have utility to be of any value at all, he asks you to dismiss utility. Since utility is obvious it can be ignored. He makes out his case only because it was already latent in his premises. The pea was in the man's finger nail all the time."

We do not wonder that this leader writer is an authority on "shallow trickery." We will not venture to dispute that he is an adept who has got more than peas concealed under his finger nails. The reasons here stated for Marx's conclusions are not Marxian reasons but deliberate distortions of those reasons. The dodge employed is one worthy of the company which the dodger keeps. Marx established his point *not* "by ignoring all the other factors" but by triumphantly proving that none of these so-called factors "contributed to the result." He dismissed utility, not "because all articles must have utility to be of any value" but by convincingly demonstrating, that utility could in no possible way enter into the determination of value. He never ignored utility because "it is obvious," but by showing that it became a reality only by use or consumption, he placed it in its proper sphere outside of the determination of value.

ONE may sometimes find a grain of truth in a bushel of lies. It is to be found in this leader of the *Manchester Evening Chronicle*. Of course it got there by accident. Here it is. "If the Marxian

**The Marxian
Edifice.**

theory of value is untrue, the theory of surplus value is untrue, the 'subsistence wage' theory is untrue, and the picture of an 'exploiting' capitalist class is an illusion." We recommend this to some of our friends in the W.E.A. who seem to think, and who are no doubt taught to think, that it is possible to accept one part of the Marxian edifice and reject the others, that they may accept *the Materialist Conception of History* and reject *the theory of value*, that they may hold *the theory of a class struggle* and refuse *the theory of surplus value*. The Marxian system is all of a piece in which the various theories are dove-tailed together and either the whole must be accepted or rejected. One cannot take the conclusions without admitting the premises. Political Economy in the hands of Marx is, so far from being dismal or dreary, the brightest and most fascinating study we know of, and beside the Marxian structure, the works of a Marshall or a Jevons are as mounds in the sight of the mountain. It is most significant this continual knocking down of Marx. He is for the bourgeoisie and their political and professorial prize-fighters, the ghost that will not be laid. And in proportion to the conscious awakening and development of the working class, he will haunt them ever more closely and vividly. And as an indispensable condition of that development is a knowledge of the movement and laws of capitalism, a knowledge which alone is to be found in the Marxian system. *The existence of the "Plebs" will be justified as a working-class educational movement in the degree that it conveys that knowledge to the toiling millions.* Those whom we have already reached do not find *Capital* to be the dry-as-dust and obscure work that it is so often represented to be. On the contrary. As a result of the study of the merest elementary principles, they manifest an enthusiasm and eagerness to translate these principles into an active service which heralds triumphantly the advance towards the new order. And when the word has become flesh the glory of the bourgeoisie will have departed. Meanwhile in the process of materialization, we would commend our fellow-workers to turn their attention to the left wing of the enemy, to the more subtle method of attack which has for its maxim, "ruin by adoption what cannot be conquered by force" and which threatens to throw a glamour over a section of the working class. It is on that point we must concentrate. And let *our maxim* be the motto of *Strathmore*:

"Slay and Spare not"

W. W. C.

The man who habitually comes to well-considered and prompt decisions makes no more mistakes than the man who, afraid to trust himself, defers making up his mind until it is forced upon him,

Hird v. Ruskin College

THE hearing of this action, brought by Mr. Dennis Hird to compel Ruskin College to fulfil an agreement to pay the former £150 a year pension in consideration of his retiring from his position as principal of Ruskin College, took place on May 4 and 5 last at the Law Courts, London, before Mr. Justice Parker. Quite a crowd of Ruskin "notabilities" were present, including the following members of the R. C. Council: Miss Agnes Weld and Messrs. Shackleton, M.P., Lees Smith, M.P., Bowerman, M.P., Berry, Carlyle, Ball; the ex-Vice-Principal, Mr. C. S. Buxton, now private secretary to his father, the President of the Board of Trade; the ex-Secretary, Mr. Bertram Wilson, now official at the Birmingham Labour Exchange; and Messrs. Walker and Heywood, students. Many inspired rumours had been circulated in Oxford as to the forthcoming "knock-out blow" which Mr. Hird and the Central Labour College were to receive as a result of the trial, it was not surprising therefore to find that Ruskin College supporters were in holiday mood, and inclined to exhibit an amount of assurance and smug gratification in keeping with the anticipated "good thing." If any of them were anxious as to the result they very successfully concealed their fears. Mr. Hird was accompanied by Messrs. Craik, Titterington, and Sims, ex-students of Ruskin College, who were subpoenaed as witnesses. Also present in court were Mrs. and Miss Sybil Hird and Messrs. Shawyer and Seed. Mr. Hird and his supporters were cheerful, and, if a little anxious, were hopeful. True, the case looked a foregone conclusion to a layman, but the Law is a fearful and wonderful thing, whose idiosyncracies are many and not to be easily understood even by the elect.

The case was opened for the Plaintiff by Mr. Duke, K.C., who briefly reviewed Mr. Hird's connexion with, and work for, Ruskin College. In February, 1909, it was decided to dispense with Mr. Hird's services, which decision was due to differences of opinion between Mr. Hird and the Executive Committee. After some negotiations between the parties it was finally decided that Mr. Hird should resign, in return for which he was to receive a pension of £150 a year and a splendid testimonial. The Executive Committee met on March 12th, 1909, and endorsed the conditions mutually agreed upon, subject to the approval of the Council of the College. Mr. Hird was informed of the Executive Committee's decision, and as the Committee usually formed the majority of the Council, it was considered sufficiently safe to grant Mr. Hird permission to inform the students of his impending departure. This was done on March 26, and then

followed the famous "strike" of the students. On March 31, the Council met and passed a resolution endorsing the agreement. This decision was communicated to Mr. Hird by Mr. Carlyle, hon. secretary to the Executive Committee, in a letter dated March 31, 1909. Mr. Hird left the College a few days later. On May 7 a communication was received by plaintiff's solicitors stating that "Owing to a misunderstanding the copy sent you of the resolution was not complete. . . The resolution went on to say that it was agreed it should be communicated to Mr. Hird that the arrangement was made subject to the understanding that Mr. Hird avoids such action, speaking or writing, as might be calculated to have an injurious effect upon the College. . . It is unfortunate we did not communicate to you the stipulation of the General Council. . . We are informed your client has made an offer to act as principal of another college in Oxford. This would be obviously contrary to the Council's stipulation." Plaintiff's solicitors replied that he could not accept this amendment, and as no settlement could be arrived at this action was brought.

Mr. Hird, in the witness box, said he knew nothing of the strike until he saw the announcement in the papers. He had not offered to become principal of another college. He had been asked if, in the event of another college being started, he would be prepared to help by giving some lectures without salary. He agreed to do so for a year.

Mr. Danckwerts, for the defendants, argued that the decision of the General Council to accept the arrangements come to between Plaintiff and the Executive Committee were subject to the additional condition which was communicated to Plaintiff's solicitors on May 7, and that the defendants were not liable for the mistake of Mr. Carlyle in not communicating this to Plaintiff at the time. He also argued that the College authorities had no power to make an agreement with the Plaintiff for the payment of a pension.

Messrs. Shackleton, Lees Smith, Carlyle, Ball, Berry, and Miss Weld, members of the Council, gave evidence.

Mr. Justice Parker, in giving judgment, held that Mr. Hird was entitled to an order to have the contract fulfilled on the terms of the agreement arrived at between the parties and contained in the minutes of the Executive Committee of March 12, 1909. It was clear that if the recommendation passed by the Council and sent to the Plaintiff's solicitors on May 7, 1909, was intended as a condition of the agreement, the Council had no right to authorize the Press notices and the communication to the students before ascertaining whether Mr. Hird accepted the new condition. The Plaintiff had proved his case both substantially and technically, and he ordered that the contract be specifically performed, with costs against the College.

By this victory for Mr. Hird, Ruskin College will be called upon to pay hundreds of pounds in legal expenses. They will, no doubt, be called upon by Labour bodies, whose support they seek, to explain their action in wasting this money in attempts to evade a liability which they assumed with such a flourish of trumpets last year. Truly the way of (Ruskin College is hard.

We offer our congratulations to Mr. Hird and family on this successful ending to the third revolutionary period in his career. Twice before "the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune" have delt them greivous wounds, yet once again they were found prepared to risk their all in this struggle for freedom in working-class education.

Reprinted from

The American Journal of Sociology, Vol. XV, No. 5, March, 1910.

Sociology and the State

SOCIOLOGY must be something very bad because it is so much like vice. Most of those who hated it at first sight now embrace it, and the rest are either in the enduring or the pitying stage.

As in the case of nearly all other sciences sociology was at first attacked and called a "pseudo-science." The sociologist is perfectly familiar with this, and it has ceased to trouble him. He has been hearing it from Lorenz Stein, Dilthey, Maurice Block, Bernheim, Lehmann, Treitschke, Martini, Van der Rest, and Leslie Stephen. They all say the same things, nothing more and nothing new. Some pains were taken at first to show that there were vast fields which no other science has ever touched or can touch without becoming sociology. But the need of sociology was so great and so keenly felt that there ceased to be any call to defend it. The people of all countries actually demanded the new science. None of the other sciences held out any hope of furnishing a theoretical and scientific basis for the study of the social problems of the day. Political economy had become a sort of quietism, and bade the people hush and cease to disturb the established order. But the people would not hush, and the unrest grew. Economics then vaulted over to the Austrian theory of value, which is a sociological principle, and then pretended that it had always been the "master science." Political science floundered about among a thousand fine-spun and wholly improbable theories of the State. It was both politically and socially hopeless.

When at last a science of both human origins and human welfare rose on the horizon it was immediately welcomed as that which had been so long looked for. Launched by Comte and fathered by John

Stuart Mill, it moved, though at first slowly. Accepted by Herbert Spencer and recognized by several strong Continental writers, it got on its feet during the last decade of the nineteenth century, and before the beginning of the twentieth century it had become the most popular of all the sciences. It began to be taught in one after another of the higher institutions of learning, and at the present time it seems there are about four hundred such in the United States alone in which sociology forms a part of the curriculum. Something analogous to this is true in other countries, but I cannot quote any recent statistics.

What are we to conclude from all this? Is the whole world, then, insane and chasing an *ignis fatuus*, a pseudo-science? I would be the last to fall back upon the old doctrines of the "voice of the people," and "which everywhere, and by all men" [has been believed] as proofs of anything. Many grave errors have been long popular and well-nigh universal. But have any of the sciences had to be abandoned as false? Yes, they say, and point to alchemy. But alchemy was rather an art. There is a sort of social alchemy, and sociology is the social chemistry whose mission it is to supplant it. Society is a domain of natural phenomena, and there must be a science to deal with it. There was no such science till sociology came. It is not the same as the science of man (anthropology); it is not the same as the science of wealth (economics); it is not the same as the science of government and the state (political science). In a certain sense these all belong to sociology, or fall under it, as furnishing its data. They are special social sciences, and there are many more, but they do not, separately or together, constitute sociology. Sociology has been called the synthesis of all the special social sciences. It is that, but it is more. It gathers material from fields not included in any recognised science, but its great work is the co-ordination of all social facts, and the elaboration of a reasoned and systematized body of knowledge relating to social origins, social processes, social development, and social causation.

Notwithstanding the recruits that sociology is constantly receiving from all sides, and the general silencing of adverse criticism by the logic of events, there ever and anon arises a new voice from some quarter reiterating the old cry that sociology is a pseudo-science. This, as we have seen, is of little consequence. Sociology has much more serious obstacles to overcome. It would be strange if among the hundreds of writers who have been attracted to this field there should not be some who would say foolish things. There is, for example, quite a large school of sociologists, who, though claiming to be such, are virtually denying that sociology is a science. Anyone who denies the existence of efficient causes in society does this. It does not mend matters to say that society is a domain of final causes. Final causes are nothing but the appropriation of efficient

causes by intelligent beings.* Of course sociology employs telic methods, and so does every other science. They are the only methods of which the intellect is capable. The higher mind works through final causes only. Telic is synonymous with intellectual. But in sociology and in all other true sciences, the mind deals with real things—the properties of matter and the forces of nature. Physic forces are as real and natural as physical force. In society physic forces become social forces, and they are the true causes of all social phenomena. The virtual denial of this truth on the part of persons classed as sociologists, is doing sociology far more harm than all that the enemies of the science can do it.

I do not propose here to repeat any of my own proofs of the strictly scientific character of sociology when properly understood. My entire contribution to the subject consists essentially in heaping up the proofs. But I take pleasure in referring to Professor Giddings's papers on "Social Causation," as showing that not all Americans vacillate on this essential point. I may also be allowed to quote one Old World author, of whom fate has so recently and tragically robbed us, and this from the last book he ever wrote, the one he referred to as his *Schwanengesang*, and which he probably never saw after it issued from the Press. I refer to the posthumous little *Sozialphilosophie im Umriss* of Ludwig Gumplowicz, a copy of which reached me on November 22nd. last through the kindness of his son, Dr. Wladyslaw Gumplowicz, of Vienna. On pp. 6-9 of this work he says :

We live in the state and in society ; we belong to a social circle which jostles against its members and is jostled by them ; we feel the social pressure from all sides and we react against it with all our might ; we experience a restraint to our free activities and we struggle to remove it ; we require the services of other men which we cannot do without ; we pursue our own interests and struggle for the interests of other social groups, which are also our interests. In short, we move in a world which we do not control, but which controls us, which is not directed toward us and adapted to us, but toward which we must direct and adapt ourselves.

Modern science knows the laws according to which the heavenly bodies move ; it knows the laws of life of all organic beings ; it knows the laws of attraction, repulsion, and combination of atoms. What does it know of the social world? Nothing. In the world-conception of modern science this most distinctive human world is absent. There is no trace or intimation even of the laws of its movement in the prevailing philosophy of nature. This world does not exist for it. . . . That the will of man is controlled by his social environment, by the social group to which he belongs, in which he inheres and must inhere, that this influence is so exactly determined that we can calculate in advance the decisions of the wills of individuals from their social position and group attachments—of all this the modern philosopher of nature takes no notice ; these factors which the phenomena of will call forth, do not exist for him. He knows only the

*Pure Sociology, chap. xvi.

organico-physical forces which set the human will in motion. The social environment of man with its impulses and suggestions, its coercion and compulsion, which determine the wills of individuals, these "forces" are as unknown to him as is the social world itself.

This final message of the author of the *Struggle of Races* fittingly supplements the splendid presentation by Dr. Ross of the great law of *Social Control*, and forces home to us anew the truth that sociology has to do with energy as certainly as astronomy, physics, chemistry, and biology. But this is only one side of the subject. It relates to the static aspect only. The dynamic aspect is even more striking and more important. To treat of that here would be but to repeat what I have been saying for thirty years.

(To be continued.)

LESTER F. WARD.

Co-operators and Central Labour College

Discussion on Whitsun Monday at Plymouth

MR. STEVENSON (Cinder Hill) said he had got up for the purpose of making a suggestion to the Central Educational Committee to try to identify themselves with a movement which was identical with themselves, as it had for its objects the thorough education of the working classes. He referred to an educational institution which was backed up by the younger bloods in the United Labour movement. They had seen how stress was laid upon Ruskin College in connexion with the co-operative movement and in the trade union movement. So far as his observation went, any man who sincerely pointed out to the working classes the road upon which they had to travel, and by which they were going to secure their emancipation, would be served by those University dignitaries who represented, not Labour—there was no middle line of salvation for the working classes—but who represented the upper classes and upper-class economic theories. (Applause.) The co-operative movement should throw itself into line with working-class authorities, by identifying itself with the teaching of such theories of sociology and economics as they found in the trade union movement and as they found in the Central Labour College started last August in Oxford. This college, the speaker pointed out, had the support of men like Joseph Pointer, M.P., and Will Thorne, M.P., and one of the noblest men that ever entered Oxford—Mr. Dennis Hird. (Loud Applause.)

A Delegate, at this stage, rose to a point of order, and the President warned the speaker that he was treading on dangerous ground.

Mr. Stevenson thereupon drew his remarks to a close.

WORKING CLASS AND CAPITALIST ECONOMICS: A SCENE.

Mr. Maddison (Blackpool Printers) said that no more false note could be struck in the Congress upon education than the one to which they had just listened. (Question, question.) The Workers' Educational Association, as he understood it, started out on a journey to find the truth. It was not associated with any particular political body. The college defended by the previous delegate belonged to one school and one school only, and if the Congress gave sanction to the advice tendered by the last delegate, it would strike a blow at Ruskin College, in connexion with which one of the promoters was a sound co-operator; he alluded to Mr. D. J. Shackleton, M.P. (Hear, hear.) Therefore, the Congress had no right of any sort whatever to recognize any institution of any character which was definitely associated with any particular set of economics and political doctrines, whether they be Liberals, Tories, or Socialists. (Hear, hear.) The Workers' Educational Association was clear of all, and it ought to command their undivided attention. (Applause.)

Mr. D. M'Carthy (Leicester) said he was afraid that Congresses were given too much to individuals, whilst too little time was devoted to principles. He was not present to qualify any individual; he believed in principle, and notwithstanding the name of Mr. Maddison, he would say, in regard to working-class ideas, there was a right side and a wrong side; there were working-class economics and capitalists' economics. (Hear, hear.) In politics, the two ideas of the rich and poor—the possessed classes and the dispossessed—were absolutely antagonistic. Mr. Maddison represented a dying cause in this movement. ("No, no," and "Hear, hear.")

Considerable confusion arose out of Mr. M'Carthy's last expression, and there were loud cries of "Withdraw." He endeavoured to continue his speech, but the chairman ruled him out of order.

The Chairman: You are absolutely out of order. I think it will appeal to you that you have made an unbearable remark, and I think it would be the best for the government of the meeting if you were to withdraw it.

Mr. M'Carthy: I said nothing personal.

The Chairman: You have.

Amid further cries of "Withdraw." Mr. M'Carthy resumed his seat.

Mr. Mansbridge (London Tenant Co-operators, and Secretary of the Workers' Educational Association) said that no one regretted more than he the tone and direction the discussion was taking. He had not one word to say in reference to the Ruskin College (Central Labour College?), and their representatives had every right to come

and make appeals at the Congress. But he did object to the insinuation that the Workers' Educational Association was allied to any one school of economics. (Loud applause.) The association was free of any political or economic party, and all they endeavoured to do was to get at truth, and unite all the various elements which could be brought to bear upon important questions of the day.

Mr. Wilson (Scottish Wholesale Society) said he would not have spoken but for certain remarks which had been made in reference to Ruskin College. He had been to the college on a mission of inquiry, and it was his opinion that the educational system in vogue there was not of a satisfactory nature. He recognized that the time had come when they should differentiate between the economics of the working-class section of the community and the economics of the capitalist section of the community. Up till now their economics as workers had been dominated by men whose natural instincts led them to look at things from a different point of view to their own.

Mr. Kelly (Central Conference Association, Scottish Section) said that no more false note could have been struck than the one now suggested. He submitted that Mr. Maddison was a dogmatist. The only remedy for the existing evil was for co-operators to take over the educational machinery in their own hands, and educate the people in a way that would uplift humanity, that would make men and true citizens.

Mr. Rae (platform) said he would not answer to the discussion on the Labour College, which he considered had been out of order. He would say this, though, that the Central Education Committee had never refused help, advice, countenance, and support to any body that was teaching any side of the truth, so long as it was truth.

The following Extract is taken from the column of "Notes for the Week":—

SCHOOLS FOR ECONOMICS.

It would be much better for us if we could have a text-book on economics consistent with the principles of co-operation. Theories of political economists are mostly in favour of a system of trade and labour that tends to favour the private capitalistic view. A rather warm discussion took place at Congress, which circulated around the schools of thought as represented by the New Labour College at Oxford, Ruskin College, and the Workers' Educational Association. Although the different expressions of opinion—rather warmly presented—were regretted by one or two of our own educational leaders, we do not see that it could do much harm. It is as well to know especially what the young men of the movement are thinking. If they are wrong, somebody must set them right. If they are right, they must be encouraged. What we would like to see is that those

of the different schools should not become so obsessed by their own pet theories as to blind themselves against the features of other systems of teaching. Probably all schools with a labour and democratic basis are working with the same object in view; and it would be better to co-ordinate a system of economics suitable to all rather than check progress through quarrelling over conflicting details that might be eradicated by a little reasoning—*The Co-operative News, May 21st, 1910.*

Mr. Stevenson who opened the above discussion is an ex-student of Ruskin College (1908), and a Notts miner. He writes "*Re Mr. Mansbridge's remarks, the report is misleading in Co-operative News. He did not mention Ruskin College, but said 'he had not one word to say against the Central Labour College, but he did object to the insinuation that the W.E.A. was teaching capitalist class economics.' I took the sentence or two down on the spot.*"

It is quite apparent from the reports of educational discussions that took place during the week that our friend Stevenson's effort on the Monday, and the discussion that followed upon it, created a little "rift in the lute," and strenuous efforts were made by the representatives of the non-partisan W.E.A. to throw the capitalist teaching "bag and baggage" overboard—in words at all events. Whether or not "a false note was struck on education" by Stevenson no one had the courage either to deny the two sides in economic teaching or to defend capitalist economics, from this it would appear that the only thing left for Messrs. Maddison, Mansbridge & Co. to do is to follow the Central Labour College and boldly endorse working-class economics. On Tuesday evening Professor Masterman gave an address on "The Education of the Citizen," and in eulogizing the W.E.A., made a few statements *re education* which may be dealt with in the next number of the "Plebs." For the present we content ourselves with quoting two statements of the Professor's which will "point a moral and adorn a tale," viz. "it was untrue that all University dons were incurably inoculated with the virus of capitalism." "He believed there was a tendency to exaggerate the value of economics as a training for the citizen; for what was economically right was often morally wrong, and human progress had, at least, been as often in the teeth of economic theory as along the lines of it." Quite so, Professor, quite so! but where has economic theory ever been taught from the working-class standpoint? Progress has always been made in the face of the opposition of the ruling class and its professional apologists, cannot you see, Professor, that it is not economics that is wrong but the economics of the established powers and taught with a view to maintaining their supremacy that has been the "dead hand" on progress. What is wrong to-day, dear Professor, is that the people do not understand

the nature of the economic bondage in which they are held; capitalist economics do not, and cannot truthfully, explain the nature of capitalism, working-class economics can, and does, do so, and with the advancement of its teaching, and the utilizing of the knowledge thus obtained, the working-class will gain such a measure of economic freedom as will lead to a demand for that higher education which to-day is being used as a decoy to lead them from a study of the bread and butter question.

We welcome the tone of the writer of "Notes of the Week" quoted above, but we would point out to our friend that the "conflicting *details*" arise from "conflicting *principles*," and if a text book is to be written in line with the principles of co-operation it can only be done from the economic principles laid down by Marx—the *only* scientific principles of co-operation which have yet been formulated. All others "sympathetic" or otherwise follow the vicious circle of capitalist teaching.

We have to thank our friend W. Stevenson for his good work at Plymouth, in the distribution of literature as well as in calling the attention of co-operators to the question of independent working-class education.

Correspondence Classes

THE CENTRAL LABOUR COLLEGE has notified all and sundry that a Correspondence Department will be opened in September next, and the announcement has naturally led to a deal of speculation as to the methods which are to be adopted by this latest recruit to educational institutions catering for working-class support. It is the object of this article to try to explain in a simple manner the aims of the Correspondence Department. In the first place, we ought to consider the object of such classes. The majority of the workers of this country start school at the age of five and finish at fourteen. During the nine years of school life the chief thing seems to be to present to the children a certain stated amount of knowledge to be acquired, failure to absorb which brands the child a dullard and the teacher a failure. Too often it is held to be a task—for the teacher to teach and the child to learn. The teacher looks upon the imparting of knowledge as a means of acquiring a livelihood, and is often compelled by this pressure to look upon the child as a simple unit, for or against, in a percentage of passes, the one official test of the capacity of the teacher. Under such a system of education little attention can be paid to the

particular requirements of the individual scholar. We do not blame the teachers, many of them are well-meaning people who are placed in an impossible position from the point of view of education—regarded as machines by the educational system, and, as a result, as taskmasters by the children—small blame to them if the results are not of the best. For the children the results are disastrous, a memorizing of a vast amount of detail, laboriously acquired, and speedily forgotten. Of trained methods of reasoning and the acquiring of principles the majority of the workers know nothing. As a consequence they start out in life entirely lacking the essentials of real education, and when they are called upon to use their judgment on matters of vital interest to themselves they more often than not decide against their own interests—due to the almost universal propagation of their opponents' interests—in Press, Pulpit and Parliament—acting upon untrained minds. It is the aim of the Central Labour College to assist those workers who join the Correspondence Classes to remedy both these defects, viz. untrained reasoning and partial teaching, by providing opportunities to acquire a thorough knowledge of the art of reasoning (Logic), the method of presentation both in writing and speaking (Grammar, Composition, and Style), and a knowledge of man and the world in which he lives, combined with a knowledge of his past history, physical, social and mental, such as will enable the workers to judge with reason the methods to be adopted in the future to secure them a greater share of comfort and well-being than has been theirs up to the present.

The aims here outlined present some difficulties, for there are few text-books at present which could be used on the lines the College classes will take. As a consequence, it has been decided that the College shall in the course of next year issue its own text-books at popular prices. For the present books will be used which approximate most nearly to the requirements, and these, with collateral reading, will bridge over the intervening time. Essays will be carefully corrected, both from the point of view of principles of the particular subject, composition, etc. This means that all essays will be corrected by qualified teachers in the various subjects, and particular pains will be taken to build up a correspondence system second to none in this country. No necessary expense will be spared, as the aim is to impart the fundamentals of education.

The entrance fee will be sixpence, to be sent with the two shillings, which is payable for the first month, and after this the fee is two shillings each month. For this fee an essay or a set of exercises will be carefully corrected each month.

Further particulars can be obtained of Mr. A. J. Hacking, M.A., at Central Labour College, Oxford, to whom all communications respecting the Classes should be addressed.

CHEERFUL CHUCKLES

THE DEATH OF THE MARXIAN SYSTEM

(Continued)

"To understand is to leave behind," said Hegel. We have now left behind the theory of value—we understand its fallacies. I said in the beginning of my lecture that if we disprove this theory we should have killed Marxism; I have done so, but it is necessary to dispose of the trimmings. Mother-in-laws are one of the disadvantages of civilization, and when we "shunt" them after a fortnight's visit we do not allow them to leave any luggage behind—we must be as stern in the case of Marx. It is with a feeling of Academic Optimism that I commence upon the Marxian trimmings; not the optimism generated by "hops," but the optimism of the gentleman who attempts to open a salmon-tin with a pickaxe. The fallacies of the trimmings are obvious almost to the point of absurdity, and we have a very easy task. As a prominent scientist once said:—"The application of telenesis adds force to an argument, but the application of the sledge-hammer carries more weight."

The trimmings I have referred to are the "Class Struggle and the Materialist Conception of History." The theory of the "Class Struggle" is broadly that all written history has hitherto been a series of class struggles; that this struggle is being carried on to-day in a society composed of two classes—the employers and the employed. Before going to the subject let me first point out a big blunder committed by Marx, a blunder which, by the way, I believe I was the first to mention. If society is composed of the employers and employed, *where do the unemployed come in?* I expect a knighthood or a month in gaol for this. I expect the first, because knighthoods are certificates testifying to the blindness of justice; and the latter because in these revolutionary days it is as well to be prepared for the worst, and we may be overwhelmed at any moment by an intelligent democracy. To return to our subject. Is it true that history has been a succession of class struggles? Let us examine history for ourselves, let us peer into its pages in an impartial manner, for we must remember that it is better to kick the cat than to expectorate on the fire-irons. One of the most prominent names that strikes the eye in English history is that of King John, who is mentioned in connexion with Magna Charta. What was the Magna Charta? Permit me to give you some hitherto unknown history in connexion with it. "Magna" is merely the name of a prominent Suffragette of those times; it was originally Mag or Maggie until she married an Oxford Don, who added "na" to Mag in order to give it a Latin sound. Maggie was in the habit of going around her neighbourhood with a cart selling winkles, and when not using the cart for business

purposes she used it as a platform; this was against the constitution of the country, but unfortunately nothing could be done—civilization had not yet reached the pitch of forced-feeding—and ultimately King John allowed Maggie perfect freedom. Now Marxists please note, *Maggie was a member of the working class*. Does this look like class antagonism?

The student will see the necessity for caution when examining the theories of Marx. Look for a moment at the Materialist Conception of History; what does it mean? Marx says that the method of production determines our ethical and religious thought. Very well, we will take him at his word. In the production of a wrinkle from its shell what determines the time required? The length of the pin or the number of twists? In producing the Rent I have seen different effects produced upon persons—the tenant has looked gloomy, whilst the collector smiled; why not the same effect on both if the Marxian theory is true? Who has not partaken of tea produced by the same method each day, yet on some days the thoughts that have arisen are entirely opposite to the pleasant ones of other days? Need we go on? Everywhere we look in Marxism we find fallacies, and in conclusion I would just add a few words of advice: remember that life is like a packet of pins, full of sharp points, and when in doubt consult a railway guide. The way to the "Labour Exchange" position is paved with forgotten principles and principals. "Slowly but surely" must be your watchwords. As Plato says, "To stand still is to remain motionless, but to fall down the cellar steps does not necessarily secure compensation!"

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS

LIZZIE writes complaining that when her husband gave her a black eye she obeyed the "dear old book" and turned the other cheek, and he nearly knocked her silly. She asks plaintively, "What am I to do?" Don't give up, Lizzie, try the book again (if it is a heavy one); remember "*a bang in time saves nine*."

MAUD C. wishes to know whether she can get any patterns for a new blouse out of Marx's III. Vol. Oh dear! Try the third chapter, Maud.

SYNDICATE.—The best costume on the market at present is the "Freeradica." It is made of "Veto" cloth, which is thrown out a good many times. It is tastefully decorated with "Labour Exchange" tickets.

The statesmanship of the near future must escape from the board-rooms of banking houses, and strive for an open-aired, broad-visioned, and earth-gripping state of mind.

Correspondence

18, Somerfield Road,
Finsbury Park, N.,
4th., May, 1910.

DEAR MR. EDITOR,—

I am glad to hear many Plebeians consider that my articles on the history of Ruskin College are "flogging a dead horse." because I would like to think we had done this poor old hack to death for its own sake, as well as for that of the Labour Movement. I shall be glad to hear further expressions of opinion on the subject. Is everybody really convinced that the enemies of Labour have captured Ruskin College; that Mr. Hird was driven out of it because he was a faithful soldier of democracy; and that the Strike and the foundation of the Central Labour College were therefore justifiable? If so it only remains to show why the reconstituted Ruskin College is not good enough for us. I hear that Professor Lees-Smith, has been elected Chairman for another three years. That is a sufficient reason. There must be a clearing out of the re-actionists,—lock, stock, and barrel. Then I have no doubt Mr. Hird and the Plebs League—which means the students and workers who in the old days made Ruskin College popular in the Labour Movement—will be prepared to march in and take possession. But we can make no terms with the enemy. We demand absolute surrender. The disappearance of Messrs. Buxton and Wilson is the best of signs. If Lees-Smith and the rest of the Dons on the Council follow suit all will be well. But there are still Trade Union Branches which support Ruskin College. I should like to have expressions of opinion as to the advisability of re-publishing my articles in pamphlet form for their benefit. At the same time I feel highly gratified, and must congratulate everybody concerned on the successful results of our efforts so far.

Yours fraternally,

WILLIAM H. SEED.

TREDEGAR MINERS AND LABOUR SCHOLARSHIPS.

At the monthly meeting of the Tredegar Valley District of the South Wales Miners Federation, it was decided to recommend the Lodges to contribute at the rate of one penny per member every half-year towards founding a scholarship at the Central Labour College, Oxford.—*Western Mail*, May 17th., 1910.

General Economic and Social Development of Rome

I. From the Founding of Rome to the Roman Republic

"In Rome the gentile organization became an exclusive aristocracy amid a numerous plebs of outsiders who had only duties, but no rights"—*Engels*.

EARLY ROME

THE cloak of legend conceals from our view the actual features attendant upon the founding and early days of Rome. Its history is that of a city which originally had only a few miles of territory, gradually extending its dominion at first over Italy and then over the civilized world. Like Greece, the Italian Peninsula was divided up among several different tribes, e.g. Latins Sabellians, Oscans, Umbrians, although it is probable that they all entered Italy as one people. When the first dim light of history fell upon them the upper stage of barbarism had been reached, they were strictly agricultural in their habits, the rearing of domestic animals had made great progress, while on the side of family relations monogamy had begun to take hold. The Latin tribes were thirty in number, forming a confederacy for the purposes of common defence against the surrounding foes. The territory they originally occupied was bounded on the north by the Tiber, on the east by the Appenines, on the west by the sea, and on the south by the Alban hills. According to the Roman Legend the Latin city of Rome was founded by Romulus, one of the twin sons of Rea Silvia, a vestal virgin, and the war god Mars. Descent from the gods is a phenomena quite common to the ancient world. All tribal heroes are of divine origin. Divinity itself, however, has a material origin. Some historians have erroneously regarded such legends as the supernatural parentage of Romulus as utterly valueless. Such a regard is only possible for those philosophers who look at the world upside down and who conceive things to be begotten in their "virgin" brain by contact with the "god" idea. A scientific conception of history enables one to see that it is impossible for the human mind to "invent" something which "has not the slightest basis in fact." Mars was the god of war and agriculture. On both of these activities the Latins at this early time depended for their existence. True the worship of Mars belongs to the category of Nature Worship but Ancestor Worship existed side by side with it. And Herbert Spencer has shown the connexion between these two forms, that the stars and the sun and the moon have been personalized by identification with a traditional human being. Once the patriarchal form of the family has arisen, the one common male ancestor from whom descent is traced becomes a god and is worshipped by his descendants. In this way Romulus and Remus would be literally sons of a god, i.e. their ancestral progenitor. That succeeding generations should exaggerate the incident handed down

to them in story, rendering it more and more grotesque, is nothing strange when we consider the material and mental development of the age in which they lived. Still even in legend there can be seen the reflex of actual life, the beliefs and customs of that day.

THE CONSTITUTION OF ROMULUS

As in Greece so in Rome, the earliest glimpse of history reveals the existence of Gentile society with its gens unit, its phratries, tribes and confederation of tribes. The founding of Rome, which is alleged to have taken place in or about 750 B.C. marks the period of the Heroic age. Progress had reached a point when it became less interrupted and more rapid. Wealth was increasing rapidly, and the acquisition of wealth was becoming the impelling motive of life. War, for the purposes of plunder, was the order of the day. But war against external foes for the seizure of their wealth soon developed its antithesis—the internal foe. Military organization and federal government of the hitherto loosely confederated tribes was rendered imperative. The rapid increase of the population, the expansion of territory, the enslavement of the conquered, the growing distinctions between rich and poor forshadowed the inevitable downfall of Roman gentilism. The period known in the official histories as that of *the seven Roman reges* or Kings reveals this down-going progress of the old gentile order. Right on towards the end of this period there goes on a continual modification of the gentile constitution, what we would call to-day reforms, attempts to patch up the existing framework. But the latter had become too rotten to hold together the superstructural splicings. The movement alleged to have been begun by Romulus the first rex (equivalent to the Celtic-Irish *righ* or tribal chief) opened with the federation of three tribes—the Ramnes, Tities and Luceres. The gentile basis remained. Each tribe contained ten curiae (analogous to Grecian phratry). The curia contained ten gentes. The symmetrical proportions of the component parts, i.e., the even distribution of the gentes to curia and curiae to tribe was no doubt artificial; still the tribes are essentially modelled after the old natural tribe. The social unit is the gens. These three tribes form the *Populus, Romanus*, or Roman people. The federation in its superstructural formation was strictly of a military character. The affairs of the community were conducted by a senate, which was composed of the chiefs of the three hundred gentes. They were called the *patres* or fathers. Paternal law and the inheritance by the children of the father's property already established, accumulation of wealth within the family developed, and the latter began to usurp the power formerly vested in the gens and to assert supremacy over it. Distinctions of rank between families were favoured by this development. Wealthy families were succeeding in gaining the official positions. Then they strove to make these positions hereditary. When this was accomplished these families became the nobility. They were designated the *Patresfamilias* or

Patricians, and in course of time claimed the exclusive right to fill the senatorial office. There was, in addition to the Senate, a sovereign assembly of the people, called the *comitia curiata*, because they assembled by *curiae*, each *curia* having a vote. Each tribe had to furnish 1,000 men for the infantry and 100 men for the cavalry. Thus 3,000 foot-soldiers and 300 horse-soldiers formed the original army of Rome and were called a Legion. At the head was the *Rex*, who is wrongly regarded by the official historians as a king, but who in reality was a general military commander, nominated and elected by the people. Kingly government was quite incompatible with the gentile constitution, and the fact that the democratic spirit was still deeply rooted in the tribes is evinced by the mysterious disappearance of Romulus, the first of the *reges*, who no doubt attempted to assume powers dangerous to the community, and as a result was assassinated. Indeed, up to the institution of the Republic, there seems to have been a continual tendency on the part of the *reges* to usurp powers outside their office, and Romulus was not the only one who, as a consequence, made an unnatural exit from the world of human affairs. When the Republic was established, the office of *Rex* was abolished, its place being taken by the *Consulate*, and it is not surprising, in view of their past experience, that to this office the Romans elected two individuals instead of only one. The danger of usurpation was in this way lessened.

PATRICIANS V. PLEBS

We have already pointed out the development of the Patrician rank in early Roman society. All who were not Patricians were called Plebs. From ancient times access to the tribe was not permitted to strangers. Emigrants to Rome, attracted by the position and growing prominence of the city, were denied the right to participate in the administration of public affairs. With every growth of the population, either through conquest or immigration, the anomalies would appear more and more glaring to the unenfranchised multitude that stood outside the gentile constitution, a large number of whom no doubt, contributed as much to the building up of Rome, and possessed quite as much wealth as the Patricians.

It must also be remembered that from the time of Romulus the Romans were continually engaged in war. They had to fight for their very existence. Occupying a fertile territory, it was to be expected that the surrounding tribes would seek to take possession of it just as the Romans themselves sought the lands of others. This, as we have already pointed out, demanded military organization. The Plebs were eligible for military service. They were compelled to fight the battles of a country in which they were excluded from political rights. Further, they could not participate in the distribution of the conquered lands for which they had fought. With every expansion of territory and every increase in population, the Plebs developed in strength, and this, coupled with their military training and armament, presented to the privileged nobility an even more threatening attitude,

THE INSTITUTION OF THE ROMAN REPUBLIC

The struggle between the Plebs and the Patricians ultimately reached a point, when the old gentile constitution had to go under. The three gentile tribes were uprooted and four new tribes instituted. The city was divided into four wards. "The residents of each ward were required to enroll their names and register their property." The voting power of each class was distributed according to the property possessed. The wealthiest class was allotted sufficient votes to carry a majority above the total vote of the remaining classes. They always voted first. If there was unanimity among the members of that section, the other classes did not trouble to vote. The lowest class on the list comprised those who had no property, the proletarian element, i.e., the possessors of children. (Lat. *proles* = offspring.) They had only one vote. As they could not serve the State with property, they served it with children.

This radical change was brought about during the military leadership of Servius Tullius, the sixth of the Roman reges, in 578 B.C. The new constitution which is attributed to him was simply the outcome of a recognition that *already existing conditions were incompatible with the gentile basis*, that to retain the latter was impossible if Rome was to advance. The legislation of Servius Tullius was only possible because of economic development. Wealth had already been steadily accumulating in the hands of individuals. But the newly acquired property of private individuals stood out in sharp contradiction to the communist principles of the gens. *The acquisition of private property necessitates the security of private property, and the latter is a necessary condition for the perpetuity of such acquisition.* For this an institution is required; an institution which, as Engels points out, will stamp the developing new forms of acquiring and protecting property with the universal sanction of society, and will lend the character of perpetuity to the newly rising division into classes as well as to the right of the possessing classes to exploit and rule the propertiless masses. It is this institution that appears in the Servian constitution at Rome—the *state*. Its appearance marks a complete revolution in social organization, *the groundwork of which is the revolutionary change from communal to private ownership.* Roman gentile society was based upon personal relations, upon kinship expressed through birth in the gens. Roman political society or the state was based upon territory and property, upon local residence and taxable wealth. The State therefore did not create economic classes, but rather based its governmental arrangements on their existence.

THE HEROIC IDEAL.

Since war was the chief means for realizing the great purpose of life, viz. the acquisition of wealth in the shape of land, goods and slaves, it is quite clear to us why strength and courage were the great moral qualities of ancient times. *To acquire bravery was to acquire wealth.* Courage (Lat. *bonus*) was a virtue, cowardice was a vice (Lat. *malus*). It is here pertinent to notice that the same Latin word was used to indicate *material*

goods and *moral* good. Again the Latin *virtus* meaning physical strength came to be employed in the moral sense of virtue. Originally neither merchants, artisans or slaves were allowed to bear arms. Plutarch tells us that in the Roman Republic (which we propose to deal with next month) 100 years before our era, Marius, a Roman general enrolled, in spite of the customs and laws, many slaves and vagrants to fight against the Teutons and Cimbri. "All the generals before him" says Plutarch, "excluded such from their armies. Arms, like other honours of the Republic, were only for men who were worthy and whose well known fortune answered for their fidelity." If courage then was the exclusive virtue of the Patricians, cowardice must necessarily have become the vice of the Plebeians. The Latin word *malus* indicates ugly, deformed, which was no doubt how the artisan and the slave appeared to the patrician eye. The arming of the propertiless would easily present itself to the patrician mind as fraught with danger. Having "nothing to loose but their chains," they might easily betray the Roman cause. On the other hand the propertied aristocracy had everything to loose and much to gain. Property was thus exacting to the possessor; it imposed physical and moral qualities upon him. *The possession of these was for him the condition for the possession of property.* Says Lafargue in his *Social Studies*: "The physical and moral virtues of the heroic ideal were in some fashion incorporated into the material goods which communicated them to their proprietors." Nowadays instead of endowing the material goods with moral virtues the Mahomet of the capitalist Allah endows the proprietor with moral qualities. In the political economy of the days of old when "Horatius kept the bridge," courage and daring were the great merits which contributed to wealth, and these qualities had their basis in the physical strength of the knights of the sword. In the apolegetic political economy of modern times, our Bohm Bawerks, Marshalls, and Hobsons endow the proprietors of to-day with the virtues of "waiting" and "abstinence" for which they are "rewarded"; they see in the "mental and moral equipment of the *entrepreneur*," in the "character" of the *chevalier d'Industrie*, the great moral and ethical factors which are responsible for the wealth of Nations. As we have already pointed out patrician virtues had their roots in bodily strength but the most excellent virtues of our capitalist possessors have their roots only in the highly organized imagination of the political economist.

Next Month: General Economic and Social Development of Rome.

II. From the Roman Republic to the Roman Empire.