

"I can promise to be candid, but not impartial"

GOETHE

THE
"Plebs" Magazine

Vol. V, No. 12 January, 1914. Price 2d.

Contents

1. Editorial
2. The Policy of the International
3. The Materialist Conception of History
4. A Feminest Extravaganza
5. Reports C.L.C. Classes
6. Correspondence

Oxford:

Printed by Fox, Jones and Co., Kemp Hall, High Street,

and

Published by the "Plebs" League at same Address

Copyright Entered at Stationer's Hall.

33

The "Plebs" League

Object

To further the interests of the Central Labour College, for working men and women, at London, and to assist in the formation of similar institutions elsewhere, all of these institutions to be controlled by the organized Labour bodies.

Methods

The holding of an Annual Meet: the issuing of a monthly Magazine, the pages of which shall be open to any proposed application of reason to human problems: and the formation of Local Branches to promote the object of the League, and for the study of Social Questions, History, and Economics—from the working-class standpoint.

Membership

All Students (R. C. and C. L. C.), past and present (Resident and Corresponding) and Sympathizers are eligible for membership


Each Member shall pay 1/- a year towards the Central Fund for general expenses in connexion with the Annual Meet, &c.

Management

An Executive of five members elected annually, and the Editor of Magazine, who shall be responsible as to publication and meets, &c.

The Magazine shall be 2d. per copy, 2½d. post free.

Subscriptions payable in advance: Quarterly 7½d., Half Yearly 1/3, Yearly 2/6

 The Sixth Annual Meet will be held in London (Bank Holiday), August, 1914

G. SIMS, Secretary-Treasurer

To whom all P.O.'s should be made payable

13 Penywern Road, Earls Court,
London, S.W.

THE
"Plebs" Magazine

Vol. V.

January, 1914.

No. 12.

Copyright Entered at Stationer's Hall.

EDITORIAL

OF the average "leader" in a crisis it may be said as of dead Hector of Troy: how much changed from what he once was. The most laudatory of their followers, then dwell on the past of their hero—in default of any present virtues to enthuse over. There is expressed the fact that "Time like an ever-rolling sea has borne their courage away," and that the crying need of the Present is to bury the dead Past. The recent conference at the Memorial Hall, London, on the Dublin dispute was quite a masoleum of the Pioneers. True the Dead Past served as an introduction to the funeral obsequies, "brave words in the act of running away," but for a funeral the pace, to what Barrie has described as the Never Never Land, was phenomenal. "Doubling to the Rear" was the order of the day. The meeting opened with the usual perorations from the leaders as to How we Saved the Labour Movement: but since the object of saving it was but to finally act as its undertakers, the object of the original gallantry is difficult to appraise. The original object was said to have had something to do with the Dublin dispute, but thanks to the forethought of the tried and trusted ones no unnecessary time was wasted on such an unimportant subject, instead a scandalized conference was informed of the wickedness of one, Mr. James Larkin, who had dared to criticize the Elders of England. Thereupon the said Elders, knowing how interested the rank and file are in the minutest details of the Lives of the Elders, treated them to many exquisite biographical details regarding their chaste careers. Amid ecstatic sobs of approval from the Faithful their progress from the Sunday Schools to the City Beautiful were limned. But even Elders have enemies, and here the voices of the Elders broke as they recounted in their gentle and forgiving way how the wicked Worldly Man Larkin had interrupted their devotion, insisted upon their defiling themselves by taking part in a wicked crusade against men in a far country—wicked men it is true, but oh! so much more righteous than Mr. Larkin himself, that more than one of the Elders have been constrained to assist these badly-used, though evil men. For thus playing the part of the Good Samaritan *they* (sobs) had been

trailed in the dust of the platforms of meetings where Mr. J. Larkin had addressed the Great Unwashed. Having sobbed themselves into a state of hysteria over such wickedness, the Chairman called upon Mr. James Larkin to answer to his peers for such shameful conduct, such base ingratitude.

To the everlasting discredit of James he attempted to prove that : what he had said he had said—and it was true ! Under such circumstances the conference quite forgot their customary quiet and respectful attitude in the presence of the Elders and actually—shouted ! And then James shouted ; the Gallery shouted ; the Chairman shouted and finally—crowning example of wrath !—tinkled the Sheep Bell. Instant silence ! Then the Faithful were asked to mark their disapproval of violent language—against Elders. This they did in no uncertain manner by holding up both hands, in sign and token of their total and unreserved submission to the Unwritten Law anent blaspheming the Elders which is characteristic of the folk of the Never Never Land. After such exhausting labours they adjourned for lunch—let us hope to the A. B. C.



ON re-assembling after lunch the Faithful were very anxious to know what the voting of the morning session had been about. The Chairman did not know, but he thought everyone would be satisfied if the vote was taken again—here there was shouts of "Cards !
Milk ! Cards !" and the Chairman gracefully acquiesced. For the information of readers we may state that it is usual to take two votes at conferences ; one for the delegates to exercise their arms, the other for purposes of reporting to those who pay the piper but do not call the tune. This ceremony having been performed it was carefully explained to the Faithful that the Elders desired to act the Christian part and forgive their enemies in Dublin and elsewhere. The delegates were surprised to hear about Dublin, but it was carefully explained to them that while Mr. J. Larkin was a very dangerous and mischievous man he happened to be concerned, with others, in a Labour dispute in a place of that name. Now because Dublin was a long, long way distant this dispute had appealed to the workers of England, and however much they, the Elders, might disagree with the manner of carrying on the dispute, by Mr. James and his lieutenants, they had decided to give financial assistance to the participants, as many women and children were suffering because of it ; they had given money, quite a lot already, and, though they thought the dispute really ought to end, they were prepared to continue this support—provided steps were taken to come to an agreement with the Dublin masters ; of course an honourable agreement. There was really no need to put in the word "honourable," but no speech from the Elders would be complete without it, and really adjectives of this kind give a roundness and literary finish to sentences. At this point some of the Faithful showed

signs of desiring to assist the Elders with a few well-chosen and seemly words. The Chairman, however, pointed out that others of the Faithful had trains to catch and he hoped no one would be so unfeeling and so inconsiderable as to prolong the meeting beyond the time allotted (by the Elders) for the Elders regulation discourses. However, a few Black Sheep were present and they insisted, and so the harmony was turned into discord.



Now it seemed that one or two people actually wanted to fight ! It appeared that merely giving money was not sufficient for these people (or persons): they desired to have a regular scrap with the masters of Dublin. They said that certain Trade

Money! Unionists were at work in Dublin and thus assisting the employers to break the back of the dispute. They stated that the rank and file of the organized workers were demanding that these men should be withdrawn by their Unions; and if this were done the rest of the workers were willing to levy themselves to keep these men idle. They further stated that this policy would finish the strike (a bad word to use, but you can never tell where militants will stop) off in short order, first by crippling the businesses of the Dublin bosses (a bad word again) and secondly by frightening them by such a show of militancy on the part of the great English Unions. The Elders were affrightened at such talk; they again repeated their offer of gifts of money, nay they would even increase the already large grants; then they stated that a General Strike was impossible; that the wider the area of dispute the less the chances of success; further, if they spend more money now how would the Unions meet their own troubles when trade was bad—which it would be before long; finally, the workers were not in favour of fighting because we (the Elders) had told them it was bad, caused the trade to leave the country, caused the Union to lose members and funds, caused suffering to the workers, &c., &c. These last irrefutable arguments carried the Faithful and finally it was decided to finance the Dublin strike as before and with proper provisions for further pursuit of peaceful pow-wows with masters. Then the Elders and the Faithful went their ways to carry on their share of the World's Work. Selah!



IDA WHIPPLE BANHAM contributes the following in the *New York Call*.

Careful Souls Would it need a keen search-party to discover similar types in Britain?—*Daily Herald*

We're careful souls, we're very careful souls;
Our touch is velvet and our step is down;
Our speech is honey served in painted bowls;
We smile, but never frown.

We're very careful souls—why should we wait
 Careless of shelter till the tempest pours?
 Whatever task delays without the gate,
 We hide us safe indoors.

"Hush," is our watchword, whispered under breath;
 Our motto this: "Let well enough alone!"
 We burrow, dim with dust, nor wait for death
 To hide us 'neath its stone.

There are who lift their faces to the sky,
 Sun-fronted, sun-illumined, strong of hand;
 We tremble as their earnest ranks go by
 To labour in the land.

They sow, they reap, they do, they even dare!
 We hinder cautiously, not over-much,
 Laying a hand on Progress here and there
 To thwart her with a touch.

We're very careful souls; we would not see
 This venerable order pass away;
 The hoary past is what it used to be—
 A pattern for to-day.

Yet should the loud reformer chance to win,
 And should the world at last by him be led,
 We careful souls would hold it then no sin
 To rise and eat his bread.

The Policy of the International

By MICHEL BAKUNIN

(Continued from last month)

II.

IF they had hoisted the flag of a political and anti-religious system, far from uniting the workers of Europe they would have divided them still more; because with the help of the ignorance of the workers, the interested and in the highest degree corrupting propaganda of priests, of governments and all bourgeois political parties, without excepting the "reddest" (the most revolutionary), has spread a crowd of false ideas among the masses of the workers, and these blinded masses are unhappily still too often zealous for lies which have no other end than to make them serve willingly and stupidly, to the detriment of their own interest, those of the privileged classes. There still exists, moreover, too great a difference between the degrees of development, industrial, political, intellectual and moral, of the masses of workers of different lands, that it should be possible to unite them to-day by one and the same political and anti-religious programme. To set

forth such a programme as being that of the International, to make of it an absolute condition of entry into this association ; that would be to wish to organize a sect, not an universal association ; that would be to kill the International.

There is still another reason which has operated to eliminate at the outset from the programme of the International, in appearance at least, *and only in appearance*, every political tendency.

From the beginning of history to this day, there has not yet been a policy of the people, and we understand by this word the humble people, the *canaille ouvrière*, which nourishes the world with its labour ; there has only been the policy of the privileged classes, of those classes who have made use of the muscular power of the people to dethrone one another, and to put themselves in the place of one another. The people in its turn has never taken part for the one against the others except with the vague hope that at least one of these political revolutions, none of which was able to be made without it, but none of which has been made on its behalf, would bring some solace to its age-long poverty and slavery. It has always been deceived. Even the great French Revolution has deceived it. It has slain the noble aristocracy and has put the bourgeoisie in its place. The people is no more called a slave or serf, it is proclaimed free-born by right, but in fact its slavery and its misery remain the same and they will always remain the same as long as the masses of the people continue to serve as a tool to the bourgeois policy, whether this policy is called conservative, liberal, progressive, radical, and although it should give itself the most revolutionary character in the world. For every bourgeois policy, whatever be its name and colour, can only have one single end in view : *the maintenance of bourgeois rule ; and bourgeois rule is the slavery of the proletariat.*

What ought the International to have done ? It ought at first to have withdrawn the masses of the workers from all bourgeois policy, it ought to have eliminated from its programme all bourgeois political programmes. But, at the time of its foundation, there was in the world no other policy than that of the church, or of the monarchy, or of the aristocracy, or of the bourgeoisie ; the last, especially that of the radical bourgeoisie, was without contradiction more liberal and more humane than the others : but all, equally based on the exploitation of the masses of the workers, had in reality no other end than to dispute the monopoly of this exploitation with one another. The International has had then to begin by clearing the ground, and like every other system of politics from the point of view of the emancipation of labour, found itself then tainted with reactionary elements, it has had first to throw out of its circle all known political systems, in order to be able to found, on the ruins of the bourgeois world, the true policy of the workers, the policy of the International Association.

The founders of the International Association of workers have acted with so much the more wisdom in avoiding the laying down of political and philosophical principles as the basis of this Association, and in confining itself at first to the exclusively economic struggle of Labour against Capital, as they had the certainty that, from the moment that the worker puts his foot on this plane, from the moment that, placing confidence in his right as well as in the numerical strength of his class, he engages himself with his companions in labour in a collective struggle against bourgeois exploitation, he will be necessarily led by force of circumstances, and by the development of this struggle, to recognize soon all the political, socialistic and philosophical principles of the International, principles, which are, in effect, only the just expression of its point of departure and of its end.

We have set forth these principles in our last numbers. From the political and social point of view they have as a necessary consequence the abolition of classes, consequently that of the bourgeoisie, which is the dominant class to-day; the abolition of all territorial states, that of all political "native-lands," and the establishment on their ruins of the great international federation of all productive groups, national and local. From the philosophic point of view, as they tend to nothing less than the realization of the human ideal, of human happiness, of equality, of justice, and of liberty on the earth, and consequently even tend to render altogether useless all celestial complements and all the hopes of a better world, they will have as an equally necessary consequence the abolition of forms of worship and of all religious systems.

Proclaim all at once these two ends to ignorant workers crushed by the labour of each day and demoralized, poisoned, so to speak, knowingly by the perverse doctrines that governments, in accord with all the privileged classes, priests, nobility, bourgeoisie, distribute to them with full hands, and you will frighten them; they will perhaps thrust you away, without suspecting that all these ideas are nothing less than the most faithful expression of their own interests, that these ends bear in them the realization of their most cherished vows: that on the contrary the religious and political prejudices in whose name they will perhaps reject them are the direct cause of the continuance of their slavery and of their poverty.

It is necessary to make a clear distinction between the prejudices of the masses of the people and those of the privileged class. The prejudices of the masses, as we have just said, are based only on their ignorance and are altogether contrary to their interests, while those of the bourgeoisie are founded exactly on the interests of that class, and maintain themselves only against the dissolving action of bourgeois knowledge itself, thanks to the collective egoism of the bourgeois. The people wishes, but it does not know; the bourgeoisie knows, but it does not wish. Which of the two is incurable? The bourgeoisie, without any doubt.

As a general rule one can only convert those who feel the need of being converted, only those who bear already in their instincts or in the miseries of their position whether external or internal all that you wish to give them ; you will never convert those who do not feel the need of any change, nor even those who, while wishing to escape from a position with which they are discontented, are driven by the nature of their moral, intellectual and social habits, to seek for a better position in a world which is not that of your ideas.

Convert, I beg of you, to Socialism a noble who covets riches, a bourgeois who wishes to become a noble, or even a workman who will only put forth all the strength of his soul to become a bourgeois ! Convert again a real or imaginary aristocrat of the intellect, a half-scholar, a quarter, a tenth, a hundredth part of a scholar, people full of scientific ostentation, who often because they have only had the chance of having understood books indifferently, are full of arrogant contempt for the illiterate masses, and they imagine that they have been called to form among them a new ruling, that is to say exploiting caste.

No reasoning, no propaganda will ever become fitted to convert these unfortunates. To convince them, there is only one means : that is fact ; the destruction of the possibility even of privileged situations, of all rule and all exploitation ; that is the social revolution, which by sweeping away all that constitutes inequality in the world, will make them moral by forcing them to seek their happiness in equality and solidarity.

It is otherwise with serious workers. We understand by serious workers all those who have been really crushed by the weight of labour ; all those whose position is so precarious and so miserable, that no one, without circumstances altogether extraordinary, can have the thought only of acquiring *for himself*, and only for himself, in the economic conditions of to-day and in the actual social environment, a better position ; to become for example in his turn a patron or a councillor of state. We also naturally place in this category the few and generous workmen who, while having the chance of mounting individually above the working-class, are not willing to profit by it, preferring to suffer still some time from the bourgeois exploitation, unitedly with their companions in poverty, than to become exploiters in their turn. Those have no need to be converted ; they are pure socialists.

We speak of the great mass of workers who, worn out by their daily labour, is ignorant and wretched, that which whatever may be the political and religious prejudices that one may have endeavoured and even succeeded in part to make prevail in its conscience, is *socialist without knowing it* ; it is, at the basis of its instinct, and by the very force of its position, more seriously, more really socialist, than are all the scientific and bourgeois socialists taken together. It is so by all the

conditions of its material existence, by all the needs of its being, while these latter are only so by all the needs of their thought; and, in real life, the needs of existence always exercise a power much stronger than those of thought, thought being, everywhere and always, but the expression of being, the reflexion of its successive developments, but never its source.

What is wanting to workers, is not reality, the real necessity of socialist aspirations, it is socialist thought only. What each worker demands in the bottom of his heart is: an existence fully human in both material well-being and intellectual development, based upon justice, that is to say, upon the equality and liberty of each and of all in labour—this cannot evidently be realized in the actual political and social world, which is based upon injustice and on the cynical exploitation of the labour of the masses of the workers. Then, every serious worker is of necessity a socialist revolutionary, since his emancipation can only be brought about by the overthrow of everything which at present exists. Either indeed this organization of injustice, with all its apparatus of unjust laws and of privileged institutions, must perish, or the masses of the workers will remain condemned indeed to an eternal slavery.

This is the socialist thought which will be found in the instinct of each serious labourer. The end is then to give him the full consciousness of what he wishes, to produce in him a thought which corresponds to his instinct, for, from the moment that the thought of the masses of the workers is raised to the height of their instinct, their will will be decisive and their power will become irresistible.

What is it which still prevents the rapid development of this wholesome thought in the minds of the masses of the workers? Their ignorance, and in great part the political and religious prejudices by which the interested classes are still forced to-day to darken their consciousness and their natural intelligence. How to dissipate this ignorance, how to destroy these maleficent prejudices? Will it be by education and by propaganda?

These are without doubt great and fine means, but in the actual state of the masses of the workers they are insufficient. The isolated worker is too much crushed by his labour, and by his daily needs, to have much time to give to his education. And besides, who will do this propaganda? Will it be done by a few sincere socialists, sprung from the bourgeoisie, who are full of generous willingness, without doubt, but are too few in numbers to give all the necessary breadth to their propaganda, and who, on the other hand, belonging by their position to a different world, have not all the hold which would be necessary on the world of the worker and who excite in him more or less legitimate distrust?

"The emancipation of the labourers must be the work of the labourers themselves" says the preamble to our general statutes. And there is reason a thousand times to say it. It is the principal

basis of our great Association. But the world of the worker is in general ignorant, he is still altogether without theory. Then there remains only one single way, it is *that of his emancipation by practice*. What can and must be this practice?

There is only one. It is that of the united struggle of the workers against their employers. It is *the organization and the federation of funds for opposition*.

III

If the International shows itself at first too indulgent to the conservative and reactionary ideas, whether in politics, or in religion, that workers may have on entering its circle, it is not altogether through indifference to these ideas. One cannot tax it with indifference, since it detests and rejects them with all the strength of its being, every reactionary idea being in opposition to the very principle of the International, as we have already demonstrated in our preceding articles.

This indulgence, we again repeat, has been inspired within it by a great wisdom. Knowing perfectly well that every serious worker is a socialist by all the needs inherent in his miserable position, and that his reactionary ideas, if he has any, can only be the effect of his ignorance, it counts on the collective experience which he cannot fail to acquire in the circle of the International, and in particular on the development of the collective struggle of the labourers against the employers, to deliver him from them.

And, in effect, from the moment that a worker, putting faith in the possibility of a near radical transformation of the economic situation, begins in association with his comrades, to fight seriously for the shortening of his hours of labour and the increase of his wages, from the moment when he begins to take a lively interest in this completely material struggle, it can be certain that he will soon forsake all his celestial pre-occupations, and that, habituating himself to rely more and more on the collective power of the labourers, he will voluntarily give up the help of heaven. Socialism takes in his spirit the place of religion.

It will be the same with his reactionary politics. It will lose his principal support in the degree that the consciousness of the worker will see itself freed from religious oppression. On the other hand, the economic struggle, while developing and extending itself more, will make him in a practical manner and by a collective experience, which is always of necessity more instructive and larger than isolated, know more and more fully who are his true enemies—the privileged classes, the clergy, the bourgeoisie, the nobility, and the State: the last being there only to safeguard all the privileges of these classes, and of necessity always taking their part against the proletariat.

The worker thus engaged in the struggle, will end by forcibly understanding the irreconcilable antagonism between these agents of reaction and his dearest human interests, and, come to this point, he will not fail to realize himself and to place himself squarely as a revolutionary socialist.

It is not thus with the bourgeoisie. All their interests are contrary to the economic transformation of society; and if their ideas are contrary thereto, if these ideas are also reactionary, or, as one calls them politely, moderate; if their intelligence and their heart reject this great act of justice and of emancipation which we call social revolution; if they have a horror of a real social equality, that is to say, of political, social, and economic equality at the same time; if, in the bottom of their soul, they wish to keep for themselves, for their class or for their children, a single privilege, be it only that of intelligence, as many bourgeois socialists do to-day; if they do not only detest with all the logic of their spirit, but also, with all the power of all their feeling, the actual order of things—then one can be certain that they will remain reactionaries, enemies of the cause of the workers all their lives. They must be kept at a distance from the International.

They must be kept at a great distance, for they could only enter therein to demoralize it and to turn it away from its path. There is besides an infallible sign by which the workers can recognize whether a bourgeois who asks to be received into their ranks comes to them freely, without the shadow of hypocrisy and without the least mental reservation. This sign is the relations which he has kept with the bourgeois world.

The antagonism which exists between the world of workers and the bourgeois world takes on a more and more pronounced character. Every man who thinks seriously, and whose sentiments and imagination are not corrupted by the influence of unconscious or interested sophisms, must understand to-day that no reconciliation is possible between them. The labourers wish for equality, and the bourgeoisie wish for the maintenance of inequality. The one evidently destroys the other. The great majority of the bourgeois capitalists and owners, also those who have the courage to avow freely what they wish, have equally that of manifesting with that same freedom the horror with which the actual movement of the workers inspires them. These are enemies, as resolute as sincere; we know them, and it is well.

But there is another order of bourgeois who have not the same freedom or the same courage, enemies of the social liquidation, which we call for with all the power of our souls, as a great act of justice, as a necessary point of departure and the indispensable basis of an equal and rational organization of society; they wish, like all the other bourgeois, to preserve economic inequality, this source of all

other inequalities ; and at the same time they pretend to wish for the entire emancipation of the labourer, and of Labour. They maintain against us, with a passion worthy of the most reactionary bourgeois, the very cause of the slavery of the proletariat, the separation of labour and of immovable or capitalized property, represented to-day by two different classes ; and they pose nevertheless as the apostles of the deliverance of the working-class from the yoke of property and capital !

Are they deceived or do they deceive ? Some are deceived in good faith, many deceive ; the greater number are deceived and deceive at one and the same time. They all belong to that category of radical bourgeois and the bourgeois socialists who have founded the League of Peace and Liberty.

Is this League socialistic ? At the beginning and during the first year of its existence as we have already had occasion to say it rejected socialism with horror.

Last year, at its Congress at Berne, it triumphantly rejected the principle of economic equality. To-day, feeling itself dying and wishing to live a little longer, and understanding at last that no political existence is forthwith possible without the Social Question, it calls itself socialist ; it has become bourgeois socialist ; which means that it wishes to resolve all social questions on a basis of *economic inequality*. It wishes to, it must, preserve the interest of capital and rent of the land, and with that it pretends to emancipate the labourers ! It tries to give a body to nonsense.

Why does it do this ! What is it which has made it undertake a work as incongruous as barren ? It is not difficult to understand.

A great part of the bourgeoisie has been wearied with the reign of Cæsarism and militarism which it founded itself in 1848 through fear of the proletariat. Do you recall only the days of June, the forerunners of the days of December ? do you recall that National Assembly which, after the days of June, cursed and insulted with but one dissentient voice, the illustrious and one may well say the heroic socialist Proudhon who alone had had the courage to hurl the defiance of socialism at this enraged flock of bourgeois Conservatives, Liberal and Radical ? And one must not forget that among these insulters of Proudhon there is a number of citizens still living and more militant to-day than ever, and who, crowned with an aureole by the persecutions of December, have since become the martyrs of liberty.

Then there is no doubt that the bourgeoisie all in a mass, the radical bourgeoisie included therein, has been properly the creator of the Cæsarism and military despotism whose effects it deploras to-day. After having made use of it against the proletariat, they would deliver themselves from it at this hour. Nothing is more natural : this régime humiliates and ruins it. But how to deliver itself therefrom ?

Formerly it was courageous and powerful, it had the power of conquests. To-day, it is cowardly and weak, it is afflicted with the impotence of old men. It knows its weakness only too well, it feels that by itself it can do nothing. It needs then a help. This help can only be the proletariat: it is then necessary to gain the proletariat.

But how to gain it? By promises of political liberty and equality? These are words which no longer touch the labourers. They have learned to their cost, they have understood by hard experience, that these words mean for them nothing but the upholding of their economic slavery, often even harder than before. If then you would touch the heart of these miserable millions of slaves of labour, speak to them of their economic emancipation. There is no longer a workman who does not know now that that is, for him, the only serious and real basis of all other emancipations. Then one must speak to them of economic reforms of society.

"Ah well!" the leaguers of Peace and Liberty have said to themselves, "let us speak of it, let us call ourselves socialists also. Let us promise them economic and social reforms, on condition always that they are willing to fully respect the bases of civilization and of bourgeois omnipotence: individual and hereditary ownership, the interest of capital, and the rent of the land. Let us persuade them that on these conditions alone, which assure us moreover rule, and slavery to the labourers, the labourers may be emancipated.

"Let us persuade them again that, to realize all these social reforms, a good political revolution is first necessary, one exclusively political, as red as it will please them from the political point of view, with a great smashing of heads if that becomes necessary, but with the greatest respect for sacrosanct property; an entirely Jacobin revolution, in a word, which will render us the masters of the situation; and once masters, we will give to the workmen what we are able and what we wish."

Here is an infallible sign by which the workers can recognize a false socialist, a bourgeois socialist: if in speaking to them of the revolution, or, if you will, of the social transformation, he says to them that the political transformation *must precede* the economic transformation; if he denies that they ought to come about both at once, or even that the political revolution ought to be something else than the putting into immediate and direct action of the social liquidation full and entire,—let them turn their back on him for he is either only a fool, or a hypocritical exploiter.

IV

The International Working Men's Association, in order to remain faithful to its principles and not to deviate from the only course which can lead it to a harbour, ought to fortify itself above all against

the influences of two kinds of bourgeois socialists : the partisans of *bourgeois politics*, including also the *bourgeois revolutionaries*, and those of *bourgeois co-operation*, or so-called *practical men*. Let us consider in the first place.

Economic emancipation as we have said in the foregoing number is the basis of all other emancipations. We have summed up by these words the whole policy of the International.

We read indeed in the preambles to our general statutes the following declaration :

"That the subjection of labour to capital is the source of all slavery, political, moral, and material, and that, for this reason, the emancipation of the labourers is the great end to which every political movement ought to be subordinated."

It is well understood with regard to every political movement which has not for its immediate and direct object the definite and complete economic emancipation of the labourers, and which has not written on its flag, in a very determinate and clear manner, the principle of economic equality, that is the entire restitution of capital to labour, or indeed social liquidation—that every such political movement is bourgeois and as such ought to be excluded from the International.

There ought to be consequently excluded without pity the policy of democratic bourgeois or bourgeois socialists who, in declaring that, "political liberty is the precedent condition of economic emancipation," can understand by these words nothing else than : "That political reforms, or the political revolution, must precede economic reforms or the economic revolution ; that workers ought in consequence to ally themselves to the more or less radical bourgeois to first bring about in conjunction with them the former, without prejudice to their right to use the latter against them in the end."

We loudly protest against this fatal theory, which could only end, for the labourers, in making them serve once again as a tool against themselves, and in delivering them anew to the exploitation of the bourgeoisie.

To acquire political liberty in the *first place*, can mean no other than to acquire it in the *first place all by itself*, leaving, at least for some days to come, economic and social relations in their present condition, that is to say, owners and capitalists with their insolent riches, and the labourers with their poverty.

But this liberty once acquired—it is said—will serve as a weapon to the labourers to acquire *equality* or *economic justice* later. The whole matter is to know if the labourers will be able to make use of it really, if it will be really in their possession, or if, as has always been up to the present, their political liberty will be only a deceptive appearance, a fiction ?

A worker, in his present economic situation, to whom one came to speak of political liberty, could he not reply by the refrain of a well known song :

* " Do not speak of liberty
Poverty is slavery "

And assuredly one must be fond of illusions to imagine that a worker, in the economic and social conditions in which he is at present, can profit fully by, and make a serious and real use of his political liberty. He needs for that purpose two little things : leisure and material means.

Moreover, have we not seen this in France, on the morrow of the Revolution of 1848, the most radical revolution that one can desire from the political point of view ?

French workmen were neither indifferent, nor unintelligent, and notwithstanding the most extensive universal suffrage, they have had to let the bourgeois go their own way. Why ? Because they have lacked the material means which are needed so that political liberty may become a reality, because they have remained the slaves of a labour forced by hunger, while the radical, liberal, and even conservative bourgeois, the one republicans of the day before, the others converts of the morrow, were going and coming, were making an agitation, were speaking and conspiring freely, the one thanks to their funds or to their lucrative bourgeois employment, the others thanks to the State budget which had been naturally preserved and which had been made even stronger than ever.

We know what resulted therefrom ; at first the days of June ; later, as a necessary consequence, the days of December.

But, it will be said, the labourers, become wiser by the very experience which they have had, will send bourgeois no more into the constituent or legislative assemblies, they will send simple workers : poor as they are, the labourers will be well able to pay the expenses of their deputies. Do you know what will result from this ? It is that the workmen deputies, transported into bourgeois conditions of existence and into an atmosphere of political ideas altogether bourgeois, ceasing to be actual labourers to become statesmen, will become bourgeois, and perhaps will be even more bourgeois than the bourgeoisie themselves. For men do not make positions, it is the positions on the contrary that make the men. We know also by experience that *bourgeois workers* are often no less egoistic than bourgeois exploiters, nor less disastrous to the International than bourgeois socialists, nor less vain and ridiculous than ennobled bourgeois. Whatever one may do and whatever one may say, while the labourer remains sunk in his actual condition there will be no liberty possible for him, and those who urge him to acquire political liberties, without first touching the burning question of socialism, without pronouncing that word which makes the bourgeois turn pale : *social liquidation*, say to him simply : Acquire first this liberty for us so that later we may be able to make use of it against you.

* Refrain of a song of Pierre Lachambeaudie.

But one may say, however, they are well meaning and sincere, these bourgeois. There are no good intentions and sincerity which prevail against the influences of position, and, since we have said that the workers themselves who would put themselves into this position would become bourgeois, perforce with much stronger reason the bourgeois who remain in this position will remain bourgeois.

If a bourgeois, inspired by a great passion for justice, equality and humanity, wishes seriously to labour for the emancipation of the proletariat, let him begin at first by breaking all the political and social bonds, all the relations of interest as well as of disposition of vanity and of heart with the bourgeoisie. Let him understand at first that no reconciliation is possible between the proletariat and this class which, living only on the exploitation of another, is a natural enemy of the proletarians.

After having definitely turned his back on the bourgeois world, let him then come to rank himself under the flag of the labourers, on which are inscribed these words: "Justice, equality and liberty, for all. Abolition of classes by the economic equality of all. Social liquidation." He will then be welcome.

With respect to the bourgeois socialists and the bourgeois workers,* who come to speak to us of conciliation between bourgeois politics and the socialism of the labourers, we have only one counsel to give to these last: You must turn your back on them. Since the bourgeois socialists are, with the bait of socialism, forced to organize to-day a formidable agitation of the workers, in order to acquire political liberty, a liberty which, as we have just seen, would profit the bourgeoisie only; since the masses of the workers having come to the knowledge of their position, enlightened and directed by the principles of the International, organize themselves assuredly and begin to form a true power, not national, but international; not to do the business of the bourgeoisie, but their own; and since, to realize this bourgeois ideal of a complete political liberty with republican institutions, a revolution is needed, and that no revolution can succeed except by the power of the people, it is necessary that this power, ceasing to draw the chestnuts from the fire for the bourgeois gentlemen, should forthwith work only to make the cause of the people succeed, the cause of all those who labour against all those who exploit labour.

The International Working Men's Association, faithful to its principles, will never give a hand to a political agitation which has not for an immediate and direct end *the complete economic emancipation of the labourer*, that is to say, the abolition of the bourgeoisie as a class economically separated from the mass of the population, nor to any revolution which from the first day, from the first hour, will not inscribe upon its flag: *social liquidation*.

* Those whom Bakunin calls the "bourgeois workers" are the independent craftsmen of Geneva, as there was a certain number in the manufacturing sections.

But revolutions do not arise suddenly. They are not made arbitrarily either by individuals, or even by the most powerful associations. Independently of all will, and of all conspiracy, they are always led by the force of circumstances. We can foresee them sometimes by having a presentiment of their approach, but we can never accelerate their outburst.

Convinced of this truth, we ask ourselves this question: What is the policy which the International ought to follow during this period, more or less lengthy, which separates us from that terrible social revolution which every one foresees to-day?

Making an abstraction, as its statutes bid it do, of all national and local politics, it will give to the agitation of the workers in all lands an *essentially economic* character, in putting, as an end, the shortening of hours of labour and the increase of wages; as a means, the association of the masses of workers and the formation of funds for opposition.

It will propagate its principles, for these principles being the purest expression of the collective interest of the labourers of the whole world, are the soul and constitute all, the vital force of the Association: it will make this propaganda broadly, without regard for bourgeois susceptibilities, in order that each labourer, going out from the intellectual and moral torpor in which it is sought to keep him, may understand the situation, may know well what he ought to wish for and with what conditions he may acquire the rights of man.

It will make thereby a propaganda so much the more energetic and sincere, since in the International itself, we meet with influences which, affecting to despise these principles, would make them pass for a useless theory and endeavour to lead back the labourers to the political, economic and religious catechism of the bourgeoisie.

It will extend itself finally and will organize itself strongly through the boundaries of all lands, so that, when the revolution, led by the force of things, shall have broken out, it may find itself a real force knowing what it ought to do, and thereby indeed capable of making itself master of the revolution and of giving to it a truly wholesome direction for the people: a serious international organization of associations of workers of all lands, capable of taking the place of this political world of states and of the bourgeoisie which vanishes.

We end this faithful exposition of the policy of the International by reproducing the last paragraph of the preambles to our general statutes:

"The movement which is being brought about among the workers of the most industrially developed countries of Europe, in giving birth to new hopes, gives the solemn warning not to fall back again into old errors."

Translated for the *Plebs Magazine* by Mr. A. J. HACKING, M.A.

The Materialist Conception of History

(Continued from last Month)

[*Foreword.*—We have "lifted" the following article from the *New York Weekly People*. We have no scruples in doing so because the aim of that journal is not commercial but educational. They, like we, desire to popularize the only really explanatory social science of the age. The article has been translated by C. H. Seaholm from the Scandinavian of Gustav Bang.]

V—Socialism

NO matter how directly elucidating the materialist conception of history may be found by the logically reasoning, no matter how sufficient its explanations of all social phenomena of ancient as well as modern times, no matter how strongly its correctness may be confirmed by tests under a multiplicity of situations,—the proletariat nevertheless is the only class in modern society fully in a position to avail itself of the idea, and only in the service of the inquiry that stands unequivocally on the side of the fighting proletariat does it become an effective medium through which to widen the mental horizon, sharpen the social intellect, and in consequence of that, forge new weapons for the class struggle. At the hands of the propertied classes and at the hands of the investigators of things historical and social, who consciously or unconsciously stand forth as their champions and spokesmen, the materialist conception of history meets only with ridicule and revilement; not even with the best of intentions are they capable of appropriating the idea to themselves.

And this is not an accident. The materialist conception of history itself explains why, within the present order of society, divided on class lines, it necessarily must be the attribute particularly of the proletariat, while it meets the most violent opposition from the camp of the bourgeoisie.

This is obvious, since **science's acknowledgement** of anything new, like all other manifestations of intellectual life, is,—socially seen,—a reflex of the class psychology that has arisen on the basis of the prevailing material technique of production. Just as little as one class can put itself in a position where it can experience the thoughts and emotional sensations of an antagonistic class can it imbibe and adopt a scientific view decidedly hostile to its own social interests. Its instinct of self-preservation will rebel against it, its mind will be unceptive.

The bourgeoisie as a class is socially conservative. It regards the existing order of things as the best one possible, as the only reasonable one, an order of things which it is essential to uphold and defend against all attacks. The bourgeoisie admits that the social system is afflicted with certain shortcomings that need be remedied, and as a

class it is willing,—surely more so in word than in deed,—occasionally to institute a few improvements which may here and there ease the conditions of life of the most miserably situated layers of the people; but, it should be noted, each such alleviation must be brought about as a peaceful reform, as an act of grace from the propertied classes and it must not unsettle the foundations of capitalist society. The capitalist class' unrestricted mastery over the means of production, and thereby over all and everything engaged in the service of production, is the order of things which for immeasurable ages must be preserved; every thought of a revolutionary change in that order is an insolent and presumptuous idea. Such is the socially conservative manner of reasoning—and quite naturally so—that takes its rise in the bourgeois mind, and to that mind the materialist conception of history stands forth as a thought nothing short of provoking.

The materialist conception of history is revolutionary in its tendency. It teaches that society constantly changes, not through the blind play of chance but through the action of certain irresistible forces, how one historical phase arises following the other, grows, reaches maturity, dies and is in turn released by new historical phases. Capitalism itself is such a passing phase of history evolution; it came into existence at a certain stage when the development of the productive forces demanded the capitalist mode of production, and is destined again to disappear when the productive forces have grown beyond the control of that mode of production. And through the light thrown by this conception of history upon the development of modern history in its entirety it shows ever more plainly from year to year that the foundation upon which capitalism bases its justification for existence is wobbling even now, that the present system is cracking in its joints, that the proletariat—being the only revolutionary class—is destined to execute the death sentence of the capitalist social order and that Socialism comes to be its unavoidable, its only conceivable heir. Thus it heralds the imminent social annihilation of the bourgeoisie, and on that account it is quite natural that that class hesitates in the matter of subscribing to it—a scientific theory carrying with it such consequences—and that it (the bourgeoisie) simply combats it and closes its eyes to the facts that speak in favour of the theory.

But things are found to be quite contrariwise with the proletariat. As socially conservative as the bourgeoisie is, so socially revolutionary the proletariat necessarily must be, because its class interests will gain predominance only under a new social order arising on the ruins of capitalist society.

Already before Marx had formulated the historical materialism and thereby created the scientific foundation for Socialism, the idea of a Socialist system had sprung up in the minds of many men, and contemporaneously a proletarian class struggle had begun to make its

appearance, reflected by strikes, trade and co-operative organizations and efforts to obtain a share in the political power and utilize that power in the interest of the working class. Both these movements naturally were inevitable reflexes of that revolution in social relations which the capitalist mode of production had brought about. But the two existed dissociated from each other and without mutual connexion. The Socialistic thoughts were utopias, ingeniously contrived systems, whose originators held they must triumph by strength of their justice, high moral and inner truth,—lofty ideas floating in the air and having no connexion with the practical life such as it was led and endured in factories, shops and mines, on fields, aboard ships and at other places of work—day-dreams in short, alien to reality. And the class struggle of the workers, on the other hand, came to be nothing but a series of planless feuds without any great, common-to-all central idea, but fought instinctively and directed at random at the very nearest practical objects and without any clearly conscious apprehension in regard to what problems lay further ahead and would next have to be tackled.

Through Marx's discovery of the law governing historical evolution, these two currents were brought together, both were given a new colour and an entirely new significance.

The materialist conception of history demonstrates that the realization of Socialism can not be the result of its justification from an idealistic point of view, but solely of its material necessity. A new, higher order of society does not arise because it is in itself more just than the existing one, but because it is the only frame within which the continued development of the productive forces is possible. The Socialistic ideas which we find breaking through and springing forth throughout capitalist society in themselves signify that Socialism satisfies a want felt by the race evolved under the influence of the capitalist mode of production, but whether these ideas at all are to be transplanted into real life depends on the forces which real life itself places at society's disposal. Therefore, instead of giving one's self over to utopian dreams, one must through sober scientific analysis of the development of capitalist society, find out in which direction present social tendencies point, what inner weaknesses society is afflicted with, and what sort of a new order or mode of carrying on production will overcome the difficulties, which under the rule of capital tower higher and higher. That is the problem which must be solved. And Marx did not rest satisfied with ascertaining that that was the question; to him the recognition of the material conception of history became only the starting point from which he proceeded to those profound inquiries into the process of capitalist production and exchange which led to the demonstration of Socialism's historical necessity. Herewith the character of Socialism as a utopia was no more; it now stepped forth as the scientifically certain destination of the entire process of capitalist development.

And with that, also, the goal was set for the class struggle of the workers. The materialist conception of history shows that the class struggle does not arise accidentally, but that it springs forth because of the class antagonisms which are a natural outcome of the development of the means of production, and it shows further that the class struggle inevitably must wax in extent and vigour until the proletariat conquers the social powers, and—driven on by its own class interests—uses those powers to abolish the capitalist mode of production and institute instead a Socialist order which obliterates all class antagonisms and all exploitation. Thus the Socialist order of society becomes the necessary consequent of the workers' class struggle and it must be realized through this, the workers,' revolutionary class struggle.

In this manner the materialist conception of history unites the two separate ideas, Socialism and the class struggle, into one indivisible whole or in other words, the Goal, which the Movement necessarily must strive to attain, and the Movement, which necessarily must lead to the goal.

To him who studies the laws governing capitalist society, with the materialist conception of history for a starting point, Socialism stands forth as the inevitably necessary result of the social development that marks the period we are at present traversing, because Socialism alone can provide the room that will allow of the development of the productive forces. **Socialism is a historic necessity, therefore it must triumph.** But, it should be noted, it does not become a reality through an automatic process with man as a passive spectator of the course of events and for the rest giving free play to the social forces. The result thereof would only be the stagnation of evolution, the decadence of society, the pollution of civilization, the germination of barbarism. Socialism as a new, higher form of social life **can be established only through the conscious efforts of men of thought, will, and action.** To enlighten the great masses of people who are now groaning under the curse of capitalism, to organize them for the class struggle, to equip them for the conquering of political power, to empower them to fulfil their historic mission—these are the problems confronting the Movement whose aim it is to lift society to a new and higher civilization. The social evolution, which, day by day, ever more plainly and insistently shows the workers to what unreasonable and provoking consequences capitalism leads, itself provides, and places at the workers' disposal all the means for the solution of these problems.

The materialist conception of history, so far from leading to a barren fatalism, or a pagan belief in the realization of Socialism through the blind play of historic Fate, on the contrary shows that Socialism's triumph depends upon the fact that there arises a fighting proletariat, an army of well educated, clearly thinking men, ready to sacrifice themselves in the service of the great cause for which they are fighting.

With the establishment of Socialism the very law which Marx discovered and formulated as governing the course of historical evolution, will be essentially changed. It was Engels who on one occasion used the expression that when the Socialist order of society is instituted, "mankind leaps out of the reign of necessity into that of freedom." Naturally, under all forms of society certain constraining needs will prevail; we shall be compelled to till and sow to be able to reap; we shall be compelled to work in order to exist; we shall be compelled to pay rational heed to the forces of nature as well as social life and adjust our actions in conformity with these forces. But under Socialism this dependence on environment will be wholly different, far less burdensome than now. At present we are placed like pieces on a chess-board and moved like things devoid of will-power by mighty forces over which we ourselves have no influence and of which we hardly have any clear comprehension. The worker is drawn to the place of work or driven into unemployment without himself being in a position to do anything in the matter; the capitalist finds the industrial conditions alternately favourable and unfavourable: we are all at the mercy of strange forces whose play is as incalculable as the weather; we all feel that our modes of thought and action are essentially determined from without, by the social environment in which we are placed, instead of from within, by the particular individuality we each develop.

We are slaves of the social system in which we live. When men adjust themselves under Socialist relations all this will be different. Instead of being compelled to submit blindly to foreign social forces they will make themselves the lords of society, take the direction of social affairs in their own hands and manage these affairs systematically, consciously, through candid decisions, responsible to themselves and their fellow men. First then man will in truth have made the earth his servant.

The End

A Feminst Extravaganza

THE race is not to the swift but to the good-humoured. Philistinism made this discovery early in the nineteenth century, and so got the start of the pedagogs and idealists on the one hand, and the heretics and Socialists on the other, by a full seventy-five years. What is the result? Our schoolmasters still teach us that the truth is pedantic, solemn-visaged, stuffy, austere; our radicals and revolutionists, that it is angry, belligerent, rebellious, iconclastic, terrible to behold. It has remained for Shaw to teach us that the

most serious truth is full of fun. This is a lesson to which American Socialists do not take kindly. We know that a raging sea of truth has dashed for a century against the Capitalist rock, and that the rock has weathered the onset with great good humour and complacency. Do we turn our experience to useful account? Not we. We lash the truth to renewed fury, instead of borrowing a weapon from the enemy's camp and applying the very simple maxim that a drop of smiling persistence will wear away a stone.

All this is apropos of an American edition of *Press Cuttings* just issued. It is really no fun to be reviewing a play written years ago, while the enlightened nations of Europe, Asia, Africa, and Australia are reviewing *Catherine the Great* and *Pygmalion*, written by the same hand only yesterday. But that is the penalty imposed on critics who commit the artistic solecism of living in the United States. And in view of the enormity of this offence, I dare say the punishment might well be much severer. This being the case, it will be enough to give a mere reminder of the theme: the conversion of the English government to votes for women. This conversion takes place when the government, driven to the direst straits by the guerilla warfare of the militant suffragets, enlists the aid of the women opposed to suffrage. But the new friends prove greater tartars than the old foes. The shameless and unscrupulous behaviour of the leading Antis throws such consternation into the government camp that the Prime Minister determines to break the intolerable alliance and yield to every suffraget demand.

The victorious good-nature of this play, cutting clean through the pretensions of the anti-suffragets and their leaders, has in all probability won more converts to the cause of suffrage than countless realms of solemn facts. It has been said that the action abounds in the wildest caricature and the most extravagant situations. The same might be said of any good farce. What is more to the point, the characters are as inimitably real and striking as any in Dickens, and, as they have not been sprinkled with Dickensian holy water, they are immeasurably truer. Indeed, much of what we dub caricature in modern creative fiction appears as such through our inveterate habit of observing life through the spectacles of our favourite dead authors and using these second-hand impressions as yardsticks to measure our new authors by. Thus, in *Press Cuttings*, the argumentative Orderly, the easily rattled General, and the shrinking Prime Minister who leads his government from behind, betray the characteristic weaknesses of the rank and file in our civil and military institutions. Yet, to Dickensians, these weaknesses are the typically feminine weaknesses. In the

same way, the brutal resourcefulness of Mrs. Banger, the conceited cleverness of Lady Corinthia, and the hard-headed sensibleness of the Charwoman are qualities that women constantly exhibit in modern public and business life. Yet, to Dickensians, these qualities are the typically masculine qualities.

Under the stress of the women's movement, this unscientific grouping is fast becoming obsolete. And so are writers who classify human qualities as male or female, and build their plays upon this classification. But it must not be supposed that Shaw's ironic inversion of such romantic labelling is the essence of his lightest vein. Even in a topical sketch, genius delves deeper than that. Well-meaning conventional people tilting in all good faith against the irresistible, innovating forces of society, or fearless, innovating people tilting against the ponderous conventional forces of society—there you have the raw materials of a Shavian extravaganza, worked up in the first case into *Press Cuttings*, and in the second, into *How He Lied to Her Husband*. Not every bird that warbles is a thrush, however. Compare *Press Cuttings* in which the fun springs straight from the heart of reality, with the *Importance of Being Earnest* in which the fun springs from ingenious make-believe, and the difference between art as a gay expression of conviction, and art as a fantastic parlour pastime strikes you with projectile force. All the wit, imagination, and grace that Wilde lavishes upon the dialogue are unavailing to the characters that never rise above the level of automatons, although they are as diabolically clever as Hoffman's dancing Olympia. Observe, in contrast, how the master hand of Shaw reaches down into the complex of human existence, and out of the substance and adventure, struggle and inertia, sweat and aroma of the life there, fashions characters that can be put through the maddest paces without belying the reality of their flesh and blood. The result is that you can read Shaw's farce over and over again with fresh enjoyment every time, whereas you can't read Wilde's farce twice, without feeling that his epigrammatic popguns are only popguns, and not anvil strokes from a Promethean forge.

Somewhere or other Shaw has stated that he tells the most absolute truth in a mood of the most absolute levity. This is the paradox of invincibility. And the paradox is justified not only by the man of genius, but by the fanatic who cheerfully dies for his convictions, and by the man who has nothing to lose but his chains. It is only your serious, scientific, American Socialist who cannot for the life of him see what a huge joke reality is. Him, accordingly, I implore to read *Press Cuttings*, in the hope that

from its truthful fantasy he may glimpse the strength of good humour as a controversial weapon. I particularly recommend the play to those who do not understand that a spur in the head is worth two in the heel, and that the world is his who has the wit to see through its pretensions.

FELIX GRENDA in *New Review*.

Reports

MANCHESTER CLASSES

Our Classes in Manchester have, we regret, finished. While not so well attended as we should have liked, yet considering the state of the Socialist Movement (?) we, I suppose, must be satisfied. By arrangement with Rochdale we were able to run four classes:—Sale, Hyde, Openshaw, and South Salford. Sale, we are glad to say, has been excellent. Would that we had such earnest seekers after enlightenment in every Branch. A word, however, must be said for the sterling effort made by our comrades at Hyde and Openshaw. In all 100 Students availed themselves of the Classes. The result of their attendance will be a finer and better equipped set of Men and Women capable of lighting the torch of discontent in the minds of others in the Working-Class Movement.

Our Lecturer, C. L. Gibbons, was splendid, and his efforts were appreciated to the full by those who attended. We would like him again, but, if ever we sweated a man, we did him. Our Comrade, J. Austin, also deserves his meed of praise: one of the right sort—always there and doing his utmost to further the interests of the C.L.C. and the Classes. May their spirit never fade! Hurrah for the College!

W. K. SMITH

Correspondence

TO THE EDITOR OF *Plebs* MAGAZINE

DEAR COMRADE,

Please find P.O for 6/- enclosed, sent from the *Plebs* Class, held in the rooms of Halifax Branch B.S.P. We desire the money to be placed to the Central Labour College Fund. The class is under the able tuition of Comrade J. Thomas, and as he guides us through the (what once appeared to us) maze of Marxian economics, we feel what a great work has to be done among the members of our class (I mean the workers)—and then we regret the smallness of our donation, and the small numerical strength of the Central Labour College Movement. In spite of all, however, we are optimistic, for the truth spreads and fallacies die, thereby we know the workers will prevail, for the moment must arrive when, to quote Lester Ward, "their actions will be based on accurate knowledge."

Yours,

ALFRED WAIGHT, *Secretary*.

Books for the Workers

By **KARL MARX.**

Capital, Vol. I., 4/-; Vol. II., 6/-; Vol III., 6/-
Critique of Political Economy, 2/9
The Poverty of Philosophy, 2/9
18th Brumaire of L. Bonaparte, 1/7
Revolution and Counter-Revolution, 1/7
The Civil War in France, paper, 10d.
Value, Price, and Profit, 1/7; paper, 4d.
Wage-Labour and Capital, 1½d.

Ancient Society—Researches in the Lines of Human Progress from Savagery through Barbarism to Civilization. By **LEWIS H. MORGAN LL.D.**, 570 pp. 4/6.

2/9 each

The Positive Outcome of Philosophy by **J. DIETZGEN**
Philosophical Essays by **J. DIETZGEN**
Essays on History by **PROF. ANTONIO LABRIOLA**
The Physical Basis of Mind and Morals by **M. H. FITCH**
The Theoretical System of Marx by **L. B. BOUDIN**
Landmarks of Scientific Socialism by **ENGELS.**

1/7 each

Evolution, Social and Organic by **ARTHUR M. LEWIS**
Ten Blind Leaders of the Blind ,,
Vital Problems in Social Evolution ,,
The Origin of the Family, &c. by **FREDRICH ENGELS**
The Roots of the Socialist Philosophy ,,
Memoirs of Karl Marx by **LIEBKNECHT**
Ethics and History by **KAUTSKY**
The Class Struggle ,,
Social and Philosophical Studies by **LAFARGUE**
The Evolution of Property ,,

1/2

Anarchism and Socialism by **PLECHANOFF**

The above prices include postage. Cash must accompany Orders.

Catalogue of Kerr's complete publications free
Address Editor "*Plebs*" Magazine.

The "Plebs" League

(Organ : "PLEBS" MAGAZINE, Published Monthly,
Price 2d.)

Executive and Officers of "Plebs" League :

SECRETARY-TREASURER

GEORGE SIMS

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

J. CLATWORTHY, 74 Heavitree Road, Plumstead, S.E.
G. HICKS, 16 Joubert Street, Battersea, S.W.
W. G. E. PRATLEY, 3 Cranham Terrace, Oxford
T. REES, 126, Parkdale Road, Plumstead, S.E.
J. REYNOLDS, 13 Penywern Road, Earl's Court, S.W.

ORGANIZERS

NOAH ABLETT, 44 Glanville Street, Mardy, Glam.
J. ARMSTRONG, 12 Sinkers' Row, Cambois, Blyth, Northumberland
G. W. BROWN, 112 Bishop's Road, Bishopston, Bristol
FRED BURGESS, 47 Clonbrock Road, Stoke Newington, London, N.
W. L. COOK, 41 Philip Street, Blaenavon, Mon.
EDWARD GILL, 83 Queen Street, Abertillery, Mon.
T. P. KEATING, 102 Clarendon Road, Luton, Beds.
J. LEACH, 15 Church Street, Bolton
R. MELL, 54 Carlton Street, Hull
J. PARKS, 11 Tulip Street, Prudhoe-on-Tyne, Northumberland
F. B. SILVESTER, 8 Evelyn Street, Sparkhill, Birmingham
W. STEWART, 195 New Lodge Road, Belfast
CHARLES WATKINS, 3 Laverack Street, Richmond Road,
Handsworth, Sheffield
G. W. WATSON, 4 Macroom Road, Paddington, W.
W. M. WATSON, Weston Cottages, Cowdenbeath, Fife