

Vol. VI, No. 9

October, 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

NOTICE

To clear off the debt on Magazine the Annual Meet decided to hold a *Grand Concert and Free Distribution of Gifts* to purchasers of Tickets for same (Tickets 1d. each, book of 30, 2/-). Will those willing to assist sale of Tickets write at once to the Concert Secretary,

W. H. MAINWARING,
13 Penywern Road,
Earls' Court, London, S. W.

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 Seventh Annual Meet will be held in London (Bank Holiday), August, 1915

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

October, 1914

No. 9

CONTENTS

- 1.—ANNUAL MEETING "PLEBS" LEAGUE
- 2.—THE PLEBS MAGAZINE: AN APPEAL
- 3.—LETTERS ON LOGIC: ECONOMICS
- 4.—PRINCIPLES OF COMMUNISM
- 5.—CLASS WAR AND CLASS FRIENDSHIP—
ERNEST JONES
- 6.—C.L.C. REPORTS
- 7.—ONE MORE STEP—FRANK JACKSON
- 8.—SHARING UP!—MEPHTE

THE "PLEBS" LEAGUE

Sixth Annual Meeting

THE SIXTH ANNUAL "MEET" of the "Plebs" League was held at the College on Bank Holiday, August 3rd. Mr. G. W. Brown, organizing secretary of the National Union of Railwaymen, presided over a fairly representative meeting of members and sympathizers.

As one who assisted in the formation of the League in November, 1909, the Chairman, in his opening remarks, very appropriately referred to the history of the League and the valuable work which had been accomplished by its members, and by the publication of the Magazine, in promoting the theory of independent working-class education in social science.

The founders of the League, he said, foresaw that there was a danger of the education of the workers being dominated with ruling-class ideas through the University authorities obtaining an influence

over the teaching of Ruskin College, and it was with the object of combatting this influence, and also bringing about a closer connexion between Ruskin College and the Labour Movement that led to the establishment of the League.

The developments which had taken place since 1909, irrefutably proved the correctness of the views held by the pioneers of the League, inasmuch as the University of Oxford had officially recognized Ruskin College since then, and that the students of Ruskin College were encouraged to study orthodox economics in order to qualify for the Oxford University Diploma in Economics and Political Science.

While there were prospects of the Central Labour College being placed on a sounder financial basis in the future, yet there was still a greater need for continuing the League and publishing of the Magazine so as to spread the principles which were taught at the College among the rank and file of the working class. From his own experience of organizing work he was more firmly convinced of the necessity of independent working-class education, so as to enable the workers to secure the requisite knowledge for improving their present social position, and eventually to achieve their emancipation from wage-slavery.

He understood there was a heavy debt on the Magazine the removal of which would require their earnest consideration when discussing the Financial Statement, as the continuation of the Magazine was indispensable to the future welfare of the League and the College.

Secretary's Report

Mr. J. Reynolds, acting secretary, in presenting the report for the past year, said that the members of the League had every reason to congratulate themselves upon the success which had attended their efforts of endeavouring to establish a working-class educational institution—the Central Labour College—free from the contaminating and demoralizing influence of the ruling class.

The present stage of development in connexion with the College was a striking testimony of what could be achieved by a comparatively small number of organized individuals, when they knew what they wanted and set to work in a determined and systematic manner. The results which had been obtained up to the present were sufficient to justify the existence of the League and to further inspire the members to continue their work with renewed vigour in the future.

He regretted to have to report that there was a heavy financial cloud hanging over the League and he hoped the members present would be able to suggest some practicable method of discovering the silver lining which was sadly needed to place the financial position of the League free from all existing liabilities.

The circulation of the Magazine throughout the year had remained practically the same as the previous one. While there were some old subscribers to the Magazine who had not paid their subscriptions for the last two years, their Magazines had consequently been stopped. There were a few others who had not forwarded their subscriptions up-to-date, and unless they were paid during the next two months, the Magazine would no longer be sent to them. Although they accepted the Magazine each month, which was an indication that they appreciated it, yet unfortunately they failed to observe the obligation on their part to send along the necessary subscription—a failure which he hoped would be speedily remedied. During the year there had been several new subscribers, and their were prospects of the circulation increasing. **If all the present readers would endeavour to secure at least one new subscriber, the future of the Magazine would be assured** and with an increased circulation the size of the Magazine could be increased and its price be reduced. There was sufficient evidence, that with a little effort, an increased demand for the Magazine could be secured, as several members of the League at the present time were disposing of quantities ranging from 12 to 62 copies each month. Notable among them were R. Mell, of Hull, 62 copies; W. Watson, Paddington, 40 copies; H. Slack, Derby, 37 copies; J. R. Work, Blackburn, 24 copies; Harold Kershaw, Rochdale, 18 copies, J. Bonner, Rhondda, 18 copies. "Where there's a will, there's a way."

The thanks of the members were due to Mr. J. F. Horrabin for the design of the Magazine cover and articles on the drama; to Harold Batho for cartoons which had been a distinguishing feature of some of the numbers; and to Miss M. Braunthall, Mr. A. J. Hacking and Mr. S. Jonsson for translations from the French and German which had rendered possible the publication of a series of articles hitherto inaccessible to those who were unable to read them in the language in which they were originally published. Arrangements had been made whereby it was hoped to publish a selection of articles from the voluminous writings of Marx and Engels which up to the present were not obtainable in the English language.

The recent appeal in the Magazine for contributions to the College Fund had resulted in over £26 being handed over to the College to help the authorities in their severe financial struggle.

He hoped that, now the financial prospects of the College appeared to be much brighter for the future, the members would devote more of their energies towards the financial side of the League and Magazine, and thus redeem their obligation to Mr. Fox, the printer, for his generosity when they considered the sum due to him, in printing the Magazine and thus enabling its publication to continue.

When the Financial Statement was presented to them, they would have an opportunity of combining the practical with the theoretical in devising ways and means of removing the debt on the Magazine.

The adoption of the Secretary's Report was moved and seconded, and carried unanimously.

Financial Statement

Mr. J. Paul, of Barry, presented the Financial Statement, and said he had carefully gone through all the accounts and examined all the receipts and found everything correct.

INCOME

	£	s.	d.
To Cash in Hand, August 3rd, 1913	3	10	2
„ Magazines... ..	70	6	4
„ Leaflets (Relief to Main)	1	10	0
„ League Membership Fees	17	13	0
„ I.O.U.'s (Redeemed)	5	10	0
„ Deficit Fund	0	13	5
„ Loan from Treasurer, 1913-14	8	3	2
„ Due Treasurer, August 1st, 1914	41	5	11
„ Balance Down, August 1st, 1914	69	13	10
	<hr/>		
	£218	5	10

EXPENDITURE

	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
By Printing, Balance due August 3rd, 1913 ...	58	13	1			
„ Printing	30	14	8			
	<hr/>			89	7	9
„ Postage on Magazines and Receipts				16	3	0
„ Parcels (Railway Charges)				1	4	0
„ Office Materials				0	2	4
„ Cash in Hand, August 3rd, 1914				0	9	0
„ Due to Treasurer, August 3rd, 1914				41	5	11
„ Due Messrs. Fox, Jones & Co.				69	13	10
	<hr/>			£218	5	10

Audited and found correct, August 3rd, 1914.

JAMES PAUL.

I.O.U.'s REDEEMED SINCE LAST MARCH.

	£	s.	d.
Brown, G. W.	1	0	0
Edwards, E.	0	10	0
Fox, F. W.	1	0	0
Keating, T. P.	1	0	0
Pratt, J. H.	1	0	0
Peake, W.	1	0	0
	<hr/>		
	£5	10	0

DEFICIT FUND.

	£	s.	d.
Hawkins, T. D.	0	1	6
Jones, J. A. (U.S.A.)	0	10	5
Smyth, J.	0	1	6
	<hr/>		
	£0	13	5

After the adoption of the Financial Statement had been carried, a lengthy discussion took place on the best method of raising money to remove the debt owing to the Printer and Treasurer.

On the motion of Mr. R. Mell, of Hull, seconded by Mr. J. Owen, of Hull, it was eventually decided to organize a Prize Draw for the purpose of clearing off the debt on the Magazine.

The following were elected, from among the London members, to form a Committee for organising the prize drawing :—

Miss M. Howarth, Mrs. W. Horrabin, Mrs. D. Montefiore, Messrs. B. T. Ames, R. Holder, Geo. Mason, W. H. Mainwaring, Ben. S. Mackay, C. T. Pendrey, and J. H. Pratt.

It was agreed that an appeal for funds towards the prizes and printing of tickets, should be published in the Magazine, and asking all the readers to assist in making the Draw a success. A collection was taken at the meeting towards the expenses of the draw and resulted in the sum of £1 14s. 6d., including an I.O.U. for 5s. from Mr. F. W. Fox, being given by those present.

Future Policy of the League and Magazine

Several members expressed their appreciation of the articles which had appeared in the Magazine, and also promised to do all they could to increase the circulation, as there was a great need among the working class for a magazine like *The Plebs*.

During the discussion on the Magazine it was stated that Mr. C. Loxston, of Long Eaton, possessed some bound volumes of writings on the Chartist Movement, by Ernest Jones, many of the articles would be suitable for publication in the Magazine. Mr. Loxston said that he should be only too pleased to forward them to the Editor, so that he could make a selection for publication in the Magazine. (One of the articles appears elsewhere in the present issue.)

On the motion of Mr. Geo. Sims, of London, seconded by Mr. R. Mell, Hull, it was unanimously agreed that the Object and Methods of the League be amended as follows :

Object

"To further the interests of independent working-class education, as a partisan effort to improve the position of Labour in the present and ultimately assist in the abolition of wage-slavery."

Methods

"The holding of an Annual Meet; the issuing of a monthly Magazine, mainly devoted to the discussion of the various questions of Labour, theoretical and practical: the formation of local branches and classes for the study of social science in connexion with the Central Labour College, and in every way to assist the development of the latter institution and its maintenance of a definite educational policy."

Membership.

"Open to all who endorse the object of the League. Each member shall pay 1s. a year to the Central Fund towards meeting the expenses in connexion with the Annual Meet, &c."

This concluded the business of the Meeting.

The "Plebs" Magazine Fund

AN APPEAL

We have to choose between clearing a debt amounting to £120, or losing the Magazine. Obviously we could not go on piling up the debt: so the Annual Meet decided that it must be wiped out. To do this under present conditions means that every reader must do his utmost.

The service rendered to the College through and by means of the Magazine has made it indispensable to its future welfare, and provides the means of keeping the active supporters in touch with the work of the College and the movement generally.

Don't say it cannot be done. It MUST be done. Some of our friends are already doing splendidly: notably Robert Mell, of Hull, who has received 2000 tickets, while the following have received a thousand tickets each:—W. G. Davies, Barry; E. Edwards, Wolverhampton; H. Kershaw, Rochdale; C. Watkins, Sheffield; G. Mason, London; F. W. Watson, Acton; E. Archbold, N. E. Lanes; and several others have

received supplies ranging from 25 books downwards. We may not all be able to dispose of a thousand tickets, but we can try at least one book.

The creation of this debt was not a one man's job. It is our joint product, and the effort to clear it off should also be a joint one.

So we appeal to those who have tickets to do their best; to those who have none to send along for supplies. **IT MUST BE DONE SOON AS THE EFFORT CLOSES ON NOVEMBER 1st.** Enlist the support of your friends. If you cannot sell any yourself, see that others do it.

If you cannot do either add your name to the list below.

The following sums have been promised towards the fund.

	£	s.	d.
*R. Mell, of Hull - - - - -	0	10	0
E. Edwards, Wolverhampton - - - - -	0	5	0
D. Mills Jones, Tonypany - - - - -	0	5	0
F. W. Fox, Oxford - - - - -	0	5	0
*D. Evans, Clydach Vale - - - - -	0	2	6
J. Thomas „ „ - - - - -	0	2	6
*F. Jackson, Rochdale, book value - - - - -	0	2	6
*H. Wood, Sheerness-on-Sea - - - - -	0	2	0
In addition to these a collection taken at the Annual Meet realized - - - - -	1	9	6
	<hr/>		
	£3	4	0

*These amounts have been received.

The Committee in charge desire it to be made known that, while the list of Gifts printed upon the tickets stipulate that the cash value will be given in Books, holders of successful tickets will be permitted to select any other article they may prefer equal to the value to which their ticket entitles them.

Send your orders to W. H. Mainwaring, Hon. Secretary,
13, Penywern Road, Earls Court, S.W.

Letters on Logic

Economics

FIFTH LETTER OF THE SECOND SERIES

IN ORDER to elucidate Economic Science we had to distinguish typical wage-labour, which is more and more predominant in modern production, from the handicraft labour, and the various forms of slavery in previous times. Such wage labour (and here the statement of the ordinary economist is correct) cannot operate without capital—that is, without accumulated labour.

Henry George misses the point when he says that wages are not drawn from capital, but are produced by labour. Labour to be effective under all circumstances needs some preceding accumulation. So much must be granted to the capitalist in order that their arrogant claims may be refuted later. This granted, it is possible to prove that the capitalistic form of accumulation is a necessary requirement for the existence of wage labour, but not for labour in general.

The same logical process which compelled us to represent wage-labour as something special and distinct amongst other forms of labour, now forces us to specially characterize the instruments of production of the competitive system. Let us turn to the concept of Capital.

In the second chapter of his book Henry George shows, by quoting half a dozen writers on Economics, how the Economists vary in their definitions of capital. He gives Adam Smith's:—"That part of a man's stock which he expects to afford him revenue is called his capital." In specifying the different kinds of capital, Adam Smith includes "the acquired and useful abilities of all the inhabitants," and this Henry George criticizes very severely. After having divided the elements of production into land, labour, and capital, he declares that these abilities belong to labour and not to capital, and he calls it a confusion of economic science to give to the one what belongs to the other. He says:

The difficulties which beset the use of the word capital, as an exact term, arise from two facts—first, that certain classes of things, the possession of which to the individual is precisely equivalent to the possession of capital, are not part of the capital of the community; and second, that things of the same kind may, or may not be capital, according to the purpose to which they are devoted.

After this, our author attempts to define more closely the terms, land, labour, and capital. Although we have now only to deal with the concept of capital, we must nevertheless consider the other two. Each is dependent upon the other, so that without a proper definition of land and labour we cannot arrive at a proper concept of capital. Henry George says :

The term land necessarily includes, not merely the surface of the earth as distinguished from the water and the air, but the whole material universe outside of man himself The term land embraces, in short, all natural materials, forces, and opportunities, and, therefore, nothing that is freely supplied by nature can be properly classed as capital. A fertile field, a rich vein of ore, a falling stream which supplies power, may give to the possessor advantages equivalent to the possession of capital, but to class such things as capital would be to put an end to the distinction between land and capital.

If we substitute for the word land the word nature, then the matter is simplified. Nature freely supplies such things as soil, minerals, &c. Capital, according to Henry George, is nothing but an unjust monopoly, and the capitalists are wicked monopolists who exact tribute from natural resources. It is apparent that clear definitions of the elements of production are of fundamental importance ; that which Henry George favours, viz. land, labour and capital cannot be considered scientific, since it confuses the issue. If capital is that part of a man's property, which is expected to yield him revenue, and if we also call capital those elements of production which are necessary for the creation of surplus value, then land is included in capital, and instead of three elements of production we have only two—capital and labour.

The term labour includes all human exertion, and hence human powers, whether natural or acquired can never properly be classed as capital. In common parlance we often speak of a man's knowledge, skill, or industry as constituting his capital ; but this is evidently a metaphorical use of language that must be eschewed in reasoning that aims at exactness. Superiority in such qualities may augment the income of an individual just as capital would, and an increase in the knowledge, skill or industry of a community may have the same effect in increasing its production as would an increase of capital ; but this effect is due to the increased power of labour and not to capital. Increased velocity may give to the impact of a cannon-ball the same effect as increased weight, yet, nevertheless, weight is one thing and velocity another.

We now know what is land and what is labour ; let us proceed to the consideration of capital.

We must exclude from the category of capital everything that may be included either as land or labour. There remain only things which are neither land nor labour, but which have resulted from the union of these two original factors of production.

Capital is, therefore, the child of mother nature and father labour. But these parents have other children, all of whom are called by the surname "wealth." We want to get acquainted with the child, who bears the Christian name, capital, and the surname, wealth, i.e., capital-wealth. For this purpose we shall distinguish the concept, and also unite them dialectically. For a thorough comprehension the latter is as necessary as the former. And here, Henry George, who only understands the one, is left far behind by Marx, who knows how to use both methods. Capital-wealth must be distinguished on the one side from national wealth, and on the other side from wealth which has been created by labour in conjunction with nature, but which is not used for the creation of profit, being personally consumed. A bottle of wine is capital for the wine merchant, and he expects it to yield him profit ; but the bottle of wine on your table is not capital. As we have already quoted : " Things of the same kind may or may not be capital, according to the purpose to which they are devoted."

That part of a farmer's crop held for sale or for seed or to feed his help in part payment of wages, would be accounted capital ; that held for the use of his own family would not be.

That means that the miserable living of the worker is part of the political economy of the capitalists, but the higher sustenance which these latter take for themselves is given them from heaven. But the capitalist is also a worker ; his dinners and suppers are means towards the proper conduct of the process of production, his family means towards continuing that production in future. Why should not the capitalist and his family and all they consume be considered as capital ?

The Economists do not logically define capital. They go too far in assuming that the old Egyptians, the patriarchs, knights, monks, and savages were capitalist producers ; while, in totally confusing the connection between economic forms and life in general, their outlook is far too narrow.

This is the difference between their and our way of thinking ; their things and their concepts are static, while by our method we get movement and life.

Capital is called "the efficient instruments of labour," but the Economists forget that the ownership of the "instruments" now carries with it the control of the productive processes, and, along with that, the domination of the whole of society.

I merely mention this in order to show how the Economists cling to words. Terms are necessary for the proper understanding of Economics, but in order that Economics may be useful, it is necessary to understand both the distinctions and their unity.

It is as plain as a pikestaff that the capitalists, although they work for themselves for their own pockets, are at the same time producers for the whole of society; they do not produce for their own consumption but for the social market; but they, and their literary accomplices, like Smith, Ricardo, Rau, Roscher—if the latter are not too much honoured by being mentioned along with the former—consider the workers not as fellow-men but as "hands," and Economics not as a science which has to be used for the sake of humanity, but just as the Babylonians considered Baal.

In consequence of this inhuman conception it appears to them that "this part of the harvest used for food for the servants" (which means the miserable living of the worker) is to be considered as a part of capital, while their own higher joys of life are excluded from vulgar economics.

Henry George is not wholly dominated by this narrow outlook, but in spite of his more humane opinions he does not succeed in understanding what capital really is. He does not distinguish the means of production of the present as something quite different from those of the past, nor does he realize the inevitability of further change; he does not understand the "historical element." Neither does he see that land, labour, and capital, nature, man, and his products are inseparably connected in spite of all distinctions, that they dialectically flow into each other.

If the confusion of private with political economy is a frequent obstacle to clear understanding, yet the one may serve as an illustration of the other. The merchant separates his business from his household expenses; his office cash book which is in the hands of the accountant is quite separate from the private cash book which he entrusts to his wife. But it is obvious that in spite of this formal separation both accounts are dependent upon each other and are interrelated.

If the housekeeper spends money extravagantly then the office must replace it; and if the wife manages the home accounts satisfactorily, it is all the better for the affairs at the office. On the

other hand prosperous business will result in a more liberal home allowance. The domestic management cannot be separated from business, and still less can national production be separated from national life. It is plain from this how blind the Capitalist Economists are if they imagine that they can regard the scanty sustenance of the workers as a part of Economics, and their own sometimes enormous expenses as belonging to another category altogether.

The different categories are connected with each other and depend each on the other.

Henry George, like the Economists, is sometimes too narrow and sometimes too vague in his views. Sometimes he fails by treating his concepts as though they had no limitations; at other times by regarding them as so sharply limited that they have no sort of connection one with the other. We have to avoid both errors.

Translated for the *Plebs Magazine* from the German of Joseph Dietzgen by Miss B. BRAUNTHAL.

Principles of Communism

by FREDERICK ENGELS

(Continued)

Secondly, the Industrial Revolution has developed the wealth and power of the Bourgeoisie to the greatest possible extent, making it the most powerful class everywhere. It proceeded to get political power into its own hands, superseding the classes which had been predominant previously—the aristocracy, the townsmen of the guilds, and the absolute monarchy representing both. It destroyed the power of the aristocracy by abolishing the right of primogeniture, or the unsaleable character of real property, as well as the various privileges of the nobility. It destroyed the power of the townsmen of the guilds by abolishing all the guild and handicraft privileges. In place of these it established free competition—i.e., a state of society in which any individual is free to carry on any branch of industry agreeable to him, and in which there is no hindrance to his so doing but the need of the required capital. With the introduction of free competition, therefore, the individual members of society are only unequal in so far as their capitals are unequal; capital is the determining factor, and the capitalists, the bourgeoisie, have become the real ruling class. Free competition is necessary for the establishment of the great industry, since it is the only state of society in

which the great industry can develop. The Bourgeoisie, after it had thus abolished the social privileges of the aristocracy, and the guildsmen, next abolished their political power. Since it had raised itself to the position of the chief class in society, it proceeded to proclaim itself, in political form, as the chief class. It accomplished this by the introduction of the representative system, which depends on civic equality and the legal recognition of free competition. This was bound up in European countries with a constitutional monarchy. In these countries, electors had to possess a certain amount of capital—and were therefore confined to the Bourgeoisie. These bourgeois voters elect bourgeois representatives; and these in turn ensure a bourgeois régime.†

Thirdly, the Industrial Revolution has developed the Proletariat to the same extent that it has developed the Bourgeoisie. Just in the same ratio as the Bourgeoisie has become richer, the Proletariat has grown more numerous. The Proletariat could only come into being through the power of capital, and capital only increases when it is increasing the number of workers. An increase of the Proletariat has therefore gone hand in hand with the increase of capital. At the same time, Bourgeoisie and Proletariat have both been concentrated in large towns, and this massing of the workers in large numbers has given them a consciousness of their power. Further, the more this process develops, the more labour-saving machines are invented and utilized, and in this way, as has already been pointed out, wages are reduced to a minimum, and the position of the Proletariat becomes more and more unendurable. § Thus, by means on the one hand of the growing discontent, and on the other of the increasing consciousness of the Proletariat, the way is made ready for a revolution of society.

† This, until the year 1848, was the state of affairs in every country in which the Bourgeoisie had attained to power. Since then it has been clearly shown that bourgeois rule is compatible with a very widely extended franchise—indeed with universal, equal, and direct suffrage. And this must remain the case for just so long as the method of production, and the general social development dependent thereon, needs the Bourgeoisie as its agent. Nevertheless, universal suffrage is the negation of bourgeois rule in the germ, and it is this which imparts to it its tremendous historical significance as the lever for an organic development of society. Universal suffrage, as Proudhon observed, is in the long run "incompatible with the subordination of Labour to Capital."—EDITOR.

§ Moreover, even where—for the reasons outlined in the note to *Question 4* (see *August Plebs*)—the reduction of wages to subsistence minimum is not possible, other factors of the capitalist régime cannot but result in making the position of the workers unendurable. Such factors are the inevitable fluctuations of capitalist trade and the consequent insecurity of the worker, and the continuous revolutionising of the process of production and transference of whole industries from one place to another. And this insecurity is the more unendurable since at the same time the general social development is raising the workers' standards of living; which standards are, in reality, only the definite expression of the demands made by society on the worker.—EDITOR.

Question 12.—What were the wider consequences of the Industrial Revolution?

Answer.—By means of the steam-engine and other machines, the great industry created the means of indefinitely increasing the industrial output, at a diminishing cost both of time and money. The free competition which followed this accelerated production soon produced definite results; a crowd of capitalists seized upon industry, and in a short time far more was produced than was actually needed. The commodities manufactured could not be sold, and a so-called *trade crisis* occurred. Factories had to be closed, employers became bankrupt, and the workers starved. After a time the surplus products were sold, the factories opened again, wages rose, and trade gradually became more prosperous than before. But this could not last long. Again, too many commodities were produced, and another crisis occurred, with all the effects of the first. Thus, since the beginning of the 19th century the condition of industry has constantly fluctuated between periods of prosperity and periods of crisis. Such crises have recurred almost regularly every five or seven years; each time resulting in the greatest misery for the workers, and each time stimulating revolutionary tendencies and threatening shipwreck of the whole existing state of society.

Question 13.—What is apparent from these regularly-recurring business crisis?

Answer.—In the first place, that the great industry—although in its earlier stages it had itself given birth to free competition—has now reached a stage at which free competition, so far from being useful to it, is actually a hindrance—a fetter from which it must break free. So long as it is organized on this basis of free competition, the great industry can only exist at the cost of a general upheaval every few years, an upheaval which each time threatens the whole fabric of civilization, thrusting not only the proletariat into misery, but also ruining some section of the bourgeoisie itself. It is plain, therefore, either that the great industry must be abolished—which is an absolute impossibility—or that it must develop into a new organization of society, in which industrial production shall no longer be in the hands of individual owners all competing one against the other, but shall be owned and controlled by society as a whole and shall satisfy the needs of all.

In the second place, it is apparent that the great industry, and the tremendous increase in the production made possible thereby, now makes practicable a new order of society in which such a sufficiency of the necessaries of life will be assured, that every member of that society will have leisure and opportunity to develop his natural powers and abilities in comparative freedom: in fact, that those same qualities or aspects of the great industry which under our existing social organization result in misery and instability, would,

under another social system, have exactly opposite consequences. It is obvious, therefore :

(i) That from now onwards all our social problems and evils are simply the result of a social system which is no longer adapted to social needs ; and

(ii) That the only means by which these evils can be abolished, viz., a new order of society, is now close at hand.*

Question 14.—Of what nature must this new order of society be ?

Answer.—First and foremost, it will take all industry and all branches of production out of the hands of individual competitive owners ; carrying on industry by the active participation of all the members of society. It will abolish competition, and put association in its place. Further, since production for individual profit is based upon private property, this later must also be abolished, and its place taken by the use of all instruments of production, and the division of all products—by communism, in short. The abolition of private property in itself sums up the new order of society, which in itself is the inevitable result of industrial development.

Question 15.—Was not the abolition of Private Property possible at an earlier date ?

Answer.—No. Every change in the social order, every revolution as regards property relations, has been the necessary consequence of new productive powers, which could no longer be adapted to the existing property relations. Private Property itself arose in this way. For Private Property has not always existed ; towards the end of the Middle Ages a new means of production—manu-

*If in this and earlier answers the ripeness of existing industrial development for immediate changes is to some extent anticipated, one must put it to the credit of youth—the youth of the author and of the modern socialist movement itself. This insistence on the high degree of industrial development attained to was common to all socialist writers of the period. "History has given us the lie," wrote Engels later in his preface to Marx's *Class Struggles in France, 1848—50*: "it has made it clear that economic development on the Continent at that time had still far to go before capitalist production could be abolished." And he points out that in spite of the mighty revolutionary events which had already occurred, the proletarian army of the period was not yet able to gain the victory by one great final blow—"it must force its way forward gradually, from position to position."

It may be noted here also, especially in regard to the later answers, that for various reasons capitalist development has not proceeded quite so swiftly to its own ruin as Marx and Engels doubtless (in these early days) hoped. Syndicates, trusts, &c., have helped to modify the competitive struggle, and the recurring trade crisis, to some extent. The workers' combinations have up to a certain point successfully resisted the wage-reducing tendency of capital. Such new factors in the struggle as co-operative stores for the workers have acquired a greater significance. In other classes and ranks of society also, the tendency towards organisation has led to unions of various kinds, while at the same time legislation and state control of various branches of industry have reduced the area and intensity of exploitation.—EDITOR.

facture—was evolved, which could not be adapted to feudal or guild relations, and which accordingly outgrew and overwhelmed them, producing a new form of property—Private Property* But for the first stages of development of the great industry, no other form of property but private property was possible—no other order of society than one based upon private property. So long as the productive powers only produce enough to satisfy the needs of a given time, without a surplus being available for the augmentation of social capital and the further development of the forces of production, so long must there inevitably be a ruling class controlling and an oppressed class subject to the social productive powers. The creation of these classes depends upon the development of these productive powers. The Middle Ages—the period of agriculture—gave us the baron and the serf; the towns of the later Middle Ages, the guild-master, the journeyman, and the day-labourer; the 17th century evolves the manufacturer and the mechanic; the 19th century, the great manufacturer and the proletarian. Up to that time the productive powers were not so widely developed that Private Property in them were a fetter or restraint upon them. But now, when, owing to the development of the great industry, the powers of production are constantly increasing by leaps and bounds; when, moreover, these powers are in the hands of a constantly decreasing number of bourgeois owners, while the great mass of the people become ever more firmly fixed as proletarians, and their condition becomes ever more unbearable: when, finally, these colossal productive powers have grown so far beyond the control of the Bourgeois Private Property Owners, that they threaten to over-balance the whole social order, now surely, the abolition of Private Property has become not only possible, but absolutely necessary.

Question 16.—Will the abolition of Private Property be achieved by peaceful means?

Answer.—That it may be is much to be wished, and the Communists are certainly the last people likely to wish otherwise. But they know that revolutions are not planned arbitrarily and deliberately, having always been the inevitable results of circumstances, and to that extent independent of the will and guidance of individuals or even of whole classes. They see the growing oppression of the proletariat in all civilised countries, and they foresee that sooner or later the proletariat will be forced into active revolution. And in that day Communists will be prepared to defend the interests of the proletariat with deeds as well as with words.

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

*It is obvious of course that in this passage Private Property means Bourgeois Private Property, i.e., unlimited individual property in the means of production.—EDITOR.

Class War and Class Friendship

From *Notes to the People*, 1851.

THERE are some who wish to fraternize all the world, but forget that with some portions of society fraternization is impossible, because of the innate hostility of their social positions. It is a NECESSITY that some classes should be enemies. This is a melancholy truth, but it is a truth nevertheless. It is injurious to create a false impression for the sake of writing with ink made of rose water. Those who try to dissipate this false impression are accused of being obstructives—of preaching the doctrine of mutual hate and distrust—they are placed in an invidious light—are asked if they consider "all men villains," and have no generous confidence and Christian love within their breasts? We reply—we do not consider all men villains—but, at the same time, we won't believe all men to be angels, and though admitting that there are good and bad in all classes, we do assert, and that distinctly, that there are certain classes whose interests are bitterly opposed to those of other classes, and who are, therefore, enemies by the very constitution of that society which makes them what they are.

To suppose that these can possibly, honestly and sincerely fraternize, is to suppose that the one should give the lie to all its antecedents—that the capitalist class, for instance, should say—all that we have done is wrong and criminal—our power was got by oppression, our riches were obtained by robbery—we are determined to make ourselves comparatively powerless and poor.

Let us illustrate our meaning.

We assert, that the interest of the capitalist of land, money, or machinery, is decidedly hostile to that of the working man and the small shopkeeper—that, therefore, the capitalists must be their bitter enemies—must seek to compass their ruin and prevent their emancipation and prosperity—and that, from the same reason, any measure of political or social reform emanating from the ranks of the capitalists must be either, in reality, hostile to the working man and small shopkeeper, or else a mere nullity, that will make matters neither better nor worse, or else, at the most, a concession extorted by the public pressure from their temporary fear or weakness, producing a measure that will be curtailed within the narrowest limits or undermined and done away with at the first seeming opportunity.

Why these interests are hostile will appear from the following incontrovertible propositions:

The interests of the working man consists in having high wages.

The interests of the capitalists consists in paying low wages.

The interest of the working man consists in working for himself.

The interest of the capitalist consists in making him work for another.

The interest of the working man consists in making hired labour scarce.

The interest of the capitalist consists in keeping hired labour plentiful.

The interest of the shopkeeper consists in the prosperity of the working classes, since high wages, or prosperous independent labour, can alone create and maintain home-trade.

The interest of the capitalist consists in unavoidably destroying home-trade as the necessary consequence of low wages, and of wages-slavery, which alone enables him to compete with the foreign manufacturer in foreign trade.

The interest of the shopkeeper consists in the diffusion and distribution of wealth, through countless channels.

The interest of the capitalist consists in the contraction and centralization of wealth—around a few fixed centres—since the necessary consequence of our competitive system is to centralize and contract wealth—ever to drive the weaker to the wall, and as countless small fortunes are extinguished day by day, to merge them by dozens and by scores in the blaze of the few great capitalists who stand their ground, and scorch up all the rest.

The interest of the working man is to obtain the land, in order to make labour scarce, and thus emancipate himself from the tyranny of capital.

The interest of the capitalist is to prevent his getting it, in order to keep him poor and enslaved.

The interest of the working man is to obtain capital wherewith to co-operate, and thus take the monopoly of production and distribution out of the hands of the few.

The interest of the capitalist is to crush co-operation, as its success would be fatal to monopoly.

The interest of the working man is to become the owner of machinery, because machinery in the hands of the monopolist throws him out of work.

The interest of the capitalist is to monopolize machinery, since, by it, he keeps up the labour surplus, by which he drives wages down, and dictates to poverty, non-employment and starvation.

The interest of the working man is to get political power, in order to unlock the monopoly of the land, to get capital for co-operation, and laws to protect it.

The interest of the capitalist is to prevent his getting political power, as that power, if rightly used, would be the death-blow of monopoly.

In fine, the interest of the working man is to make the capitalist poorer and weaker.

The interest of the capitalist is to grow stronger and richer.

Now, how is it possible that these two classes can fraternize ?

The one can rise, only by the fall of the other.

Now, how is it possible for these two classes to work together on the field of political reform and social right ?

It is, therefore, I say, that a union between capitalists on the one hand, and working men and shopkeepers on the other, is perfectly impossible ; and that the politician who recommends, expects, or strives for it, is no statesman—cannot understand the common rudiments of social economy—and is only, however unconsciously, playing into the hand of enemies, smoothing the path for a new delusion ; and by lulling and softening down the public mind, facilitating to our enemies the means of tricking us, and casting us at their feet once more.

ERNEST JONES.

POSTSCRIPT.—*Must the rich be impoverished ?* In the preceding remarks it has been observed, that the interest of the working men and small shopkeepers is to make the capitalist poorer and weaker.

Some may object to this, and say, can we not, by developing additional resources, make the poor richer without impoverishing the great capitalists ? I say—impossible ! For, in the first place, if you enriched the poor, without making the rich *richer*, you must necessarily make them *poorer*—for riches are relative—the commercial value of money, and of all wealth, is dependent on its plenty or its scarceness—and the wealth of the rich, being less scarce, would become less valuable to its possessor—*the rich men would grow poorer*.

But, not looking at the question from this abstract point of view, how are the poor to become enriched without the rich being impoverished ?

What is to enrich the poor? High wages? Then high wages must impoverish the rich, since foreign competition will prevent prices rising in proportion.

What is to enrich the poor? Obtaining the land. Will that not impoverish the landlord?

What is to enrich the poor? Developing co-operation. Will that not take trade and commerce out of the hands of the capitalists?

Shew me any possible means by which the poor can be enriched, without the rich being impoverished. E.J.

C.L.C. Reports

BARRY CLASS

The Barry C.L.C. Provincial Class commenced this winter's Sunday morning classes on September 27th last, Mr. A. J. Cook of Porth, ex-student of the C.L.C., again obliging by giving his services. It has been decided to study Industrial History until Christmas, then, after a short vacation, Economics. All the old members are available and are bent on progress, and a good number of new names were registered last Sunday. Mr. Cook's first lecture was especially good, and much appreciated by the class.

T. EDDOLLS,
Secretary.

NORTH EAST LANCASHIRE AREA

Regarding arrangements for the coming Winter Session, I regret to report that we have lost three of our previous classes i.e., Nelson, Colne, and Burnley, the cause in the main being due to the present crisis. But we shall be able to continue owing to the formation of new classes.

At present the arrangements are as follows:—Classes certain at Padiham and Accrington in Logic and Advanced Industrial History. Blackburn taking Economics. New classes at Darwen and Clitheroe taking Industrial History. And in all probability classes at Blackpool and Birkenhead in Economics.

We shall have another successful winter's work.

W. H. BARTON,
General Secretary,
N.E.L.C.L.C. Classes.

One More Step

EMERSON once wrote that "Self-trust is the first secret of success," and when we take a retrospective view of the history of the Central Labour College we realize the truth of his assertion.

Some few years ago a number of young men came to the conclusion that the Labour Movement, to be successful in its everyday struggle with the capitalist class, must of necessity aim at complete independence, not alone on the industrial and political fields, but also as regards education. They placed their trust in their fellow-workers, and to a certain extent their fellow-workers have responded. Each year a steady growth becomes manifest, especially in the provinces, where there has been a greater demand for this particular kind of Education than the College has been able to supply. The development of a more adequate organization demands careful consideration, and it is to this that I wish to draw the attention of my fellow students.

The first step of the College was the formation of provincial classes in different parts of the country, with the object of providing those who had not the opportunity of becoming Resident Students with facilities to study in their leisure hours. As these classes have increased in number, "districts" have in certain instances been formed. This is the case in Lancashire, where at present there are three districts, composed of fifteen branches, with an approximate total of 500 students. The utility of "districts," from various standpoints, has been clearly manifested to those concerned. It has allowed those branches with a smaller number of students to continue by the support of larger branches, thereby encouraging the growth of that desirable virtue, *Solidarity*. We must see to it that this expression of feeling must be extended, as it is only by increasing our knowledge and by an extension of our forces that we shall be able to achieve the best results.

The next step in that extension ought to be the formation of a Division; the work that could be accomplished in this way is enormous and is yet well within our capabilities.

Inquiries continue to come in from different parts of the country in reference to the character of education supplied by the College, and also as to the formation of branches and the methods adopted. No doubt in many instances inquirers wishing to obtain an independent working-class education are lost owing to their isolation, and the fact that there is no one near to give them any encourage-

ment. Another difficulty that arises is the supply of efficient lecturers; this is a difficulty that has yet to be overcome and the sooner it is overcome the better it will be for the work of the College.

I suggest that the difficulty of forming branches and making them permanent, and the providing of lecturers for the same, can be overcome by forming County Divisions and Sub-Divisions. The sub-division may be utilized in a county like Yorkshire, which is so large that it would be impossible to affix a centre convenient to those in all parts of the county. With regard to Lancashire, I suggest that a place like Blackpool would make a good centre, since it can be reached at cheap travelling rates from any part of the county. Moreover, seeing that a branch is actually being opened there, *we should be able to secure a convenient hall or rooms for an Annual Conference at Easter. At this conference, which should be composed of all Students, a Divisional Council could be formed, consisting of one delegate from each branch. This Divisional Council would elect its own Secretary, who would carry out all correspondence in relation to the same. A Central Fund would be arranged, which would come from the districts, and be set aside for the purpose of meeting expenses, correspondence, &c. The remainder could be devoted to the institution of scholarships to be competed for by the students of the particular division.*

This would to some extent meet the demand for lecturers, for I am convinced that some of the students attending the provincial classes would make efficient lecturers if they could only find the means to take up residence for a short period at the College in London.

Another advantage to be gained is that we could decide in which direction we could extend and stimulate our forces to secure those scholarships at present in the hands of our enemies—Ruskin College. These scholarships must come into our hands. We might also be able to get some of the staff from London to attend the Annual Conference of these divisions as they are formed and secure some advice from them.

In conclusion I will ask all secretaries to bring this matter before the students of the different branches at the earliest opportunity, inviting them to express an opinion on the same and report that opinion through the *Plebs Magazine*.

FRANK JACKSON (Rochdale Branch).

Sharing Up!

TURBINES may be responsible for more revolutions than ever took place in Mexico, yet exorbitant naval demands will not make Mr. Churchill into a revolutionary, although the movement be in the trend of capitalist fulfilment and overthrow. Armament Protectionists are superseding Fiscal Protectionists. One can imagine the formation of a Fourth Party under the former heading. The Conservative Party, if one may judge the utterances of a prospective candidate, is booming Co-partnery. It is a serious effort to ensure industrial peace by share-holders instead of musket-shoulderers.

Co-partnery in Industry, by C. R. Fay, Cambridge Manuals of Science and Literature, 1s., is to hand. It is a fair summary of classical co-partnery operations and experiments. Some extremely interesting schemes of various periods, including those of Godin, Leclaire, and Levers are overhauled, analysed and explained. The book is capable of conveying a doubtful moral if one may judge from extracts.

Even at the end of our enquiry we are unable to state categorically the things which constitute co-partnership. For it is not so much a body of things as a body with a spirit in it.

It is the line which English development is taking. When they are studying successes they are studying personalities—studying, in fine, the stuff of which industrial chivalry is made.

We are rid of the stigma of "trade," we have transcended the dignity of "labour" and now speak of "chivalry." It feels like a breath of mediaevalism from the cloistered college, or the council conscious audacity of an elected Socialist and Labour Councillor.

Let us rid ourselves of the fetish. What of they who fall by the wayside of the industrial highway upon which the successful co-partnery combines march? Economically, the Co-partners are benefited. What of the growing unemployment; what of the intensification of industry; what of the concentration of the wealth producing machinery; what of the congress of commodities; what of the growing unsatisfied clamour for food, shelter and clothing?

These complicated matters do not appear in the conclusions for "categorical reasons," one presumes.

What is the social standard of Industrial Chivalry? Is it seen in Insurance Acts, Old Age Pensions, Child-feeding Schemes, Strikes, Lock-outs, Governmental Coercion or Deportations, Deputations and Commissions? The monuments of the many

Richard Oastlers stand in public squares, what think ye of the canonization of co-partners ?

For freedom is the breath of life to co-partnery ; if compelled by law co-partnership would lose all its stimulus.

The meaning of Freedom is a strange quantity under modern Society. Co-partnership, as concrete freedom, is interesting. Co-partnership is an industrial dilemma which cannot be rebutted by rebates on goods, it represents the economic line of least resistance. If Co-partnery were compelled by Common Law for Commonwealth it would be quite obvious that industrial individualism would receive no stimulus. Modern Co-partnery is legally free, but commercially and competitively compulsory, "it is in the line of English development."

If co-partnery be rejected because it does not assure prosperity in addition to sharing it when it comes, then Democracy had better drop its claim to freedom and write itself "slave," to be ridden by the expert.

If Capitalist Economy, through its economists, can share the surplus accruing from its method of Social production under private control, it offers no logical reason why the workers should not wish to abolish and entirely reject its methods, and desire a Collectivist State.

The rejection of Modern Co-partnership which helps the few, the palliative and consequence of economic evolution, nowise vitiates the claims for the desired economic freedom of all. Co-partnership for the whole Commonwealth of economically independent and self-governing units is the only logical freedom. Co-partnery as expounded to-day is a social futility, if one expects it to solve the industrial problem. The yeoman-like air, "the country's pride" atmosphere, which hovers round the workman with an interest in the firm, is a question of emotion ; the relations of co-partnery and Social Evolution are largely economic. There is a satisfaction in knowing that "It is the line in which English development is taking !"

MEPHTE.

Books for the Workers

By **KARL MARX.**

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

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

2/9 each

The Positive Outcome of Philosophy by **J. DIETZGEN**

Philosophical Essays by **J. DIETZGEN**

Essays on History by **PROF. ANTONIO LABRIOLA**

The Physical Basis of Mind and Morals by **M. H. FITCH**

The Theoretical System of Marx by **L. B. BOUDIN**

Landmarks of Scientific Socialism by **ENGELS.**

1/7 each

Evolution, Social and Organic by **ARTHUR M. LEWIS**

Ten Blind Leaders of the Blind "

Vital Problems in Social Evolution "

The Origin of the Family, &c. by **FREDRICH ENGELS**

The Roots of the Socialist Philosophy "

Memoirs of Karl Marx by **LIEBKNECHT**

Ethics and History by **KAUTSKY**

The Class Struggle "

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**

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.
G. W. BROWN, 112 Bishop's Road, Bishopston, Bristol
FRED BURGESS, 47 Clonbrock Road, Stoke Newington, London, N.
EBBY EDWARDS, 3 Duke Street, Ashington, Northumberland
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
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