

THE PLEBS MAGAZINE

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

Vol. VII

January, 1916

No. 12

CONTENTS

	Page
1.—ARE CLERKS WORKERS? By W. E. WALKER - - -	266
2.—WOMEN IN INDUSTRY: A REPLY TO CRITICS. By ALICE SMITH	268
3.—LETTERS ON LOGIC: ECONOMICS. DIETZGEN (Concluded.) -	271
4.—OUTLINES OF POLITICAL ECONOMY. By W. W. CRAIK -	277
5.—CORRESPONDENCE. G. W. BROWN - - - - -	281
6.—REPORTS - - - - -	281
7.—REVIEWS: By W.W.C., AND G.S. - - - - -	282
8.—THE <i>PLEBS</i> BOOKSHELF. J.F.H. - - - - -	284
9.—INDEX TO VOL. VII. - - - - -	286

The *Plebs* Fund

WANTED £100. Received to Dec. 17th—**£27 5s. 2d.**

A further List of Subscribers will be published next month. P.O.'s, &c., to be addressed to Secretary, Plebs League, C.L.C., 13, Penywern Road, Earls Court, S.W.

Take Notice

With this issue we complete our seventh annual volume. We invite our readers to glance over the Index published herewith, and to ask themselves whether the *Plebs*, in view of the value and variety of its contents, does not deserve a wider circulation. The circulation has increased 20% during the last two months, and we are confident that, with a determined effort on the part of every individual subscriber, we could start the new volume next month with double or even treble the present figure. Show your friends and fellow-workers the Index, and tell them we go forward, not backward, and that however good Vol. VII. has been,

Vol. VIII. is going to be better still. The Secretary will be glad to forward specimen copies of back numbers of the magazine to anyone willing to distribute them among likely subscribers.

We take this opportunity of thanking all our readers for their past support; and of reminding them that a renewal of their annual subscription to the League and Magazine for 1916 at an early date would be much appreciated. Will you enclose a subscription—however small—to our Special Appeal Fund? We have now raised more than a quarter of the total we have to reach. Only a comparative minority of our readers have sent in as yet. Are you one of the majority? If so, will you make a New Year resolution—and keep it, without further postponement?

Are Clerks Workers?

“**W**E consider that all workmen employed in and about collieries should belong to the same organization.” In a recent statement of the case for Industrial Unionism, George Barker reminded us of this resolution (carried by an overwhelming majority at the Annual Conference of the M. F. G. B. in 1911). He, further, asserted that its language is without ambiguity, and stated the one exception it implicates as follows:—“The only workmen who are not included are the colliery office clerks, who are treated as the confidants of the employing class.” As a clerk who is also a trade unionist I cannot allow this defined attitude of the miners towards my fellow-craftsmen—and *their* fellow-workers—to pass unnoticed.

The reason assigned for the exclusion by the miners of the clerks from the scope of their “industrial unionist” resolution is that the latter are “the confidants of the employing class”; in which estimation of the calling of clerk I partially concur. But this fact by no means constitutes clerks *members* of the employing class; and, therefore, the ground is cut from under the feet of the Industrial Unionist who argues for the exclusion of the clerk from his organization, since, if he is to be consistent in his argument as an Industrial Unionist, this must rest absolutely upon the class conditions obtaining in society. The class dividing-line of society, as I understand it, occurs precisely where the sale of labour power ends and exploitation begins, and I have yet to learn that clerks *qua* clerks possess any other than a commodity status as compared to manual-workers.

So much for the identity of class interest between, let us say, the miners and the colliery office clerks: what of their relative economic interests? What of the clerk’s wages, hours of employ-

If you really wish us a Happy New Year, send that bob along.

ment and general office conditions? Are these very much different, *in effect*, from those appertaining to manual employment? To answer this question in the negative, it will be sufficient for me to state that the National Union of Clerks (of which I am a member) aims at securing as a minimum weekly wage for clerks, 35/- in London, and 30/- in the Provinces. From this it will be understood that there are many clerks whose wages are under these amounts; in addition, clerks are largely the victims of unpaid overtime and other adverse conditions. So that the effect of labour is the same on them as on the manual workers, namely, enslavement. And for them, as for the manual workers, there is one road to emancipation, which is *working-class* organization.

Is it, however, contended that the position of clerk is *essentially* of so small account that it can be ignored by the organizations of manual workers? Well, he is a fool who argues the dispensability, in some measure, of the clerical function in any industrial economy. And, meanwhile, many hundreds of thousands of clerks are engaged in the industry and commerce of this country; and though one of their "instincts" is to blackleg manual workers on strike, several thousands of them have realized their need of trade union organization. Here, for instance, is a problem for the M. F. G. B. There is in the country a trade union for railway clerks (the Railway Clerks' Association), containing, I suppose, between 20,000 and 30,000 members. Should then the N. U. R. and A. S. L. & E. adopt a similar resolution to that carried by the M. F. G. B.—with the same interpretation—and dismiss the R. C. A. as a society of "confidants of the employing class"? Or should they not, rather, if they are to develop on industrial unionist lines, themselves amalgamate and invite the R. C. A. to join them? Certainly, the latter.

To Comrade Barker (for the M. F. G. B.) I have a proposal to make which represents a sounder and more honest policy than the one involved (on his interpretation) in the Federation's resolution. It is that the miners should become propagandists in the colliery offices, and, if necessary, ultimately coercionists. In the first place, I take it that with the spread of class-consciousness throughout the whole of the membership of the M. F. G. B., that organization will almost, *ipso facto*, become an Industrial Union. Why, then, in the second place, should it not commence to exert a trade union influence on the office clerks, who will continue to be employed in the industry, Industrial Union or no Industrial Union? This could be done in one of two ways: either the Federation could co-operate with, say, the National Union of Clerks, who could hold the Colliery office clerks as members until such time as the Federation should open its doors

"Welcome, little strangers!"—as the Secretary said to the Postal Orders.

to receive them ; or the Federation might make arrangements straightway for the addition of this craft to its membership roll, and be prepared to adopt the same methods for the persuasion of non-unionist clerks as for non-unionist miners.

In conclusion, a quotation from the first pamphlet issued by the National Guilds League serves to emphasize my brief criticism. It is as follows : " Labour organization must not cease when every manual worker has been brought into the Unions ; clerks and foremen, works managers and managers, stationmasters and draughtsmen, designers and architects, must be enrolled in their appropriate Industrial Unions ; for they are no less essentially a part of the industry than the manual workers."

W. E. WALKER.

Women in Industry: A Reply to Critics

In the following letter, which appeared in the *New Age* of December 2nd, Miss Alice Smith replied to two critics of an article by her, entitled "*A Women in Industry*," previously published in that journal. The first of those critics, Miss Alice Morning, fastened upon Miss Smith's remark that " thought is not a sex function," and asserted—at considerable length—that, so far as she had been able to discover, thought was " a function dependent on possession of the masculine sex." The second critic, Mr. Rowland Kenney, concentrated on the " practical " side of the problem of women in industry, asserting that women by entering industry, were " not only depressing wages, but absolutely delaying—preventing, I should say—men in their work of overturning the wage system."

For the benefit of new *Plebs* readers, to whom Miss Smith's name may be unfamiliar, we may be permitted to mention that she is an ex-student of the C.L.C., holding a Women's League scholarship at the College in 1913-14.—ED.)

IN my recent article on women in industry I advanced the theory that woman's capacity for mental development renders her capable of organization along with men, and thus removes the blackleg menace apparently attached to her entrance into industry.

Miss Alice Morning, replying to my article, writes, " When men shall possess an organ of perfection, women may possess an organ of thought, but hardly before this ; " and she ridicules the suggestion that women possess the " faculty of thought "—much less exercise it. After reading her article, I must admit that it is a convincing demonstration that what she has put forward is, at any rate, a partial truth. But I would gently entreat her to shed the delusion that one addled female head constitutes the female head in general. In my argument I safeguarded my position by stating that " We who have the faculty of thought get our ideas from material conditions," in order to show that I expected no ideas or mental development

from those who do not possess this faculty. But these unfortunates are the exception and not the rule; so, while Alice Morning is to be complimented on the candour with which she has made clear her own position, it is hardly sporting of her to assume that a personal limitation is a sex limitation. Still, despite the obvious, she displays in her final statement a perspicacity unexcelled even by Old Moore. "You are lacking something, Miss Smith, my friend," she writes. Inspired utterance, since it is not due to reflection! It is money that I lack! I go into industry in my efforts to fill this financial void. May I suggest with equal friendliness that the same sphere might prove efficacious in filling other voids? Or is she quite determined to wait for the organ of thought discarded by man on his attainment of the "organ of perfection"? If so, 'tis an unhappy fate—destined for ever to be merely the recipient of man's superfluity. However, after the insistent stress she lays upon her mental poverty, it would be wicked to take a mean advantage, so I will wish her the best of luck in connection with the ideas she mentions as "in the air," just as I would wish the very best records for my next-door neighbour's gramophone. I will turn to Mr. Rowland Kenney, whose sex, perhaps, has ensured the mental equipment necessary to perceive that the boundary line separating industry from other aspects of the universe is not marked out by a row of saucepans, and that the wage slave at the sewing-machine is at one with the wage-slave at the spinning-machine.

But, in considering my argument that women should enter industry by virtue of her capacity for mental development, Mr. Kenney falls into what I should term an error if I were not sure that it is merely a trick of debate. He assumes my meaning to be that women cannot develop mentally outside industry, that they can develop intelligence only by providing profits for manufacturers. I did not say so, although I believe that they can develop more intelligence by class exploitation than by sex exploitation. We have at least a greater relative freedom from an employer than from an owner. What I did say was this—that woman's "will to live" will force her into industry, and that her "capacity for mental development" renders her just as capable of efficient organization as man, and neither more nor less a blackleg menace. Some National Guildsmen must consider women, as a sex, incapable of organization, or they would not make this a purely sex question. If it were merely a matter of competition with the men in industry, they would advocate the exclusion of *any* new labour, young *male* labour included, so that the men already engaged could have a fair field and no competition.

Mr. Kenney makes a point of commercial travellers and commission agents going on with Socialist propaganda, in spite of the knowledge that collectivism would ruin their jobs. Why not? If I were sure that there would be no cotton operatives under industrial ownership I would push on towards that goal just as keenly. I am not wedded to the cotton industry; and I should expect to find some other occupation under the new system. But, if commercial travellers, merely because they are such, were asked to stand aside *now* and starve until the inauguration of this new system, they would

Last day for sending in Copy, 18th of the month.

refuse just as emphatically as we women refuse to creep into a corner and die quietly and gracefully in order to fit in with the theories of National Guildsmen. And, until the fact is recognized that we are not so many bundles of merchandise, to be deposited awaiting convenient time for collection, the matter has not been dealt with in a practical way, even from the point of view of the least thoughtful of women.

But I am not going to shelter behind this little oversight of the Guildsmen, important though it is. I will come into the open and state clearly that I would still fight against my exclusion from industry—by industry I mean all wage-earning occupations—even if accompanied by a monetary dole. For this reason:—When the workers take over the control of industry—whether by means of National Guilds or a Federation of Labour—I intend to be one of the workers, if possible. I do not choose to be among the dispossessed, again, and *that is where woman will be, if she is excluded from industry*. National Guildsmen, among others, lay it down that those who own the economic power own the real power, that those who own the means of production of the necessaries of life are top dogs, and, therefore, that private ownership of the means of production means a subject class and a master class. The Guildsmen are out, avowedly, to abolish this state of affairs. So am I, but I want to be careful not to abolish a subject class merely to institute a subject sex. And that is what will happen if women are outside industry and industrial ownership is confined solely to men. The men as a sex would own the means of life, and the women as a sex could exist only by favour of the dominant sex, as playthings or slaves according to the mood of our masters. Frankly, I would rather be a wage-slave under the capitalist system, with the opportunity to sell my labour power, than a chattel-slave under a system of industrial ownership, with nothing to sell but my sex. It is no use to imagine that the men would not exploit this state of affairs; they would have just the same motive as inspires the capitalist, who may be kindly enough in private life. The capitalist grinds profits out of the workers for the good things these profits will secure to him. So, in a favourable position, would men *as such* hold women *as such* in subjection, for the reason that, in general, women still constitute the chief pleasure of men, and it would be no slight advantage to have an enormous supply of this pleasure always available, on their own terms.

If women are to have a chance of freedom and development equal with the men in the new society, they must have an equal share in the ownership of the means of life. They will lose this by their banishment from industry; so I take my stand for women in industry and the abolition of sex bondage along with that of wage bondage.

ALICE SMITH.

We haven't raised all we want to raise,
 Although we're not far from it. A
 Good thumping effort—one and all—
 And we'll smash the d—— thermometer.

Letters on Logic

ECONOMICS

(Continued from last month)

Human beings being both male and female, Henry George is right in stating that one cannot make such a classification. The question remains whether the analogy is appropriate; whether profit is nothing but a conglomeration of rent, wages, and interest of capital. It is true that whether the gains of capital be called interest, profit, or otherwise, has nothing to do with logic; but our friend, by means of a careless division, calmly sets on one side the most important share of the produced surplus value. This is an offence against the elucidation of political economy at which he is aiming—a sin against the holy spirit! While keeping his eye on the landlords, he wants to let the lords of industry and commerce escape. And so he is induced to confound that smaller section of capitalists who receive interest for lending money with the great capitalist companies which squeeze enormous profits out of the results of production.

Thus, it is expressly stated in the third chapter of the third book :—

Interest, as an abstract term in the distribution of wealth, differs in meaning from the word as commonly used in this : That it includes all returns for the use of capital, and not merely those that pass from borrower to lender.

If this definition had been rigidly adhered to, the cardinal question of this investigation—how the most miserable poverty is possible simultaneously with the enormous efficiency of our productive powers—would have acquired a quite different aspect. Henry George wants us to believe that not the capitalists but the landlords snap up the lion's share at the distribution of commodities. Hence his whole argument is based on the evident fact that in new colonies, where land and soil are free, the wages of labour and the interest of capital are high. But this "interest" concerns only the rate of interest, and is not identical with the income of capital in general. The manufacturers in California and Australia have not had very rosy days when the common day-wage was standing at five dollars and higher; and it is the manufacturers and great merchants with varying profit rates, and not the money-lender with standing rates of interest, who represent capitalism.

Where there is a lordless land, servants are scarce, because there the wage of a labourer can be earned, without an intermediary in freedom. If we did, as Henry George suggests, i.e., make all

land masterless (or nationalize it) then the labourer could live—live like the barbarians—like the poor land labourers in California ; but life worthy of humanity, culture, cultivated political economy, these things are only possible by means of the democratic socialization of capital.

As we commonly understand wages to be the price for hired labour power, so we understand interest to be the rate which is paid to the money lender, and profit that part which one grabs from the other. Our guide would like to make more scientific *termini technici*; nevertheless instead of making the matter clearer he confuses it. In this case also the logic of the common man is better than that of Henry George.

We want to know which part of the social product falls to capital. If it is interest, then the chief part, namely, profit, is omitted, and the whole picture distorted. Current economy has not been able to draw a true picture ; and while we recognize that our author has come nearer to reality, yet still he falls far short of an accurate representation. His distinction of the levers of production as land, labour, and capital, is very likely to obliterate certain prominent features ; land, especially, is a very indistinct feature. Land has exchange value in civilized countries. The little areas on which London or Paris are built have enormous value, whilst land in so far as it costs no labour, represents a free gift of nature. Land comes, apparently, in collision with our law of value, which states that labour forms the only substance of value. In this connexion you may remember that, in consequence of our uneven society, the law of value has found an uneven expression interrupted by many exceptions and hindrances. Labour determines the value of things in so far as they are in the right proportion on the market. It comes to this, that great or small quantities, demand and supply, varies the money expression of value, or the market price. You are not, moreover, to regard arable land as an immovable, limited mass. Land, also, can be manufactured to one's liking. If one imports wheat from the American West, or corn from Russia, to Western Europe, then one imports land. To bring virgin forests under the plough, or to double the harvest by means of better methods and increased labour, means in effect that one manufactures acres. Land is so closely connected with the whole of industry that one could write a big volume on this matter without appreciably exhausting it. Enough ; cultivated land is like every piece of value, a mixture of nature and labour, of accumulated labour which serves as a means of production for living labour, and yields a revenue. Land is, therefore, a piece of capital and agriculture is an industry, and, so far, there is no reason to separate land from national and international capital.

THE THERMOMETER'S GOING DOWN. (see cover)

We may distinguish between movable and immovable capital, but to separate the factors in production into land, labour, and capital, as the bourgeois national economists like to do, is to divide human beings into men, women, and human beings. Instead of land it would be better to say nature. Nature, labour, and capital are the levers of production. And because nature is everywhere and eternal, it may be omitted as a matter of course ; so that only labour and capital are left, and these divide the whole product into two (not at all equal) parts.

I beg you to bear in mind how extremely important this distinction is for our understanding—it is the only object of our logic—and then I approach the economic point at issue—the question :—whence does capital get its justification for its share in the distribution of commodities ?

Henry George answers this in the third chapter of the third book, in which, he says, that time provides the reason ; that the small tree becomes a big tree, the sour wine a sweet wine, and the young calf an old cow ; time and the active power of nature is the cause of the increase of capital.

It is true that if I put away money it will not increase but if I set out bees, I will have more swarms of bees, and the honey which they have made While many things might be mentioned which, like money, or planes, or planks, or engines, or clothing, have no innate power of increase, yet other things are included in the terms wealth and capital which, like wine, will of themselves increase in qualityor like bees and animals, in quantity.

Moreover, he explains, how by means of the exchange of living with dead things, the latter share the forces of the former, so that the whole capital on an average brings interest or profit. Capital profit is to him no arbitrary but a natural thing ; not a result of a particular social organization, but of universal laws which underlie society. If ever political economy produced a bad egg, then this definition of how capital grows is a miserably rotten one .

We ask : whence do the accumulated products of labour derive the power to make the capitalist's purse swell ? The answer H. George gives, "from the active power of nature," is the most futile which can be given. There is nothing in the whole world which does not come out of the active power of nature ; but nothing can be explained by this. Who makes everything makes nothing ; natural omnipotence is no logical explanation of creative power of capital. When man achieves anything, " nature " has achieved it ; for man also is a piece of nature. The explanation that the profit of capital is an achievement of clever capitalists is no sufficient one. The matter must be specialized. We want to know how the clever people so contrive it that the rotten eggs of national

economy are changed in their hands into ready money. Logic in special cases can not be satisfied with the general cause. To trace the profit of capital to "nature" is tantamount to answering the question, whence comest thou? 'I come from Paradise and my father was Adam.'

FIFTEENTH LETTER OF THE SECOND SERIES

If you study closely this important Chapter III. of Book III., and if you bring its contents into relation with your other knowledge, you will find much that is instructive in it. Remember that the training of your mind being your object, it is not sufficient merely to read and accept a thing; subjects must be *studied*, i.e., brought into contact and connection with one's other knowledge. And only when the whole of a subject stands in systematic order before your mind's eye, are you entitled to say, "This conception is clear to me."

Nature, says Henry George, is the cause of Capital yielding interest and profit. Now, unquestionably, Nature is the omnipresent and omnipotent cause of all things. If I place in your care a cask of fresh wine, still sour, and a young pig, the wine, after a certain time, will become sweet, and the pig a full-grown animal. Nature will have turned this small capital to good account; it will have brought forth interest and profit. Yet not altogether without labour. And the question arises, who—the capitalist, or the worker who has distilled the wine, stored and bottled it, and fed the pig—is to have the interest or the profit? When I refund to you the costs for having taken care of my capital, how are we going to divide things up? What has the labour cost? Are you, the worker, entitled to the whole of the increase which, with Nature's assistance, you have brought about; or is it laid down in the eternal order of things that I, the owner, shall take the surplus value and grow fat without care or effort?

The problem arises only through the division of capital and labour between two persons, of whom one has the capital and the other the labour. If I myself look after my wine and my pig, no calculations are necessary. Is it, then, eternally inevitable that one of us must own the cellar and the wine—and be called a capitalist; while the other is called a cooper, and must be content to subsist on bread and water? Is it part of the order of Nature that one should drink wine and the other water—one eat pork-chops, and the other pig's food, potatoes? The capitalist, it is commonly said, is entitled to reward for abstaining from drinking the wine while it was sour and from eating the pig while it was little. Nature rewards him for his frugality, after a time, with sweet wine and bacon. But the worker has been still more frugal

SHELL OUT!

Why does not "time and the active power of Nature" work also for him? Is it necessary to point out that the capitalist, as well as the landlord, is a monopolist, who confiscates Nature's gifts?

In my Fifth Letter I gave a quotation from Henry George, in which he remarked that "nothing that is freely supplied by Nature can be classified as capital." Yet he declares that the increase of capital is a product of Nature; and since this surplus is added to the existing capital, practically the whole of the capital becomes in time a free gift of Nature! But Henry George, as we have noted before, is no expert in logical classification. Rent, wages, and profit, all spring originally from one source—Nature. But nowhere do they actually materialize without labour. Why should profit spring from a different source to rent? Both are alike in this—that they lessen the wages of labour.

What gives to Henry George's reasoning an appearance of justification is the mistake he makes in putting, contrary to his own statement, the special money-lending transaction in the place of capitalism as a whole.

What is the reason and justification of interest? Why should the borrower pay back to the lender more than he received? . . . The expounders of the current political economy say that there is no conflict between labour and capital, and oppose as injurious to labour, as well as to capital, all schemes for resisting the reward which capital obtains; yet in the same works the doctrine is laid down that wages and interest bear to each other an inverse relation; and that interest will be low or high as wages are high or low.

Certainly with high wages there is high interest; so far, the interests of worker and money-lender do not clash. In times of economic prosperity not only wages and interest, but the profits of the industrial capitalist, are raised, and all co-exist "harmoniously." The strenuous labours of the capitalist are handsomely rewarded, and he graciously increases the workers' wages by a trifle. Nevertheless, what is added to the one is taken from the other. If the worker gets nine-tenths of the product, and the capitalist only one-tenth, profit still takes the lion's share; for the master takes one-tenth from every servant—and a hundred or a thousand servants may be in his employ.

Capitalist and worker are alike "harmoniously" interested in the prosperity of trade. But this harmony of interests does not exclude discord. As death is in life, so collision is in harmony. The logic of the employer (whose spokesman Henry George is) is naturally interested in laying stress on the harmony and nothing but the harmony. They stick to the old tune; "when interests

**"It's a long, long way to get to Zero,
But we're bound right there."**

harmonise, they cannot clash." We hold another opinion. Capitalist and worker may eat out of one dish; but they stand over against each other like cat and dog.

We have seen that the gain of capital, whether it is called rent, interest, or profit, springs from Nature; from Nature, nevertheless, to which wage-labour has been applied; and it consists of that part by the extent of which capital lessens wages. Has this profit—this appropriation—any justification? It has—but not in the way Henry George tries to justify it. The concept of capital can only be justified historically. The products of labour had to be accumulated in order that the productive power of labour might be progressively increased. The actual luxuries which the capitalists personally enjoy—the wine and the pork-chops and the rest—do not impoverish the workers; the workers can as easily afford to overlook the luxuries the capitalists consume, as the bourgeois can afford to ignore the high civil lists of their monarchs.

But we cannot overlook the unhistorical spirit, which regards the existing order not as playing a passing part on the stage of history, but as eternal—even though it is now blocking the way for better qualified players. The profits which these fat Falstoffs *consume* do not offend us, but the products which their out-of-date exertion of power prevents us from creating.

On the one hand, the means produced by past dead labour, and accumulated by capital, could, with the help of living labour, double or treble the national means of subsistence. On the other, selfish proprietors of the means of production hinder their employment for the public benefit. That is the economic situation which Henry George "justifies" by a logic which regards the links of the world-chain as single pieces, and cannot see how they are inter-linked one with the other.

END OF THE SERIES.

(Translated for the *Plebs Magazine* from the German of Josef Dietzgen by Miss BERTA BRAUNTHAL.)

CONGRATULATIONS.

There are persistent rumours that certain active and well-known members of the Plebs League have recently fallen victims to Cupid's onslaught, and even that they have travelled a step further—to the altar, or the registrar's. No official confirmation of these reports is forthcoming. The Press Bureau has no objection to their publication, but takes no responsibility for their accuracy. In case the reports are true, all Plebeians will join with us in offering congratulations and best wishes to the parties concerned.

N.B.—A mark thus—X—on the left-hand side of the wrapper signifies that your subscription has lapsed.

Outlines of Political Economy

(Continued.)

*LECTURE OUTLINE, No. 4.—CAPITAL.—MONEY AS CAPITAL:—*It is important, at the outset, to clearly grasp the distinction between money as a *medium of the simple circulation of commodities*, and money as *capital*. Just, however, as a man still exercises human functions, for example, eats, drinks and sleeps, although he in addition functions as a King, so also money still performs the functions of money while it functions also as capital. The *hall mark* of money as capital consists in the fact that it is advanced for the purpose of withdrawing *more* money. This understood, we overcome many of the illusions that attribute to money, the evils which emanate from its capitalist function.

*HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF CAPITAL.—*Historically, exchange is first of all exchange between producers, and in the form of barter. In the course of time, there arises the merchant and usurer, who come *between* the producers and dispose of their commodities, and lend to the producers the money which they require to procure the means of life. In the hands of the merchants and usurers, money accumulates and serves as means for accumulating still more money. These are the *oldest forms* of money as capital. They are so far confined to the *sphere of circulation*. After a certain stage in the development of Circulation has been reached, the merchant begins to take control of production in a more and more direct way, and, finally, establishes himself as an *industrial capitalist*. This process simultaneously converts the formerly independent producers into *wage-labourers*. The exchange of the products of labour as commodities, leads, therefore, to the exchange of the productive power of the labourer himself.

*PROFIT AND PRODUCERS.—*So long as capital functioned only in the hands of the merchant, the profit of the merchant could be realized by "buying cheap and selling dear,"—by cheating. In that case, we have the *exploitation of independent producers*. But industrial capital cannot accumulate in this way, for now that capital is, fundamentally, *industrial capital*, "buying cheap and selling dear"—would simply be a mutual robbing by capitalists of each other, which "profiteth nothing." The profit of industrial capital, and of the other forms dependent upon industrial capital, can only arise from the *exploitation of the dependent producers*—the wage-labourers.

*THE LABOUR MARKET.—*The first step in this process is made in circulation—in the act M.-C. The purchase of C. takes place in two markets: (1) the market where the *products of labour* are sold, (2) the market where the *power to produce* is sold—the "labour market." This market is not an eternal verity but a historical creation, a process which "frees" the labourer from all guarantees of existence by divorcing him from the means of maintaining existence, and making him, therefore, dependent upon the

The Lord loveth a cheerful giver. We don't mind whether you're cheerful or not, so long as you GIVE.

owners of those means. At the close of the transaction, money—labour-power, the labourer has contracted to hand over the use-value of his commodity in return for a wage. Wages are the price of labour-power—the value of labour-power expressed in money. The value of this commodity is determined, like all other commodities, by the social labour required, in this case for the reproduction of labour-power, i.e., of the labourer himself. The elements that enter into this determination have already been noted in Study Outline No. 9.

Chapters 4, 5, 6, Vol. 1, *Capital*.

STUDY OUTLINE, No. 10—THE LABOUR-PROCESS IN GENERAL AND ITS CAPITALIST FORM.—What are the common elements of the labour-process regardless of its special forms? Answer:—(1) the *labour* of man, (2) the *subject* on which the activity of man is exercised, (3) the *instruments* which facilitate this exercise. The result of the union of those three elements is a useful object adapted to meet a particular need. Labour has become productive. The *living* labour expended during the process has become *materialized* at the end of the process. The product turned out may serve either as an article of *personal consumption*, or as the raw material of some other product, or as an instrument of labour. In the two last cases, it falls within the sphere of *productive consumption*. It becomes a factor in the production of new products. The process of personal consumption produces the consumer himself. The process of productive consumption produces a product distinct from the consumer. Finally, the labour-process is a natural necessity of human life in general.

THE CAPITALIST FORM.—Nature, however, cannot explain the specific social forms of the labour process, e.g., the capitalist form. The elements characteristic of the general labour process are not set aside by the special form. (It is the same here as with money. See Lecture Outline 4. paragraph 1.) Two peculiarities are added by the capitalist form:—(1) the consumption of labour-power belongs to the capitalist and the latter, therefore, *controls the labourer* throughout the labour-process, and (2) the result of the process—the product—*belongs* not to the labourer but *to the capitalist*.

VALUE AND SURPLUS VALUE—This product must be a *use-value*, but it is not for the sake of the use-value that the capitalist carries on production. The use-value is, for the capitalist, merely the material bearer of *exchange-value* and it is with the latter that he is most concerned. More particularly, is his all-absorbing aim to sell a commodity at a price above the price paid for the labour-power and means of production employed in its creation, in short, he wishes to realize *surplus-value*.

THE SOURCE OF SURPLUS VALUE.—The value of the instruments and raw material, used up in the production of a given product, re-appear in the value of that product. Materialized labour creates no value. It is value—the *result of living labour*. The value of labour-power is replaced in the value of the product by means of the *new value added* by the labourers

Be good (to us,) sweet maid, and let who will be clever.

function. If production ended at this point, the value of the product would only equal the value of the constituents of the product which the capitalist bought in M.-C. There would be no surplus-value and money would not, therefore, have been converted into capital. Surplus-value, then, can only arise from an extension of the labourers function beyond the point where the value of labour-power has been replaced, an additional expenditure of labour which costs the capitalist nothing. In the difference between the *value of a day's labour-power* and the *value created by its function during a working day*, there resides the possibility and actuality of surplus-value.

Chapter 7. Volume I.—*Capital*.

STUDY OUTLINE, No. II—Constant and Variable Capital.—Forms of Industrial Capital.—We can now distinguish three forms in the process by which money is converted into capital, two of which belong to *circulation* and one to *production*, the latter intervening between M.-C. and C.-M-. If we designate production by P. then we can fully express the whole cycle by M.C...P...C.-M., and the three forms, in which capital successively manifests itself, are Money Capital, Productive Capital, Commodity Capital. In this place, we have only to analyse *Productive Capital*. In this phase of the existence of capital, an important distinction has to be made, viz., between *Constant* and *Variable Capital*.

VALUE PRESERVED AND VALUE CREATED.—The three constituents of the labour-process are: (1) labour, (2) the subject of labour, and (3) the instruments of labour. These two latter may be classed together as *means of production*. Viewed as a process of creating value, labour, therein, presents a two-fold character. It (1) preserves the value of the means of production used up in the process by transferring this value to the product, and (2) it creates new value. This *dual* role, which is exercised at one and the same time, rests upon the twofold character of labour already considered, viz., *concrete useful labour* (qualitative) and *abstract social labour* (quantitative). The value of the product, when analysed, consists in *value preserved*, i.e., old value *plus value added*. The added value consists in a value = the value of labour-power which the *capitalist pays* to the labourer *plus* a value for which the *capitalist pays nothing*—surplus-value.

CONSTANT CAPITAL.—That part of capital which has been advanced in the form of means of production which perform their function so long as their use-value lasts and the value of which is preserved by being transferred to the product, is distinguished as the *constant* part of capital, constant, because the magnitude of value which re-appears in the product, in the degree in which the means of production are used up, *varies not* from the magnitude of the value possessed by those means.

VARIABLE CAPITAL.—That part of capital which has been advanced in wages and which exists in productive capital in the form of labour-power,

• **I hear they want more shillings.**

is called the *variable* part of capital, variable, because this power in its function *creates* value of a *varying* magnitude. It represents the living labour which adds value, while the constant represents the dead labour which adds no value.

Chapter 8. Volume I.—*Capital*.

STUDY OUTLINE, No. 12.—THE WORKING DAY.—The Rate of Surplus Value or Exploitation.—The total value of the product may be expressed as constant capital *plus* variable capital *plus* surplus value. The value added by labour in the course of the working-day, *excludes the constant*, the value of which is preserved simultaneous with the addition of new value. The working-day may thus be divided in two parts. The part in which the labourer has added a value which is equivalent to the variable capital, and the part in which the value added is surplus-value. The first part can be designated the *necessary labour time*, i.e., the time necessary for the creation of a value equal to the value of labour-power, and the second part as the *surplus-labour time*. The ratio of these two parts of the working-day signifies the *rate of exploitation* of the labourer, or, what is the same thing, the ratio of the surplus-value to the variable capital advanced, signifies the *rate of surplus-value*. Constant capital does not count in this calculation for the reason that surplus-value does not arise therefrom.

THE LIMITS OF THE WORKING-DAY.—Given the value of labour-power and, therefore, of the necessary labour time, surplus-value can be realized and increased to the extent that the working-day *is prolonged beyond the necessary labour time*. What are the limits of this prolongation? The minimum limit being given, what is the maximum limit? The length of the working-day must be less than the day of twenty-four hours, otherwise the labourer cannot meet his elementary physical needs, e.g., rest. But how much less? There is here considerable playroom within which, the power wielded by either party, capital or wage-labour, is the arbiter. The owner of capital claims the *right* to as long a working-day as he can get; the labourer claims the *right* to as short a working-day as he can get. *Force decides*. Hence the *historical struggle* between the workers and the capitalists for the regulation of the working-day.

THE STRUGGLE FOR THE REGULATION OF THE WORKING-DAY.—Legislation *lengthening* the working-day.—Statute of Labourers 1349, 1496, 1562. The introduction of steam-driven machinery gives to capital the power to *abnormally* exploit labour-power. In the first decades of the 19th century, the working-day is extended to its uttermost limits, and "all bounds of morals, nature, age, sex, day and night, broken down." Then begins the movement for a legalized *normal* working-day. Legislation from 1802–1833, not carried out in fact. From 1833 onwards, the Factory Acts progressively shorten the working-day for an increasing number of industries.

Chapter 10. Volume I.—*Capital*.

W. W. CRAIK,

Correspondence

INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATION ON THE RAILWAYS

SIR,—L. B.'s letter in the December issue may be divided into three points. (1) The argument that there is a feeling among the lower-paid grades that there is no reason why loco.-men should be more highly paid. (2) That if loco.-men amalgamated with other grades, the other grades would have a voice, and this would result in a lowering of wages. (3) That a leading sectionalist speaker instanced a *composite conciliation board* where the loco.-representatives were out-voted on the question of standing out for eight hours or accepting nine hours per day.

Point (1) exists more in imagination than in reality, and is the last refuge of the sectionalist. Point (3) really answers point (1) and (2) and any other points which might be brought forward. Why? Because it so happens that there is *only one composite conciliation board*, and that is on the North Eastern Railway. The North Eastern men, using this board as a medium of negotiation, obtained a reduction of the working day from ten hours to nine hours for loco.-men and some other grades. The North Eastern is the only railway where the loco.-men have achieved a general nine hours' day; on most other railways the general working-day is ten hours. So by amalgamated methods we have, not a lowering of wages, but a shortening of the working-day!

Enough said! L. B. had better find—if he can—some definite instances where amalgamation has been detrimental to loco.-men. In so doing, he will be well-advised to investigate any statements emanating from a "leading sectionalist" before rushing into print. The opinion of the undersigned is that One Union for all grades of railwaymen is a necessity to the progress of all, or of any one grade—even if that grade be loco.-men.

(Bristol.)

Yours,

G. W. BROWN

Reports

PADIHAM C.L.C. CLASS

We commenced our winter session on October 19th, with Mr. Edward Archbold as lecturer. This is our fourth year's course, and we are taking subjects which are appropriate to the times, viz., "Modern European History, The Historical Background of the War, and The War and the Working Class."

We have received grants from a few of the organizations in the town, which allows their members to attend the whole series of lectures for 8d. Although the war has undoubtedly affected the male membership, we are glad to report that we have an increase of women students.

One word about our lecturer. Mr. Archbold has worked magnificently in N.E. Lancashire on behalf of the C.L.C. movement, and has made great sacrifices in order to help to arouse Trade Unionists and Co-operators from their mental sleep.

J. W. HUDSON.

Reviews

SCIENCE AND SUPERSTITION

The Struggle between Science and Superstition. By Arthur M. Lewis. (Kerr & Co., Chicago, 1/7, post free.)

Every winter during the past nine years, Mr. Arthur M. Lewis has been conducting courses of popular lectures in the Garrick Theatre, Chicago. From time to time these lectures have been arranged in book form and published by Messrs. Kerr & Co. Among the volumes thus published are *Evolution, Social and Organic*; *Ten Blind Leaders of the Blind*; and *Vital Problems of Social Science*. With these, the majority of *Plebs* readers are familiar. *The Struggle between Science and Superstition* is the seventh of these volumes and is based on sixteen lectures delivered during 1914-15.

The contents of the volume deal with the period covered by Draper in his *Intellectual Development of Europe*, although, necessarily, the subject is treated in a more general way than by Draper. The aim of the author is to provide an easy outline of the progress of scientific thought, from the dawn of philosophical inquiry in ancient Greece down to the revival of the classical learning of antiquity, and the birth of natural science, in the 16th century. This outline should serve admirably as an introduction to the more detailed study of the history of the intellect.

The progress of science has the effect of diminishing the territory of superstition. Religion, however, has not accepted this curtailing of her dominion without a struggle. For behind the Altar was the Throne, and behind the priest, the politician. The attack on religion has thus generally been one which, in its destructive effects, reached beyond the sacred commandments to the secular interests of some economic class. This fact is most prominent in the Middle Ages, for the reason that the Church itself was an economic and political power. Mr. Lewis, in a simple way, tells the story of some of the most outstanding moments in the conflict of science with religion and of the central figures in these conflicts. Particularly, the author gives attention to the part played by Giordano Bruno and Vincenzo Galileo, in the battle for the liberation of the human mind from the fetters of traditional authority.

The author discusses the intellectual struggle, for the most part, separated from the material development of society. Such separations are, of course, justified in cases of special study. Still, it would have been helpful to beginners had he given for each intellectual epoch a general outline of the economic relations which were at that time dominant. In this way, he would have guarded against the unscientific habit of detaching the intellectual development from the conditions of that development.

We commend this little volume to *Plebs* readers.

W. W. C.

You can get a Postal Order at any Post Office.

A PAPER-MONEY WORSHIPPER

The Evolution of Banking. By R. H. Howe. (C. H. Kerr & Co., 1/7 post free.)

The author of this book is misappropriately named—so far, at least, as Banking is concerned. Howe never comes to *How*. Marx once observed that the theorists on money had made the mistake of giving us historical Recitation instead of Explanation, and the author of *The Evolution of Banking* is a case in point. He does not seem to know How money arrived or Why it remains. He is one of the many worshippers of the phraseology of Marx who have little or no grasp of the truths underlying the phrases. Take, for instance, the two conflicting sentences on p. 182: "Any commodity which fluctuates in value . . . is a poor instrument to measure the relative exchange value of commodities." An orthodoxy of the vilest kind!—followed by this quotation from Marx: "The labour time necessary to produce an article will ultimately be the *standard* by which its exchange value will be estimated." And apparently our author sees no incongruity in the two passages!

As a matter of fact, he is a disciple of Kitson, and Paper Money is his God. Yet—being a modern!—he thinks he ought to quote Marx with approval, and as a consequence he is neither Fish, Fowl, nor good Red Herring. He has not grasped the Marxian truism—that, in a society of private producers, each acting without thought or regard either to the production of others or to the ultimate useful end of all production, i.e., consumption, some power must operate by which all these productive activities are ultimately compressed to the needs of society. Such a power is money—a product of labour whose value is determined (as with all other exchangeable products) by the amount of socially-necessary labour devoted to its production. The one thing that Howe, Kitson, & Co. cannot understand is the social process by which the alterations of the labour-time, socially necessary to produce commodities, are adjusted. Such adjustments take place in the markets, and take general effect more or less slowly. At one and the same time, tokens of money are circulating at a given value in relation to other products; until, at some stage, an adjustment based on the new relationship of values has to be made—and we are confronted with a Crisis. "A crisis without money is impossible; money without a crisis is impossible," says Marx; Howe does not understand that—probably thinks it a brilliant paradox, theoretically arguable, but not practical. He fails to see that while public bodies can violently adjust paper values,—as in the Guernsey paper currency—they can only accept fictitious values in the process; the municipality or Government, that is, accepts a £1 paper note as £1 value, *but they cannot get the same quantity of goods for the £1 as was originally exchanged for it at its (the paper £1's) date of issue.* The process of taxation is, of course, open to public bodies in order to retrieve their losses; but it is not open to private traders, whose loss in such a case is final, perhaps irretrievable, in any case certain.

Howe constantly writes as though 'Society' met at a round-table conference, and decided on this or that as the most economical means of carrying on production and exchange. Any student of sociology "knows

different." Society and social relations are not guided by conscious plans; their movement is unconscious, but always tending to eliminate the superfluous. In such a way we have arrived at a mature state of Credit, and eliminated in large measure the use of gold. But let a stage be reached where the *real* basis of our exchange relations is forced home to us, and we quickly realize the basis of our credit system, and then Money, Hard Cash, is the universal cry. We are then forced to realize on what the Credit system is based, viz., *the relationship of one man's labour to another's*, or in other words, the relationship of gold-mining labour to, say, cotton-spinning. The cry, in times of Crisis, is 'Value for value' or 'Goods for goods'—money included; in such times we are made to realize that one man's socially necessary labour is equal to another man's. And this—once more—Howe does not understand. He is one of the Labour Note theorists, trying to adjust co-operative circulation to individualist production.

One can but hope that this book will circulate only among Marxians, for to them its shortcomings will be apparent. (The illustrations, by the way, are quite interesting.)

G. S.

The Plebs' Bookshelf

No bookshelf—least of all one belonging to a student of international affairs—is complete without a good atlas. The Oxford University Press has just published an *Historical Atlas of Modern Europe*, by C. Grant Robertson and J. G. Bartholomew (3/6 net), which deserves a place on every Plebeian's bookshelf. The Atlas covers the period 1789–1914, and contains, besides 43 maps, a full and admirably written historical introduction, and a useful statistical table dealing with population, religion, language, etc. The maps, intelligently studied, are an historical education in themselves. Each country is dealt with separately, and the various changes in frontiers, etc., during the period under consideration are clearly marked. Germany, for instance, is shown in one map split up into the hundred and odd little states of 1789; in a second (1810), divided into the Kingdom of Prussia, the Confederation of the Rhine, and the Empire of Napoleon; while three further maps show the changes between 1815 and 1914,—the gradual expansion of Prussia, the North German Confederation of 1866, and the Empire of 1871. France, Italy, Austria-Hungary, the Balkan States, Russia, Poland, are all dealt with in the same way. There are maps of Europe showing racial distribution, density of population, and divisions into industrial and agricultural districts; and, finally, four useful maps showing Persia and the Persian Gulf, the Far East (both showing "spheres of influence"), the Partition of Africa, and World Colonial Powers (1914). Only those, perhaps, who have had some working experience of atlases, old and new, can fully appreciate the lucidity, the concentration on essentials and omission of unnecessary detail—and the cheapness—of this volume.

"MORE, I PRITHEE, MORE!"—Good advice by Shakespeare.

The current number of the *Socialist Review* (6d. net.)—now published quarterly—contains a good deal of interesting matter. *Plebs'* readers should note a very useful article by Mr. J. T. Walton Newbold, "At the Balkan Cross Roads," dealing with certain economic aspects of the struggle in South-Eastern Europe and the Near East. Mr. Ramsay Macdonald contributes an outspoken article on "The War and Civil Liberty," and there are memorial articles on Keir Hardie (by Mr. Bruce Glasier) and Walter Crane (by Mr. Robert Steele). Mr. Bruce Glasier's Editorial, in the course of which he remarks that the forces of reaction in the House of Commons would be considerably weakened if a dozen or so of the "Labour" Members were promoted to the House of Lords (the main difficulty being that some of them would be content with nothing less than a dukedom), is quite refreshing reading.

* * * * *

Two or three months ago I referred to that excellent little series, the World's Classics, Pocket Edition (1/- net. each). Recent additions include Meadows Taylor's *Confessions of a Thug*, a vivid picture of a particular phase of Indian life—in pre-Kipling times; Hazlitt's *Characters of Shakespeare's Plays*; a selection of English (19th Century) Critical Essays; and a volume of *English Short Stories* (19th Century). This last should certainly be 'made a note of.' It includes stories by Scott, Hawthorne, Poe, Dr. John Brown, Dickens, Trollope, Meredith, Mark Rutherford, William Morris, Bret Harte, Stevenson, Gissing, and Hubert Crackanthorpe; as well as a good historical introduction by Mr. Hugh Walker. The No-Treating Order does not—as yet—apply to books; so if you're looking out for an inexpensive gift for anybody (male or female) remember this volume.

* * * * *

If the *Plebs* had not a debt to wipe out before it can afford to indulge in little luxuries, we would offer a prize for the best essay on a volume recently published in the Home University Library (1/- net.)—*Political Thought in England, from Herbert Spencer to the Present Day*, by Ernest Barker. Every working-class student ought to sharpen his teeth on it, especially since (to mix the metaphors) it provides him with a magnificent opportunity of using the "key" to political theorizing supplied by Marx. It is an open question, indeed, whether a keen student does not really get more out of a book like this than out of one written from "our" point of view throughout; he has constantly to test what he is reading in the light of the Marxian theory of history, and his critical faculty is strengthened and sharpened in the process. Mr. Barker's book—apart from its lack of any theory as to the *how* and *why* of political thought, and the relation of that thought to the politico-economic conditions of the time—is admirably well done. It summarizes the doctrines of the Idealists—T. H. Green, Bradley, Bosanquet; the "Scientific" School—Spencer, Huxley, Kidd, Graham Wallas; the Lawyers, and the Literary Men; ending with a chapter on "Economics and Politics," in the course of which Fabianism, Guild-Socialism, B.S.P. Marxism, Norman Angell-ism, etc., etc., are discussed. One sentence must be quoted—not to prejudice Plebeians, for the book really is valuable—but just for its own sweet sake. Mr. Barker is dealing with the Psychologists;—

Our fathers thought biologically; we think psychologically. Ever since Jevons plunged into the mind of the consumer, and constructed the theory of final value, economists have tended to be more and more psychological. . . .

Subject for a historical fresco, to adorn some ante-chamber in the Central Labour College—"Professor Jevons Plunging into the Mind of a Consumer." We must have that picture as a Photogravure Supplement to some future Christmas Number of the *Plebs*.

* * * * *

In the review of *A Manual on Essay-Writing* in last month's *Plebs*, we quoted, among other pieces of good advice to essayists, the authors' warning against a too reckless use of metaphor. There is an "awful example" of this little weakness in the manifesto issued by the London Trade Unionist Protest Committee against the new licensing laws. The Committee's activities are first described as "a struggle against Prussianism." A little further on "Prussianism" becomes the "chains of a Chinese despotism," and still later the "obscurities of a Venetian oligarchy." Then the "darkness of the Byzantine Empire" is worked in; and the grand finale comes with a reference to "Russian despotism at its worst." An impressive list! But what had Abdul Hamid, Nero, Herod, Rockefeller, and Murphy done amiss, that they should be left out in the cold?

* * * * *

After which, we must find space for a really good metaphor. A recent issue of the *New Statesman* contained a description of orthodox economists which Plebians will thoroughly appreciate. It deserves a line to itself—and capital letters:—

"CHAPLAINS TO THE PIRATE SHIP."

It would be hard to improve on that.

J. F. H.

Index to Vol. VII

ARTICLES, ETC.

	PAGE
An Appeal by the Executive Committee	193
Are Clerks Workers? (W. E. Walker)	206
Battle of the Welsh Miners, The (W. H. Mainwaring)	148
Bernard Shaw, Socialist (J. F. Horrabin)	14
Bookshelf, The <i>Plebs</i> (J.F.H.)	142, 166, 191, 263, 284
C. L. C. Annual Report	170
Coming Recoil, The (A.E.)	85
Current Events (W. H. Mainwaring)	154
Domestic Workers, Effects of the War on (Grace Neal)	10
Dry Bones of Robert Blatchford, The (H. Wynn-Cuthbert)	181
Editorials (J.F.H.)	1, 25, 49, 73, 121, 145
Engineers, Effects of the War on (Frank Jackson)	64

Guild Socialism and Women in Industry (J. F. and W. Horrabin) ...	200
Hamsters and the Mice, The: A Fable	87
Herve on the Welsh Strike	228
Historical Materialism, A Defence of (W. W. Craik)	4, 29, 51, 79
Historical Materialism (D.J.W.)	60
Industrial Unionism and the State (R. Holder)	197
Labour in War Time (Noah Ablett)	224
Letters on Logic: Economics (Dietzgen) 41, 89, 110, 132, 185, 230, 246, 271	
"Moderate" on Peace and War, A (W. W. Craik)	125
Mysteries of Wagery in South Wales (Noah Ablett)	195
Need for a Policy, The (Noah Ablett)	76
Need for Noah—and Others, The (Winifred Horrabin)	105
Outcome of Philosophy, The (W. W. Craik)	100
On "Educating" the "Democracy" (J. F. Horrabin)	241
Plebs' Annual Meet Report	207
Plebs' Fund Subscription List	245
Plebs' Next Step, The (W. H. Mainwaring)	129
Political Economy: Outlines (W. W. Craik)	232, 248, 277
Psychology a la Mode (X.Y.Z.)	157
Railway Workers, Effects of War on (C. Watkins)	81
Reports	17, 44, 93, 113, 139, 189, 210, 238, 258, 281
Should the Workers be Organized by Industries? (G. Barker)	123, 218
Socialism and the War (H. Wynn-Cuthbert)	11
Stale Fish and Red Herrings (H. Wynn-Cuthbert)	97
State, The (R. Holder)	151
Supplies and the Engineers (T. Rees)	205
Textile Workers, Effects of War on (Alice Smith)	33
Tribute to the C. L. C., A	226
VERSE:—	
A Phat-riotic Song (Langdon Everard)	40
An Australian Version of Mark Antony's Speech	168
"He Died for His Country" (Mrs. D. B. Montefiore)	144
"?" (J.F.H.)	217
"W.E.A. Way," The (F. J. Adkins)	56
What of the Women? (Alice Smith)	221
Women in Industry: A Reply to Critics (Alice Smith)	268

CORRESPONDENCE

The War—Where Do We Stand ?	J. P. M. Millar, 19, 138 ; E. Rodway, 20 ; W. H. Mainwaring, 37 ; T. E. Shuttleworth, 67 ; C. T. Cramp, 91, 139 ; Mens Sana, 113, 160 ; G. S., 136, 210.
The Magazine—	W. G. Davies, 20 ; Regular Reader, 21 ; D.J.W., 22 ; W. M. Gormlie, 22, 92 ; J. Jones, 39 ; M. N. Jones, 92 ; J.S.C., 93 ; A.K., 258.
Should Workers be Organized by Industries ?—	B. S. Mackay, 211, 256 ; Worker, 213 ; L.B., 257 ; G. W. Brown, 281.
The B.S.P. and the C.L.C. (— Duckworth) 39
The C.L.C. —Vorwärts ! (P. Mather) 68
The " W.E.A. Way " (F. B. Silvester) 114
The National Guilds League (W. Mellor) 159
From South Australia (W. M. Gormlie) 162
The late Dr. Gustav Bang (S. Jonnson) 35

REVIEWS

<i>A Christian with Two Wives</i> —Dennis Hird (J.F.H.) 142
<i>After the War</i> —G. Lowes Dickinson (J.F.H.) 96
<i>Brand</i> .—Ibsen (J.F.H.) 95
<i>British Empire, The</i> —Sir C. P. Lucas (J.F.H.) 95
<i>Britannica Histories of European Nations</i> (R. Holder) 22
<i>Evolution and the War</i> .—Chalmers Mitchell (R. Holder) 163
<i>Evolution of Banking</i> .—Howe (G.S.) 283
<i>Essay-Writing</i> .—Henderson and Freeman (J.F.H.) 261
<i>Edward Carpenter</i> .—E. Lewis (J.F.H.) 215
<i>German Philosophy in Relation to the War</i> .—Muirhead (W.W.C.) 115
<i>Healing of Nations</i> .—E. Carpenter (J.F.H.) 118
<i>Herald War Pamphlets</i> .—G. Lansbury, etc. (J.F.H.) 141
<i>Homeland or Empire ?</i> —J. Burgess (R. Holder) 260
<i>How the War Came</i> .—I.L.P. Pamphlet (J.F.H.) 96
<i>International Socialism and the War</i> .—Humphrey (R. Holder) 71
<i>International Crisis : Ethical and Psychological Aspects</i> (J.F.H.) 165
<i>Labour in War Time</i> .—Cole (N. Ablett) 224
<i>Lowland Scotch</i> .—Wilson (A. J. Hacking) 214
<i>Mainsprings of Russia</i> .—Baring (J.F.H.) 116
<i>New Faith, The</i> —F. Henderson (J.F.H.) 95
<i>Peace and War in Europe</i> .—G. Slater (W.W.C.) 125
<i>Political Economy : Evolution of Industry : Unemployment</i> .—Home University Library (J.F.H. and W.H.) 46
<i>Science and Superstition</i> .—Lewis (W.W.C.) 282
<i>Shaw, Selected Passages from</i> (G.S.) 239
<i>Submerged Nationalities of German Empire</i> .—Barker (J.F.H.) 140
<i>Trade Unionism</i> .—C. M. Lloyd (J. H. Pratt) 1. 9
<i>The War and Democracy</i> .—Zimmern, Seton-Watson, etc. (J.F.H.) 70
<i>The War : Its Origins and Warnings</i> .—F. J. Adkins (J.F.H.) 47
<i>The War of Steel and Gold</i> .—Brailsford (B. S. Mackay) 23
<i>What is Wrong with Germany ?</i> —Dawson (H. W. Cuthbert) 68
<i>Wells, H. G.</i> —Beresford (J.F.H.) 190