

Vol. VI, No. 7

August, 1914

The
PLEBS
MAGAZINE



*Printed by Fox, Jones & Co., at Kemp
Hall, High St., Oxford, & published
by the Plebs League
at the same address.*

MONTHLY

TWOPENCE

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. VI

August, 1914

No. 7

CONTENTS

1. EDITORIAL—E. GILL
2. POLITICAL PARTIES—DENNIS HIRD
3. CARTOON—N.U.R. & S.W.M.F.
4. PRINCIPLES OF COMMUNISM
5. LETTERS ON LOGIC: ECONOMICS

Plebs C.L.C. Appeal WILL YOU HELP?

	<i>s.</i>	<i>d.</i>		<i>s.</i>	<i>d.</i>
Benson, L.	5	0	Holt, H.	1	0
Earl	2	6	Horsfield, W.	1	0
Garland, J.	4	0	Jackson, F.	1	0
Melhuish, Geo.	1	6	Jackson, H.	1	0
Moore, C.	5	0	Mills, J. B.	1	0
Sale, B. S. P.	4	0	Oddy, W.	1	0
Smith, A. E.	2	0	Taylor, Betsy	1	0
Thomas, J. W.	15	0	Taylor, L.	1	0
Walker, Arthur	4	0	Taylor, T.	1	0
Walker, W. E.	2	6	<i>Collected: p.p. W. H. Pratt—</i>		
Watson, W. M. and Mrs. E.	10	0	Adams, F.	1	
Yates, J.	4	0	Blizzard, J. S.	6	
<i>Collected: p.p. A. Hicks:—</i>			Donnelly, J.	6	
Hicks, Mrs.	2	6	Fowkes, W.	3	
Hicks, Arthur	2	6	Griffiths, E. J.	6	
Holder, W. J.	1	0	Griffiths, J.	6	
Liddington, T.	2	6	Havard, F. G.	3	
Morris, Walter	10	0	Hayward, J.	1	0
Morris, Wm.	10	0	Morgan, J.	6	
Sheldon, A.	2	6	Newns, E.	3	
Wintle, W. L.	2	6	Owen, P. E.	6	
York, E.	2	6	Powell, E.	3	
<i>Collected: p.p. C. W. Daines—</i>			Preston, J.	6	
Stratford No. 1: N.U.R.	7	9	Pratt, M.	5	
<i>Collected: p.p. O. Keighley—</i>	3	0	Pratt, W. H.	1	0
<i>Collected: p.p. Frank Jackson—</i>			Pratt, V.	6	
Adehead, G.	1	0	Price, W.	6	
Brook, G.	1	0	Roberts, J.	6	
Hall, E.	1	0	Smith, Geo.	6	
Henighan, T.	1	9	Townsend, E.	1	9

EDITORIAL

AT last year's Trade Union Congress, it was the privilege of Frank Hodges and myself to put in a plea on behalf of the Central Labour College against an attempt to swing the prestige of the Congress to the side of Ruskin College. The opposition people were on thoroughly good terms with themselves, they were chummy with quite a number of representative men and doubtlessly considered that their plans would be brought to a successful issue. However, they had overlooked one or two salient points. For a long time the advocates of R.C. had informed the Labour world, that the supporters of the C.L.C. were just a crowd of disrupters out either to smash the unions or to depose the leaders in order to get their jobs. Poor simple souls! Bankrupt of argument, they had to invent some "sam" and in their case, repetition brought belief!

For five years the "irreconcilables" had been working away in the movement and the invective of the "Ruskinians" had left them cold, because the rank and file always turned to the C.L.C. whenever opportunity was given to present both cases. Ruskin had been content to "tout" for the support of the official. The C.L.C., has endeavoured to enlighten the rank and file. But to return to the overlooked points. The work of the C.L.C. men in their trade unions had brought many of them to the Congress as delegates. Other delegates had heard of both institutions, but their unions were committed to neither. These delegates were not going to express an opinion favourable to one institution at the expense of the other, merely on the instruction of the Parliamentary Committee. Again, on the floor of the Congress were delegates far greater in number supporting the C.L.C. than there were delegates supporting R.C., i.e. representing unions definitely committed to either College. Was it any wonder that the foregoing facts coupled with a most fatuous attack by Mr. James Sexton upon the supporters of the C.L.C. were sufficient to defeat the recommendations of the Parliamentary Committee? Anyhow the P.C. were routed and the delegates demanded that an inquiry should be held into the position of the C.L.C.

The usually urbane secretary, Mr. C. W. Bowerman, M.P. was ruffled and demanded a card vote. However, a night's reflection led to capitulation on the part of the P.C., and next morning, instead of taking a card vote (which the C.L.C. supporters would have welcomed) the announcement was made that the concession asked for (in the form of an inquiry) would be conceded.

The Board of Management of the C.L.C. have waited very anxiously for the proposed inquiry. The College has been hard pressed to keep open. Perhaps if it had been left to stodgy labour men, like Ablett, Hodges and myself, the institution might have been closed, (perhaps) but the confounded optimists refused to haul down the flag. Not until the Railwaymen decided to approach the Miners did the College hear anything relative to the "Inquiry" from the P.C. and I am rather afraid there is a suspicion that the P.C. was devoutly hoping to read of the demise of the C.L.C. after which event they would have speeded up the customary obsequies. No! the optimists would not surrender. Edwards and other railwaymen were forcing us along. The N.U.R. E.C. invited our E.C. to appoint representatives to go into the financial position of the College. Our E.C. proceeded to appoint the Federation officials. Several pow wows were held, and eventually a report was submitted to both E.C.'s. Everybody got to work and the Railwaymen arrived first,—at Swansea. The delegates to the A.G.M. passed the following resolution :—

CENTRAL LABOUR COLLEGE

That, this Congress decides to increase the number of our Students at the Central Labour College from two to six, the additional four to take up residence at the beginning of the next College term.

Further, in view of the financial difficulties of the College, the removal of which requires the sum of £2,300 this A.G.M. resolves, *on condition that the South Wales Miner's Federation will advance a similar sum*, to increase the N.U.R. scholarships fees for this year by an additional £1,150 in return for which, it be understood that the two organizations will jointly hold the title deeds of the property. This decision to be at once communicated to the Secretary of the South Wales Miner's Federation.

We, further, instruct the Finance Committee that on receipt of a favourable decision from the South Wales Miners, to at once give effect to this resolution.

For the resolution	40
Against	12

S.W.M.F. E.C. decided to place the matter upon the agenda of a special conference called for July 13th., at Cardiff. The item upon the agenda reads as follows :—

"To consider proposals for the purchasing of the Buildings and the management and control of the C.L.C. by the S.W.M.F. and the N.U.R."

Copies of the N.U.R. proposals were forwarded to all Lodges. Craik put in valuable work prior to the Conference and after a stirring address by Mr. Hird, the delegates by a majority vote, 115 to

44, accepted the Railwaymen's proposal en bloc. It is noteworthy that no dissentient voice against the institution was raised in the Conference. The difficulty of the minority was either one of money or the possibility of a wider scheme covering the M.F.G.B., Transport Federation and the N.U.R. The effect of the Conference decisions is obviously a considerable advantage to the C.L.C.

First of all we have the definite assurance of the continuance of the institution and the relief of the College from private patronage. I am not unmindful of the services rendered by George Davison, in placing securities at the bank, which he will now receive, but, for one, I shall never be anxious to put any private individual to a similar inconvenience. In the second place there should be a definite and continuous income from scholarships.

The decision of the Cardiff conference vitally alters the relationship that has hitherto existed between the C.L.C. and the S.W.M.F. The support of the past has been district support. The Federation is a federation of districts and some of the districts, exercising their right under local authority rule, have, from time to time, voted either grants or scholarships from their districts funds. The support has always been of an uncertain character. Change of personnel at District meetings and depletion of District funds may involve loss of scholarships or grant as the case might be.

The Conference not only decided to join the N.U.R. in the carrying out of the latter's resolution, but it instructed the E.C. to draw up a scheme making provision for scholarships for the whole of the Coal-field.

Just then, as the 150,000 or more members of the Federation have become interested in the bricks and mortar of the C.L.C., so they have become (or will when the scheme is launched) interested in its teaching. Another change involved in the decision, is, that sooner or later, the District representatives of the S. W. Miners on the Board of Management must cease and Coal-field representation must take its place.

Of course, all the above is to the good, but paradoxically as it may appear, the more successful the C.L.C. becomes in winning organised working-class support, the greater will be the necessity for the existence of a Plebs League and Magazine.

E. GILL

[The resolution was moved at the Cardiff Conference by A. J. Cook, of Porth, and ably supported by John Evans, of Maesteg, T. Langley, of Pontypool, Jabez Jones, of Abersychan, and others.]—EDITOR.

Get your facts first, and then you can distort them as much as you please.—MARK TWAIN,

Political Parties

CLOSELY bound up with our institutions is our system of Party Government. The extraordinary influence exerted by the two chief Parties in the State will probably be denied by none. Party Government has been burlesqued as a foolish game, quite unworthy of reasonable men, it has also been lauded as the source and guardian of constitutional liberties. The truth may lie between these two extreme statements. At any rate we may judge the better, if we trace its history.

Party Government does not owe its origin or power to any well thought out scheme in our Constitution.

Like many of our greatest institutions, it arose without deliberate thought as to its future. No wise statesman could have predicted the course it would take, or the force it would exert, in the destruction of our Empire. We must turn to the days of Queen Bess to see its rise.

When Elizabeth came to the throne in 1558 many British citizens were anxious to burn each other, in order to show the beauty of truth. Protestants and Papists were accustomed to fires, which were more deadly than illuminating. The ashes of an opponent were more effective than the dust of logic. Elizabeth endeavoured to steer a middle course between the Roman Catholics and the Reformers. She was prepared to establish a modified church which was really a hodge-podge of Roman ceremonies and Reform doctrines, and thousands of her subjects were only too willing to welcome such a compromise. This is clearly proved by the fact that of all the Roman Catholic clergy left in office at the death of Mary, only 200 retired from office when Elizabeth inaugurated her new system. Sometimes, man's conscience melts before the fires of martyrdom.

But there abounded extreme fanatics in both the opposing parties; puffed up with the infallibility of their own venom, they were more deadly than vipers.

In order to unify the Church, the Act of Uniformity was passed in 1559 in the first Parliament of Elizabeth. This act forbade the use of any public prayer other than the second prayer book of Edward VI. All the bishops, but one, objected to the new order of things as too Protestant, and retired from their office.

The extreme Protestant Party refused to assent to this Act of Uniformity because they said it was too favourable to Roman doctrine and ritual. Their hatred of ritual grew till they objected to the use of the surplice, kneeling at Communion, using the ring at marriage and the sign of the cross at baptism. They demanded "the *pure* gospel," with such vehemence and iteration, that they were called Puritans in 1564. With these Puritans, not only Elizabeth, but also succeeding Monarchs had to wage an endless warfare.

Long before Elizabeth's time, fierce struggles for freedom had deluged the nation with blood, but as Sir Erskine May well says, "Classes asserted their rights: but Parliamentary Parties, habitually maintaining opposite principles, were unknown." That order of mere class wars had passed away, and in its place had arisen a new method of defending the People from the tyranny of the Crown and the despotism of power.

To Puritanism, for inaugurating this method, are due the thanks of the world. Not only did the Puritans object to pagan practices in ritual, but in the House of Commons they spoke out in support of the rights of Parliament and against Elizabeth's prerogatives in Church and State. They spared no effort to secure seats in Parliament and in 1571 Elizabeth had to deal with a Puritan House of Commons; one member, Strickland, having purposed to ask leave to amend the Prayer Book, the Queen ordered him to absent himself from the House.

The Parliament rose to remonstrate with Elizabeth, and with supreme common sense, she allowed Mr. Strickland to return—but his motion was referred to a Committee, so the Prayer Book was not touched.

Still, the Puritans had realised their power as an organised party and as they were joined by other opponents of prerogative, they at length acquired a majority. In 1601 they successfully resisted the Queen's prerogative of granting monopolies in trade by royal patent.

Her successor James I. came from Scotland with his high flying notions of the divine right of kings. The High Church Party rejoiced and committed many excesses. This extremely royal doctrine and this excess of ecclesiastical conduct widened the breach between the Crown and the great body of the Puritans, and greatly strengthened the popular party.

Henceforth we are to begin to know two parties in England, under various names it may be, but representing cardinal principles of Government,—authority on the one side and popular rights on the other. Some of the greatest men in our history were on the popular side. Sandys, Coke, Eliot, Selden and Pym "may be regarded as the first leaders of a regular Parliamentary Opposition."

"The arbitrary measures of Charles I., the bold schemes of Strafford, and the intolerant bigotry of Laud, precipitated a collision between the opposite principles of Government, and divided the whole country into Cavaliers and Roundheads.

Charles I. belonged to that hopeless order of royal official who never learns anything, or he might have been convinced that the House of Commons would not endure any tricks of royal prerogative. But Charles paid up and we can well afford to smile at him now.

When Charles II. returned he had learnt no lesson from his headless father, but the excesses of the Commonwealth seemed

rather to have provoked all that was reckless in the inbred folly of the Stuarts. This king, "who never said a foolish thing and never did a wise one," had wrought much folly in England when in 1679 he met a powerful opposition in Parliament. The point at issue was the succession of his brother James.

James as an avowed Roman Catholic was regarded as a dangerous man to occupy the throne, and the House of Commons wished to set him aside. Charles finally evaded the issue by first proroguing and then dissolving Parliament.

In 1680 the Party opposed to James *petitioned* Charles to allow Parliament to meet; those on the other side sent in petitions declaring their *abhorrence* at such an attempt to force the King's will. The former were called Petitioners, the latter Abhorrrers.

These two names were changed into nick names. The Petitioners were called Whigs and the Abhorrrers were called Tories. For a long period of our history these nick-names were in use. "The courtiers called the Petitioners Whigs which is short for Whiggamore, the name by which the peasants of West Scotland were known, from the cry of 'Whiggam' with which they used to encourage their horses. Whig therefore implied that they were no better than covenanting rebels. The Petitioners called their opponents Tories, the name given to brigands in Ireland implying that they were no better than Popish thieves." (*Gardiner*).

"The Whigs espoused the principles of liberty—the independent rights of Parliament and the people—and the lawfulness of resistance to a King who violated the laws. The Tories maintained the divine and indefeasible right of the King, the supremacy of the prerogative and the duty of passive obedience on the part of the subject. Both parties alike upheld the monarchy; but the Whigs contended for the limitation of its authority within the bounds of law: the principles of the Tories favoured absolutism in Church and State. (*May*.)

The infatuated assaults of James II. upon the religion and liberties of the people, united, for a time, the Whigs and Tories in a common cause, and both admitted the necessity of expelling a dangerous tyrant from the throne. Thus we had the glorious revolution of 1688, which was the triumph of Whig principles, as the foundation of a limited monarchy. Yet the principles of the two parties, modified by the conditions of this constitutional settlement, were still distinct and antagonistic.

The Whigs continued to promote every necessary limitation of the royal authority and to favour religious toleration. The Tories generally leaned to prerogative, to High Church doctrines and hostility to Dissenters, till finally some of them became Non-jurors and others Jacobites.

The two parties struggled and intrigued during the reigns of William and Anne, when at last the final victory of the Whigs secured Constitutional Government.

The Tories disturbed the reigns of the two first Georges, objecting to the House of Hanover and causing treason and civil wars. The final overthrow of the Pretender in 1745, being fatal to the Jacobite cause, the Tories became a national party, and, still preserving their principles, at length transferred their loyalty to the reigning King. The principles of both parties had naturally been modified by the political circumstances of the times. The Whigs had ruled for forty years after the death of Anne, and had consolidated the power and influence of the Crown, in connection with Parliamentary Government. The Tories had been compelled to renounce the untenable doctrines of their party and to recognise the lawful rights of Parliament and the people.

Still the class war and the class origin of the parties remained generally. "The loyal adherents of Charles I. were drawn from the territorial nobles, the country gentlemen, the higher yeomanry, the Church and the Universities: the Parliament was mainly supported by the smaller freeholders, the inhabitants of towns and the Protestant Nonconformists. Seven years afterwards, on the accession of George I., the same classes were distinguished by similar principles." (May, 138). The rustics were poor, ignorant and helpless and had little share in the government of their country.

The towns, merchants and manufacturers were on the side of Parliament and the People against the Crown.

During the first half of George II's reign, the Tories were a dispirited and helpless minority, but from 1754 the Whig Party began to break up and a new Toryism arose. With the death of George II, 1760, the Tory Party revived. They were favoured by the young King, George III. "George III. ascended the throne with the determination to put an end to the prevailing party Government and to give effect in the State to the personal will of the monarch." (Gneist, 369). He put aside his Whig councillors and installed his Tory favourite, Lord Bute, as first minister, in 1762. At length the Cabinet became wholly Tory, with Lord North at the head of George's first ministry, and soon the Court party and the country gentlemen, known as the King's friends, allied themselves with the Tories. Even many of the men, who had risen to wealth by commerce, were won over to the royal cause.

The Whigs excluded from office and power, offered themselves as leaders of the people, and rendered great services to the cause of liberty during the whole of this reign. Men of great genius and eloquence were their leaders, such as Lord Chatham, Mr. Fox, Lord Camden, Mr. Burke and Mr. Sheridan.

As against this brilliant opposition, the Tories began to view the amendment of our laws with distrust and aversion. In their eyes change was a political evil. Tory sympathies were with the past. Men who in the last generation would have restored the Stuarts and annulled the revolution, had no faith in enlightened progress.

The struggle with an American colony put to the test the principles of both parties.

Grenville obtained the assent of the British Government to the Stamp Act (1765) by which he hoped to raise £100,000 from America. This pleased the King, though he hated Grenville as a rule. For a few months the King placed the Whigs in office under Rockingham, to get rid of Grenville, and hoping soon to get rid of the Whigs also. In July 1766 the King dismissed Rockingham and the old Whigs, and created Pitt, the Earl of Chatham, prime minister, and next year it was attempted to impose import duties on America. The Americans resisted. The Tories called this the crime of rebellion and agreed that rebellion must be crushed. This they attempted to do, first with Duke of Grafton as Prime Minister and then with Lord North in 1770. North held office till March 20, 1782. The American colony had been lost. A new nation had sprung into being.

The whole of this struggle had raged round the fundamental question whether all British subjects had the right to tax themselves by their representatives and to resist oppression and injustice. The Whigs maintained they had that right. The Tories denied it, and, backed up by a King of narrow intellect and strong prejudices, they lost our largest colony and created a new nation as a triumph over their folly.

England had gained one prize in this struggle, that is the formation of a democratic party, which in the course of a few years exercised an important influence upon the relation of Whigs and Tories.

After the declaration of American Independence had become an established fact, events moved rapidly and political confusion was great.

Lord North, the Tory minister, resigned, March 20, 1782. The King appointed Rockingham, the Whig, as minister over a coalition Government.

Rockingham died July 1st, 1782.

Lord Shelburne succeeded Rockingham. Fox objected to him. This was a crisis in the history of parties, whose future destinies were deeply affected by the conduct of two remarkable men, Fox and the younger Pitt.

If Fox could have worked with Shelburne the Whig party might have become dominant, but he could not.

The younger Pitt, a man of extraordinary ability and ambition, who had been passed over when the Rockingham Ministry was formed, now became Chancellor of the Exchequer under Lord Shelburne, so that "instead of co-operating with Mr. Fox he became his rival, his fortunes were identified with the King's friends and the Tories, and he was permanently alienated from the Whig connection." (May, 153). This loss to the popular cause can never be estimated. It was a

discomfiture to the Whigs, a source of hope and strength to the Tories.

There were now three parties :—

Lord Shelburne and the Court.

Lord North and the Tories.

Mr. Fox and the Whigs.

Overtures were made by the first party to each of the others separately but they failed. To the amazement of the country and posterity Lord North and Mr. Fox formed a coalition.

The consequences were disastrous, at least to the Whigs. The two men had always been at daggers drawn, and the coalition was regarded as a bid for power at the sacrifice of principle. Fox's contemporaries were very severe upon him, and history has said hard things of him. But we must remember that the whole reign of George III. had been a period of coalitions. One benefit at any rate accrued, the virulence of the censure clearly demonstrated that there is a real antagonism of principles between Whigs and Tories.

Principles and parties were in a strangely unsettled condition ; Fox began life as a Tory, but was now leader of the Whigs ; Pitt had entered Parliament as a Whig, and now had become the leader of the Tories.

The coalition was soon overthrown. The King triumphed. The consequent ruin of the Whigs secured the undisputed domination of the Crown for the next fifty years.

Pitt became Prime Minister over another coalition Ministry, and rapidly rose in popularity and power.

The Whigs proscribed at Court and despairing of royal favour, cultivated the friendship of the Prince of Wales, who was in direct opposition to the King and his government. They were still a considerable party and were led by men of great talent, rank and social influence.

But the French Revolution upset all the relationships of parties. The democrats hailed it with enthusiasm, the Whigs with sympathy, the King and the Tories with indignation and alarm. Burke renounced his friendship with Fox and repudiated the old associations of his party.

Society was becoming separated into two opposite parties—the friends and the foes of democracy. For a while the Whigs were able to stand between them, but not for long. The Democrats espoused parliamentary reform—their opponents called it revolution. The Society of the Friends of the People was founded, Fox did not join it, but many leading Whigs did. The Whig Party became divided.

The excesses of the French Revolution disgusted and terrified people of all ranks and parties.

When the King of France was executed and revolutionary war broke out, the English Democrats displayed some extravagance. The ruin of the Whig party seemed completed. One after another of the leading Whigs joined the supporters of Pitt. Even Mr. Grattan and the Irish patriots sided with the Government.

A small party clung to Fox, about 60 in number. But all their ablest men except Burke and Windham were still true to their principles. They were powerless against ministers in divisions, but in debate their eloquence and their defence of constitutional liberty kept alive the spirit of freedom. They received little support from the people. The Prince of Wales abandoned them. The great body of the people took part with the Government in the repression of Democracy.

Pitt enjoyed the most absolute power of any minister since England had been a constitutional state governed by the instrumentality of parties—Democracy, the clergy, the lawyers, proprietors of the soil, capitalists, fund-holders, in short all classes, sought the protection of Pitt. All parties joined him and his policy was accepted as national. All patronage and all preferment were in his hands, so that whether in the Church or at the Bar, success could be secured only by being on the side of the Government.

The Whigs were further depressed by the fact that any man of liberal principles was under a social bann, he was not only regarded as a malcontent in politics but it was whispered that he was a free thinker or infidel in religion. In Scotland the Tory Party was even stronger and more violent than in England. In both countries, it was a reign of terror and an orgy of despotism.

The Whigs in despair withdrew for three Sessions from the House of Commons. This merely strengthened the Government. The Union of Ireland with England further strengthened the Government with an overwhelming force of Tories.

Yet at the moment of his highest prosperity (1801), this very Union cast down the Minister and shook the Party to its centre, owing to Pitt's liberal views upon the Catholic question and the government of Ireland. The Party was divided by conflicting councils, and upon Pitt's retirement, personal differences caused great disunion. Canning inflamed the discord, till at last Pitt and his adherents were found making common cause with the Whigs against the new Tory Minister. Pitt was recalled to power in 1804 and he sought an alliance with Lord Grenville and the Whig Leaders, but the King's hatred of Fox frustrated the arrangement. On January 23, 1806, he died.

Now the Whigs were called to office. At length, even the King's hatred to Fox had to give way and he received him as a Minister. Again it was a coalition ministry, the Whigs united with "the King's Friends," to form the ministry of all the talents. They were men

widely opposed in political sentiments. Their reign was short, but it was signalised by the abolition of the slave trade and other useful measures. "They had not the confidence of the King; they failed to conciliate the Prince of Wales; they mismanaged the elections; they were weakened by the death of Fox; they were unsuccessful in their negotiations for peace; and fell easily before the King's displeasure and the intrigues of their opponents." They resigned in March 1807.

The Tories came into power *the next day*, under the inefficient Duke of Portland as Prime Minister. All his colleagues were pledged to resist Catholic emancipation. The French Revolution had so terrified the English and Napoleon was working such havoc in Europe, that the cry of "the Church in danger" or "No Popery," was enough to rally all the parties which had fled to the Tories for protection.

Though the Whigs were routed, they had gained strength by their brief term of power. They were no longer a despised party without hope. Younger Whigs were rising in repute, both in politics and in literature. They established the *Edinburgh Review*. They had gradually recovered the principal Whig families and were in fact a powerful Party.

In 1809 the Duke of Portland died. He was succeeded by Perceval. In 1811 George III. became permanently mad, and the Regency was appointed. In 1812 Perceval was shot dead by a lunatic as he stepped out of the House of Commons. He was succeeded by Lord Liverpool, who was Tory Prime Minister till 1827. Canning succeeded him.

If we pause at this date, we may say in a few lines that a new state of things had arisen since the resignation of the Whigs in 1807. Great events had happened, Napoleon had come and gone. Poor old mad George III. died in 1820; the last of the hopeless Georges was on the throne. Personal ambitions, party intrigues, popular riots, and official murders give to this period the ghastly vitality of horrors. But the oppressed and the dead are soon forgotten. The forces which had brought about the most momentous changes, were commercial and social. Towns had sprung up and vast populations lived under new conditions; machinery displaced labour; the awful war which closed with Waterloo had left the country in an exhausted condition; under poverty and absence of work, riots broke out, and political leaders could only think of official muzzles or apply the remedy of the bayonet and the sword, as at Peterloo, known as "the Manchester massacre." The Catholic disabilities waited for removal. The Tories regarded any concession as dangerous to the Church, and poor Perceval thought it would be dangerous to the State.

Repression and coercion were the grand remedies which blind officialism could apply to misery and oppression.

Towards the end of 1816, a few intelligent men began to suspect that there might be something wrong with the existing political system and they called for a complete and "radical" reform, hence they were known as Radicals, and hated with the blind fury of terror.

The proceedings against Queen Caroline united the Whigs and the Radicals, and the great body of the people.

Perhaps Canning was the only man of influence on the other side who could "recognise the just claims of nations as well as the rights of sovereigns."

Democratic ideas were seething, Lord Liverpool died, and Canning came into power, April 10, 1827. He was in favour of Catholic emancipations, but opposed to Parliamentary reform. The Whigs, led by such men as Earl Grey in the House of Lords, and Lord Althorp and Lord John Russell in the Commons, were in favour of both. Canning died on August 8, 1827.

He was succeeded for a few months by Lord Goderich formerly Chancellor of the Exchequer, as Mr. Robinson. "Goody Goderich," as the wits called him. He resigned January 9, 1828.

A Tory Ministry was formed under the Duke of Wellington; the Iron Duke understood the needs of nations as well as the ordinary common soldier understands the motion of the stars. Peel was the Home Secretary again and the leading Minister in the House of Commons.

In 1829 Peel determined to grant Catholic emancipation. Wellington disapproved, the King resisted, but the Act was passed by the combination of the Whigs and the Canningites. This caused great divisions in the Tory Party. Men of all parties were astounded and said the ministers had abandoned the principles of the Party.

George IV. died unregretted on June 26, 1830. The ministers, weak and discredited, were forced to appeal to the country. The Whigs, with the followers of Canning, were returned to power under Earl Grey. Democracy was now on the side of the King's ministers and they demanded parliamentary reform. Great was the popular ferment. The Tories became united in face of a common danger, and made a bold effort, but they were overthrown. Even under the old electoral abuses, the dissolution of 1831 secured a large majority to the ministers. On March 1st of this year the Reform Bill was brought in by Russell. This generation is unable to form any idea of the corrupt state of affairs at that period.

"Old Sarum which returned two members, was only a green mound without a habitation upon it. Gatton, which also returned two members, was only a ruined wall, whilst vast communities like Birmingham and Manchester were totally unrepresented." (Gardiner). Edinburgh had 33 voters.

The Ministry proposed to sweep away sixty small boroughs returning 119 members, and to give only one member apiece instead of two to forty-six other boroughs nearly as small. Most of these seats were to be given, in almost equal proportions, to the counties and the great towns of England, a few being reserved for Scotland and Ireland. In the counties, the franchise which had hitherto been confined to possessors of a freehold worth 40/- a year, was conferred also on persons holding land worth £10 a year by copyhold, or £50 a year by lease. In the boroughs a uniform franchise was given to all householders paying rent £10 a year.

The Tories opposed the Bill as revolutionary. They were panic stricken, and many Tory old ladies of both sexes expected to be murdered in their beds if the Bill became law.

The second reading only passed by a majority of one, so the Government withdrew the Bill and dissolved Parliament.

Then agitation raged, there arose the war cry, "The Bill, the whole Bill and nothing but the Bill." The Government was returned by an enormous Whig majority. Russell again brought in the Bill slightly amended, yet when it had passed the House of Commons, it was rejected by the House of Lords on October 8, 1831.

This news was received with a torrent of indignation. In the House of Commons, Macaulay urged the Government to persist in its course. On December 12, 1831, the Bill was brought in, passed the Commons, and again was referred to the Lords. They adopted a substantial alteration in it. The Government asked the King to create fifty new Peers to carry the Bill. The King was frightened, he refused, the Ministers resigned. Wellington was ready to take office, but Peel refused to join him, so Earl Grey's government was reinstated, receiving from King William the promise to create the new peers if necessary. This frightened Wellington, so the Bill met with no further obstacles, and on June 7, 1832, the Bill became an Act of Parliament by Royal assent.

Before the end of 1832 a Parliament was elected by the new constituencies created by the Reform Act, and the Whigs had an enormous majority. There were great differences between the old Whigs and the Radicals with regard to the introduction of practical reforms. To conceal these differences as far as possible a new name—that of Liberals—was borrowed from the Continental politicians to cover the whole party. The Radicals had about 50 representatives in the House. The first two years after the Reform Act form the most glorious period of the Party. "Slavery was abolished; the commerce of the East thrown open; the Church in Ireland reformed; the social peril of the poor laws averted." (May, page 198.)

But soon their popularity began to decline; the Whig alliance with democracy could not be permanent. "Earl Grey and his older aristocratic associates recoiled from any contact with democracy."

Differences—that curse of all reformers—began to weaken their ranks. There was a further element of discord caused by the Irish Party under O'Connell.

Their opponents divested themselves of the old reproachful name of Tories and adopted the title of Conservatives and said their mission was the maintenance of the Constitution against the inroads of democracy—a mission which they have usually fulfilled. Still they abandoned some of their old tactics and were prepared to rule under the new Constitution without seeking to destroy it.

In July 1834, Earl Grey resigned and the Reform Ministry was no more. Lord Melbourne, a Whig, succeeded him. Melbourne was a man of great abilities and great indolence, to any proposals of reform, he usually answered, "Can't you let it alone?" He only held office a few months, for the King dismissed him. This was the *last time* that a Ministry was dismissed by a Sovereign.

The King appointed Sir Robert Peel as Prime Minister. He threw off the doctrines of the old Tories, professing to be a moderate but Conservative reformer. He held office a few months, and then resigned, (1835). Melbourne succeeded him. On June 20, 1837 William IV. died and Queen Victoria began to reign.

In 1839 bread was frightfully dear and great distress prevailed. Thousands lived in cellars—sties, not homes. The Chartist movement was in full force, with its six points, only three of which have yet been gained and some of these in a modified form. The Anti-Corn Law League was formed, riots broke out.

The Conservatives meanwhile were reconstructing their party and in 1841 Peel came into office with his second Ministry and a great majority.

In 1842 Peel brought in what is known as his first Free Trade Budget, though it was not Free Trade as we understand it. He modified the sliding scale on corn duties and he re-imposed the Income Tax, which has never since been taken off.

For the next two years trade improved and in 1845 Peel brought in his second Budget. He had a surplus which he used to remove a number of duties upon imports, and put an end to all duties upon exports. Many were alarmed at this. The country gentlemen began to grumble and they found a spokesman in a young member, Benjamin Disraeli. Meantime the Anti-Corn Law League was growing under the leadership of Bright and Cobden. By public meetings and printed matter they were educating the nation. The population increased rapidly and starvation seemed permanently established in this country. Said an agricultural labourer, at a meeting "I be protected and I be starving." Peel saw that corn must be cheapened and in October he asked the Cabinet to support him in taking off the duty; its decision

was postponed. Again he attempted to induce the Cabinet to follow him, the Cabinet refused. Peel resigned on December 11. But Russell was unable to form a Ministry and on December 20 Peel returned to office, Russell pledging that the Liberals would support his measure. Accordingly next January Peel brought in his Bill for the abolition of the Corn Law. "On June 25, 1846, the Bill having previously passed the Commons, passed the Lords, and an end was at last put to a long continued attempt to raise, by artificial means, the price of bread." (Gardiner).

Peel's party could not forgive him and on the day his Bill passed the Lords, he resigned.

It is not necessary to trace the details of Party Government in recent years for they are fairly well known. We have learnt from this survey of a chequered past, that to trust the people is the best safeguard of a nation.

Sir Erskine May says :—

"In the history of Parties there is much to deplore and condemn ; but more to approve and commend. We observe the evil passions of our nature aroused—'envy, hatred, malice, and all uncharitableness.' Eminent statesmen are bitterest enemies, the nation is often stirred to anger, violent factions destroy patriotism, Party rule keeps half our statesmen from the service of our country—at all this waste we grieve. But without Party, Government is absolutism and rulers may be despots. We owe to Party most of our rights and liberties. We have seen that an Opposition may often serve the country better than a Ministry, and that where its principles are right, they will prevail. By argument and discussion truth is discovered, public opinion is expressed and a free people are trained to self-government. We feel that Party is essential to representative institutions. . . . Who can fail to recognise in Party the very life-blood of freedom?"

DENNIS HIRD

Soap and Education are not as sudden as a massacre, but they are more deadly in the long run.—MARK TWAIN.

A College diploma is a Social Certificate, not a proof of competence.—PHILISTINE.

Just see these superfluous ones ! Wealth they acquire and become poorer thereby. Power they seek for, and above all, the lever of power, much money—these impotent ones !—NIETZSCHE.



The Miner (to Railwayman):—"I'm with you this journey, mate."

[The South Wales Miners Federation have decided to join with the National Union of Railwaymen in purchasing premises, &c., for the Central Labour College.]

Principles of Communism

by FREDERICK ENGELS

Question 1.—What is Communism?

Answer.—Communism is a theoretical statement of the conditions for the emancipation of the Proletariat.

Question 2.—What is the Proletariat?

Answer.—The Proletariat is that class in society which obtains its livelihood wholly and solely from the sale of its labour, and not from the profit of any capital; whose weal and woe, whose life and death, whose whole existence depends upon the demand for labour, and therefore upon the variations of anarchical competition, with its alternations of good and bad periods of trade. The proletariat, in a word, is the working-class of the 19th century. [And also of the present time.]

Question 3.—Has there not, then, been a Proletariat, always?

Answer.—No. There have always been poor and working-classes—and the working-classes have usually been poor. But never before have there been poor men or workers living under such condition as those just mentioned; and there has not, therefore, been a Proletariat always, any more than there has been free and unchecked competition.

Question 4.—How did the Proletariat originate?

Answer.—The Proletariat originated with the Industrial Revolution, which began in England in the later half of the 18th century, and which has since been repeated in every civilised country in the world. The Industrial Revolution was caused by the invention of the steam-engine, the various spinning machines, the mechanical loom, and a whole host of other mechanical contrivances. These machines, which being very expensive, could only be purchased by men with considerable capital, changed the whole method of production; and supplanted the workers of that day, because they could produce commodities much more cheaply and efficiently than the workers, with their imperfect spinning-wheels and looms. The machines, therefore, placed industry entirely in the hands of the capitalists, making the former property of the workers—tools, hand-loom, &c.,—useless, and thus leaving them propertyless. The factory system had first been introduced in the textile industry. Work was more and more divided among individual workers, so that he who formerly had completed a whole piece of work, now worked at only one part of it. This division of labour made it possible for products to be turned out more rapidly, and therefore more cheaply. It reduced the activity of each worker to a very simple operation, constantly repeated, which could therefore be performed as well, or even better, by a machine. Once the impulse was given to the factory system by the installation of

machinery, this system quickly assumed the mastery of other branches of industry, e.g., printing, pottery, metal-ware. In this way, various branches of industry, one after the other, were dominated by steam-power, machinery, and the factory-system, as had already happened in the textile industries. But at the same time these industries necessarily passed into the control of capitalists. In addition to actual manufactures, handicrafts also gradually came under the domination of the factory system; since here as well capitalists supplanted the small producers by the establishment of the greater workshop, which saved time and expense, and permitted an increasing division of labour. Thus, in civilised countries, all branches of work and manufacture were replaced by the great industry. The former status of the workers was entirely revolutionised, and the middle-class of the period—particularly the master-craftsmen—ruined; and thus arose two new classes, gradually absorbing all the rest, namely:—

(i) The Capitalist Class, which everywhere is in possession of the means of subsistence—the raw materials and tools, machines, factories, &c., necessary for the production of the means of life. This is the class of the Bourgeois, or the Bourgeoisie.

(ii) The Working Class, who, being propertyless, are compelled to sell their labour to the Bourgeoisie, in order to obtain the means for their subsistence. This class is called the Proletariat.

Question 5.—Under what conditions does the Proletariat sell its labour to the Bourgeoisie?

Answer.—Labour is a commodity, and its price is therefore determined by the same laws as other commodities. Under the system of great industry or free competition—which, as we shall see, amount to the same thing—the price of a commodity is, on the average, determined by its labour-cost of production. The cost of production of labour,* however, is in reality just as much of the means of subsistence as is necessary to keep the worker physically fit, and to enable him to reproduce his kind. The worker will thus receive for his work no more than is necessary for this purpose. The price of labour, or wage, will therefore be the lowest, the minimum,

* Labour here means *labour-power*, i.e., the ability to perform certain functions in the productions of objects of utility, for the service of the machinery used in production; or the otherwise necessary performance of work in industry. The worker sells this power or ability, whether by time or by piece, for wages, and is apparently paid the value of the work or performance of service incorporated in the product. But he is actually paid—as Marx has demonstrated in *Capital*—only the value of the labour-power expended. So that it must be understood that where this expression occurs in this work, such as "sale of labour," "price of labour," it is but a mode of expression peculiar to orthodox political economy, and one which was generally adopted by scientific socialism till Karl Marx demonstrated, in *Capital*, its absurdity as an expression of the actual productive relations. With this discovery the contradictions, to which the popular mode of expression had given rise, vanish and the "secret of profit" is discovered. At the time when this pamphlet was written, Marx, also, still used the old phraseology in his economic writings.—EDITOR.

necessary for subsistence.† But trade being at one time good, at another bad, the wages of the worker will vary accordingly, just as the manufacturer receives more or less for his commodities. Just as the manufacturer, however, receives on the average neither more nor less for his commodities than the equivalent of their cost of production, so the worker will, on the average, receive neither more nor less than this minimum of wages. And the more the great industry conquers all branches of industry, the more definitely will this economic law of wages assert itself.

Question 5.—What was the position of the working-classes before the Industrial Revolution?

Answer.—At different stages of the evolution of society, the working-class has occupied different positions in relation to the owning and ruling classes. In ancient times the workers were the slaves of the landowner, as they still are in many backward countries, and even in the Southern part of the United States [i.e. 1847]. In the Middle Ages they were the serfs of the landowning noble, as they are yet in Hungary, Poland and Russia. In the Middle Ages also, and until the Industrial Revolution, there were handicraft guilds in the towns under the control of small masters, out of which developed manufacture, the factory system, and the wage-worker employed by a capitalist.

Question 7.—What distinguishes the Proletarian from the Slave?

Answer.—The slave was sold outright. The Proletarian must sell himself daily and hourly. It is to the interest of the slave-owner that his property, the slave, should have an assured existence, however wretched that may be. The individual proletarian, the property, so to speak, of the whole capitalist class, has no assured existence; since his labour will only be purchased for just the period when someone has

† This proposition, that the worker receives in wages, only the value of the bare necessities for his subsistence, was rectified later by Marx, in *Capital*. "The value of labour-power is the value of the means of subsistence necessary for the maintenance of the labourer His means of subsistence must be sufficient to maintain him in his normal state as a labouring individual The number and extent of his so-called necessary wants are themselves the product of historical development and depend to a great extent on the degree of civilization of a country and on the habits and degree of comfort in which the class of free labourers has been formed The minimum limit of the value of labour-power is determined by the value of the commodities that are physically indispensable. If the price of labour-power falls to the minimum, it falls below its value But the value of every commodity is determined by the labour-time requisite to turn it out so as to be of normal quality." The tendency of the Capitalist system of industry is to continually lower the wages of the workers to this minimum—just as it constantly strives to depress the price of commodities below their value—but other factors act as a check to this tendency, among them the will to live better of the worker himself which grows with the rise of productive powers of society. "In contradistinction therefore to the other commodities there enters into the determination of the value of labour-power a historical and moral element."—EDITOR.

need of it. Existence is only assured to the workers as a class. The Slave stands outside competition; the Proletarian stands within it and suffers all its variations. The Slave is regarded as a thing, and not as a member of society; the Proletarian is regarded as a human being, and is acknowledged as a member of bourgeois society. The Slave may enjoy a more assured existence, but the Proletarian belongs to a higher stage of the development of society—stands indeed on a higher level than the Slave. The Slave can free himself because, of all the private property relations, he need only abolish the single relation of slavery—in this way, indeed, becoming a proletarian; the Proletarian, on the other hand, can only free himself on condition that he abolishes private property in general.

Question 8.—What distinguishes the Proletarian from the Serf?

Answer.—The Serf has the possession and use of a means of production—a piece of land—in exchange for a tribute of a part of the produce, or for the performance of work for his lord. The Proletarian works with another's implements of production, for the benefit of this other, in exchange for a part of his produce. The Serf, therefore, pays; whereas payment is made to the Proletarian. The Serf has an assured existence; the Proletarian has not. The Serf stands outside competition: the Proletarian within it. The Serf frees himself either by running away to the town, and there becoming a handicraftsman; or by making payments in money to his lord instead of labour or payments in kind, thereby becoming a free farmer; or by forcibly ridding himself of his feudal lord, and becoming himself a private owner; in short, by one or other of these means, entering either the ranks of the owners or of the competing workers. The Proletarian can only free himself by abolishing competition, private property, and all class distinction.

(To be continued.)

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

Letters on Logic

Economics

THIRD LETTER OF THE SECOND SERIES

WHEN I called the works of nature,—such as meadow, forest, mountain and valley, soil and water,—*natural* labour, I meant that they are to be included in the general concept of "labour." At first sight, this may seem to you to be making an illegitimate use of that concept, but this apparent extravagance is necessary, not only to explain the capacity for co-ordination possible

to our mind, but also to make clear the economic problems. You will, by this means, recognize specific human labour, which is the only object of economics, as something apart, as a division in the whole universe. This is necessary in order to conceive the different forms or kinds of labour as belonging to a common order, and at the same time view them in their separation or distinction.

You know that in natural science everything is reduced to motion. Light, sound, heat, matter and energy, all is motion. Just as this is a scientific concept, so—economically—it is right to conceive everything as labour. Everything is motion everything is labour. Also everything is nature. All is large, all is small, all is warm and all is cold, transient and eternal, simultaneously. All is all, all is the universe; every part reveals the general nature of the whole and the whole the general nature of every part. In the first part of these letters we have often dealt with this—this concept of the universe is the cardinal concept of logic. The universe is the total of all things. We have often explained this. Division or distinction of the universal unity,—that is the logical starting point. It teaches you not to exaggerate any distinction, not to accept implicitly any metaphysical distinction. Everything is distinguished, but only to the degree that the nature of all is contained in all; in reason there is also unreason and in unreason, reason.

In this sense the whole world is labour, the human labour being only a special part of the universal. It would be illogical not to generalize the object of economics even to the furthest extent; on the other hand, it would be confusing merely to make generalizations and not to proceed to particularize and distinguish. Human labour is a sub-division, which is further divided into primitive-communistic labour, slave labour, serf labour and wage labour. The latter is the one that particularly concerns us, and I will explain it to you, for the sake of logical reasoning, in its connexion with the whole universe.

The labour of competitive society is divided into, (1) free labour, the performance of which is its own reward and which is mostly done by idle people, and (2) "free labour" (with inverted commas) the performance of which brings no reward, but is paid; that is called wage-labour.

It sounds paradoxical to say that labour which finds its own reward is done by idle people, but this will be better understood if you realize that the actual workers get per head but a miserable portion of the national produce, while the captains of industry pocket a large amount of it.

For the moment we turn aside from the considerations of the sub-division of competitive labour, and only bear in mind that it is connected with all human labour and with nature, of which it forms

part. This must be specially mentioned, because confused economists, as we shall realize when we deal subsequently with value, constantly use their natural connexion as a means of confusing the theory of value which Marx so clearly defined.

Labour creates products. Natural labour creates wild growing trees, grass, sunbeams, and other things which have no market value; while human labour, of course with the aid of nature, creates marketable products. Thus, purely human products of labour do not exist, but all our labour must, as it were, be chemically combined with the natural material. In this way human labour takes a material form and can be accumulated. Accumulated labour is of high importance in economics, because it is a means of making labour-power more and more profitable.

The distinction of actual human living labour from past, dead, accumulated labour, is a logical process which serves to make economics clear. Dead labour not only exists in actual material, but has also mental forms. The acquirement of greater knowledge of the processes of nature, improved methods of working &c., all this is accumulated labour. You may think that there is a difference between mental and material labour, but you must not imagine that this is so distinct that there exists any material piece of labour which is not connected with mind; or any intellectual knowledge which has not taken a material form. Not only paper and printing ink, but all the instructions, which the master gives to the apprentice, are the results of the accumulated labour of our forefathers.

My letters, the first series of which dealt with the connexion between mind and body, treat in this second part of the connexion between the various kinds—mental, physical, &c.—of labour, distinguishing them by species, kinds, divisions and sub-divisions, in order to demonstrate the whole as something indivisible. Riches are also connected with labour. Nature is neither rich nor poor. If we speak of countries being rich in nature, we only mean potentially rich. Countries like Russia and the West of the United States have great natural riches but small economical riches; they possess but little accumulated labour.

The man who picks blackberries is working, even if he eats the berries on the spot. Such labour is not economically considered productive. But it is not entirely unproductive, because it performs that task, which is the end of all labour; it nourishes, refreshes and delights the worker, and satisfies his wants. The picker of blackberries becomes productive, in the economic sense, if he picks more berries than he is able to consume. Thus on one day he gets food enough for two, that is provision for the following day; he accumulates. The accumulation, the filling of his pocket with berries, which are intended to feed him the next day, enables him on the following day to go hunting for a deer, which will give him sustenance for eight days. In order to be able to hunt deer, one

must have something in his pocket. He might possibly shoot a deer before hunger came, but this would be quite exceptional. As a rule it would be necessary to have accumulated labour in one's pocket. In this way by means of picking berries productively during one day, a deer is accumulated, this deer sustains the man eight days and can be used as a means of accumulating further provisions, to build, weave &c. You can thus see that accumulated fortunes contain accumulated labour.

The accumulation of riches, or products of labour, was economically necessary to transform barbarian labour, which provided only for living from hand to mouth, into civilised labour, which enables, or might enable, humanity to live lives worthy the dignity of human beings. All labour creates something, but only the most productive labour provides conditions for decent living.

The great productiveness of our labour to-day is chiefly the results of historical growth. From the beginning of history the creative power of labour has always been increasing, so that never before was there such a productiveness of labour-power in the world as that which astonishes us to-day. This increased productiveness is only made possible by means of the enormous accumulations of former labour represented by our modern tools.

Wage-labour is only possible where labour is productive in the above-mentioned restricted sense, where it realizes more than its cost, where it produces more than it consumes, creates more than is allotted for the sustenance of the labourer. The production of surplus-value is dependent on wage-labour. The labourer who is not able to pick more berries than he needs as his food cannot create surplus-value for the purchaser of his labour-power. Wage-labour is only possible by means of historically acquired productiveness.

Now read again the first chapter of Henry George's *Progress and Poverty*, if necessary a third time, and you will find in it several errors, which are repeated in the following chapters.

Henry George is unable to clearly perceive the conditions of free competition, the conditions of our present economic system, because he confuses it with the system of primitive economy à la Robinson Crusoe, the Guild system, and with production on a small scale, from which capitalism has historically evolved. One product of German philosophy that the Americans lack is—Logic, which distinguishes the phases of history without breaking the continuity.

(To be continued.)

Translated for the *Plebs Magazine* from the German of Joseph Dietzgen by MISS R. BRAMTHAL.

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 L.L.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 ..

The High Cost of Living by **KAUTSKY**

The Road to Power by **KAUTSKY**

Social and Philosophical Studies by **LAFARGUE**

The Evolution of Property ..

Anarchism and Socialism by **PLECHANOFF, 1/2**

Labour in Irish History by **J. CONNOLLY, 1/2**

The above prices include postage. Cash must accompany Orders.

Catalogue of Kerr's publications free from

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, 18 Clarence Street, Abertillery, Mon.
T. P. KEATING, 80 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