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

THE

"Plebs" Magazine

Vol. V, No. 7. August, 1913 Price 2d.

Contents

Oxford:
Printed by Fox, Jones and Co., Kemp Hall, High Street,
and
Published by the "Plebs" League at same Address

The "Plebs" League

Object

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

Methods

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

Membership

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

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

Management

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

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

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

☞ **The Fifth Annual Meet will be held in London (Bank Holiday), August, 1913**

G. SIMS, Secretary-Treasurer

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

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

PRIZE DRAW

Mr. E. Edward, Strathmore, Park Village, Wolverhampton, is arranging for a Draw in aid of the Funds of the Central Labour College. All desirous of assisting in the sale of tickets should make application to him at the above address.

THE

"Plebs" Magazine

Vol. V. August, 1913. No. 7.

EDITORIAL

THE development of the movement for Woman's Suffrage, and particularly its recent tactics and their outcome, have made it no longer possible either for the governing or for the governed classes to dismiss the matter with a contemptuous shrug of the shoulders, as a mere piece of the innate folly of woman having no bearing on the practical course of society. The Women themselves have successfully administered a corrective to that form of conceit. The cat will purr contentedly so long as its anatomy comes in contact with no obstacle to its comfort. Tread on its tail and its former complacency gives way to an angered howl. Our propertied tabby cat has arrived at the howling and scratching stage. If our anti-feminist literary hod-carriers still pursue their wonderful art of phrase-mongering, they have now to ramsack that which they suppose to be the receptacle of all wisdom, but which in reality has all the worn-out characteristics of a second-hand furniture store, in order to find those phrases which are distinguished by their filthy and ferocious content. "Fancy a pregnant woman in Parliament" represents what is perhaps the lowest depths in this literary ooze. Certainly, *intellectual*

Women v. Wastrels

pregnancy could not with justice be charged against them. Our legal and political prostitutes are also immune from this danger. And these are they who rule out women on the ground that men alone have the Jovian spark of intelligence, and women merely intuition, and that without this intelligence women would become a helpless prey to immorality. The gods, thought Epicurus, were so absorbed in laughter and in the general enjoyment of the divine comedy that they had ceased to take any part in the direction of human affairs. He must have meant that their laughter was derived from the human comedy. If only the actors could laugh at their own comedy, it might be that the act would less often end in tragedy. But a sense of humour requires intelligence, and the absence of this latter quality is exemplified in those who laugh in the tragedy and wear the owl-like mien in the comedy.

The spread of militant tactics among the women of the Suffrage movement has not only caused a recrudescence of atavism in the phrase-mongering yellow press. So cracked is the voice of bourgeois reason and so shortsighted its mental vision, that when it cannot browbeat with its bullies, it tries to break with its bludgeons. When it cannot defend itself with a platitude, it whistles for a policeman. When it fails to make the pen mightier than the sword, it fetches out the stomach pump. There is a delicate irony about this last device—the forcible feeding of women in a society conditioned on the forcible starving of men. Oh! Epicurus! peace be to thy shade!

❀ ❀ ❀

Forcible Feeding and Forcible Starving!

ARE those women who are forcibly fed in any way related with those men who are forcibly starved? Do they suffer from different causes or from the same cause? Do their interests lie in different directions or in the same direction? These are questions which we, as representing the class that is ever faced by this prospect of forcible starvation, are called upon to answer. Of course the same class who justify the forcible feeding of women deny that men are forcibly starved and impoverished. Those that are at the bottom of the scale, they claim, are there because of laziness or dissolute habits. "All men are free," which means that they are free to look for a master, and they that seek him early find him only on the condition that he may take toll on their labour. Only on this condition may the worker keep body and soul together. It is this economic dependence upon masters that is at the root of the forcible impoverishment of men. And as the political and juridical organs of society exist to maintain that economic dependence, these are requisitioned when occasion requires to keep down any attempt that endangers the continuance of this economic relation, a relation which is grounded upon the private ownership of the means of life.

The forcible feeding of those militant women who have been thrown into the Bastille's of capitalist society, is justified by the genii of capitalism, on the grounds of destruction of private property. By a logic which is peculiar to those guardians of "law and order," this destruction of private property is converted into a crime against the "public." But the workmen of this country are quite familiar with that dearly beloved bogey even if they have not completely discovered its bogey character. When a body of workmen go out on strike, the public are invoked to put a stop to this crime, when as a matter of fact the strike is an attack against the private interests of some particular set of industrial capitalists. The latter anxious to frustrate this attack, together with the other capitalists who are liable to experience the same inconvenience, clothe the interests of capital with the "public" mantle with the object of preventing a union of the opposing forces, or causing a breach in the opposing forces, and thus securing the defeat of the attacking party. Similarly the attack of those militant women upon private property cannot be directed against the working class in general for the very good reason that the latter are propertiless, that they have "nothing to lose but their chains." But that is sufficient reason why those who are property-owners should come forward and in the name of the public denounce the offended so as to prevent any sympathetic relations or amalgam between the forcibly starved and the forcibly fed. *Respect for property* is an ideal that the private interests of capitalism seek to cherish and to protect in the heads of those who have got no property. So much for that parallel. Before, however, we can adequately appraise the tactics of the militant women we must consider broadly the origin of the movement itself as well as the direction of its development.

⁂ ⁂ ⁂

The Alpha and Omega

We need waste no words over the fact that the enfranchisement which is sought for women, is sought not as an end in itself but as a means to an end. That end consists in the emancipation of women from the domination of man. That this end is as yet conceived only in a vague way is at once admitted. It will, we think, be correct to say, that the women's movement has in view to-day the immediate lightening of the pressure rather than its immediate abolition. No doubt there are many women who think that what is merely a modification of the pressure, a number of reforms in the relations of women to men, is equivalent to removing the pressure altogether. These are illusions that are common to the earlier stages of most great movements. In the same way the earlier organizations of the modern proletariat, aimed and still aim not at abolishing the pressure of capitalism but of lightening it by certain reforms, industrial and political. Still we can to-day scientifically estimate that the conflict of the working class with the

owners of capital for this lightening of the pressure, must of necessity lead to its complete removal. In the same way we can discern the tendency and outcome of the women's movement which in its development and conflict with the existing framework will experience more and more the relative value of all reforms, will with this experience shed its former illusions and clarify its outlook, until it finally lines up with the one army of working men and women for the sweeping away of all the remaining obstacles to economic equality and social freedom. The women's movement arises out of *the economic dependence of woman upon man*, just as the modern working-class movement arises out of *the economic dependence of the workman upon the capitalist. And both dependences arise from the common cause of private property in the means of life.* The Labour Contract and the Marriage Contract are two expressions of this fact. Both are veiled in illusions. Both are idealized as free contracts. In both cases it is *a forced sale.* The worker is compelled to sell himself piecemeal in order to live, and the conditions of the sale are in favour of the capitalist buyer by virtue of his ownership of the means of production. The woman (if she has no means of maintaining herself) marries in order to obtain a livelihood. She seeks a husband in order to get a living. This economic relation, which is veiled over but not removed for all that, is indeed inferior to the economic relation of wage-labour to capital. It is a relation pertaining more to the nature of chattel-slavery. It is not an hourly or daily transaction, it is a life-long transaction. The condition of this transaction is favourable to the buyer by virtue of his ability to secure a certain quantity of the means of subsistence. And following from this condition, the legal relations of the transaction operate also against the woman. That, as said above, the relation of the woman to the man in marriage is inferior to the relation of the wage-labourer to the capitalist, is evidenced, irrational as it may seem, in the relatively greater freedom of the prostitute over the married woman. This is a contrast as old as civilization itself. The freest women in old Greece and the most respected, were none other than the hetairae.

* * *

The Fall

UNDOUBTEDLY there exists an antagonism between the sexes. What, however, the majority of women and men have not yet clearly recognized is that this sex antagonism has not arisen merely because men are sexually different from women, but because of an economic difference. Women's subjection and all that this has involved, has rested upon the economic superiority of man. Economic superiority carries with it supremacy over the inferior—the woman, in this case. To say that this inferiority of woman is based on natural causes, e.g., on the function of child-rearing, is simply to repeat a prejudice that has been going the rounds dressed up in the garb of science ever since the revolt

of women began. It comes from the same pseudo-scientific quarter that furnished the Malthusian explanation of the nature-ordained poverty of the working-man. It seems to have been an illusion common to every ruling class that their position in society was a bequest made by Nature to them, that their rights were natural rights, and their slaves, "slaves by nature." God and Nature have certainly proved serviceable in the history of mankind as the man-appointed father and mother of human prejudice, and as the scape-goats for human bestiality.

This declaration, that woman's place is in the home and that Nature has bolted the front door in order that she may faithfully accommodate the requirements of her special providence, proves something opposite to what was intended. It leads straight to the conclusion that the natural functions of women are not the cause of her economic dependence and social inequality, but that *this dependence has given to a natural function the form of an economic function.*

This economic dependence of female upon male, and which makes of marriage a sexuo-economic relation, arises at a stage in economic development when the industry of man was overshadowing in importance the industry of woman. So long as production was primitive, e.g., hunting and fishing, the activity of man and woman was substantially equal in social importance. The woman performed the work of the house, a work which under the communal form of living was a public work. But in the degree that new resources of wealth were discovered outside of the household, e.g., cattle raising and agriculture, the sphere of man's industrial activity extended, and in relation thereto, the domestic labour of women contracted and appeared in the eyes of men more and more insignificant. Those new fields of production falling to the ownership and control of man, made woman more dependent upon man, and led to her disenfranchisement as a political being. The tasks imposed upon her in the private house became heavier in proportion as the need for labour-power increased, and the means for maintaining a larger family developed. It became an economic necessity to "multiply and replenish the earth." And the power of woman to resist the dictatorship of man disappeared with the disappearance of the communal household. There the collective power of the women predominated, but with the separation of the women into the isolated private houses, this communal solidarity of women was at an end. When civilization dawned woman was already a slave. "The wife was only an apparatus for the production of children, a faithful dog that watched the house." A woman could only escape from this degradation by becoming a prostitute!

W. W. C.

(*To be continued next month*)

Mars and its Lesson

[An article from the pen of Professor Ward in which are set forth conclusions of enormous significance to the human race. Hitherto man has lived under the shadow of impermanence. So fixed has been his belief in the ephemeral character of the world he inhabits that he has time and again set the date of its destruction ; and though the years 1000 and 1843 and 1881 have all been safely passed, still he has a sense of living at the end rather than at the beginning of the ages. The religions are full of this conviction, and both science and history teem with the depression and perversion engendered by this pessimistic instinct. But now a cheerful optimist comes forward and tells the race that it has hardly chipped the shell, that the men of to-day are living in the feeble dawn, not so much of civilization as of existence itself. With twenty-four million years still to the good, what may not the race accomplish that has achieved so much in the six thousand years of recorded time, which prove to be but seven seconds of the cosmic day ! The thought means a transformation of all sociology, philosophy, poetry, religion. It means that man is "the heir of all the ages, in the foremost files of time," in a vast and wonderful sense whereof he never has dreamed. It means that his line stretches far beyond the fabled crack of doom to which Banquo's reached, into a period which, as Professor Ward justly says, represents to our finite conception nothing less than eternity. In summer, when

> the first watch of the night is given
> To the red planet Mars,

these are the glad tidings which Professor Ward's epoch-making thought would have us rejoice in as we contemplate the ruddy orb aglow in the southern heavens.—*Brown Alumni Monthly.*]

THE precise knowledge now in possession of the world relative to the true nature of Mars has for its chief value to open up an illimitable field of inquiry into the most important of all problems, the role of life and mind in the universe. The facts are for the most part now established. The question turns entirely upon their interpretation. True, they have already been interpreted in their main features, aud no logical mind can doubt the substantial accuracy of this interpretation. We must start from it as we start from the facts themselves. But every avenue thus opened branches and dichotomizes, forming a system of canals of thought as intricate and yet as rational as the system of Martian canals.

It is not proposed to reiterate here the conclusions already reached and given to the world. It is proposed to follow the reasoning farther and to search for wider and deeper interpretations which shall ultimately teach us the lesson of Mars.

The first step in this quest must be the study of *areology*, using this term in exactly the same sense in relation to Mars as *geology* is used in relation to the earth—the geology of Mars. This aspect has not of course been overlooked by writers on Mars, but from conservatism and other motives its treatment has been inadequate. Attention has been called to the fact that, being a smaller planet than the earth,

Mars would cool and hence age more rapidly. It has also been shown that on the earth the land has long been encroaching upon the sea, and that the absence of seas on Mars may be due to a continuation of this process. The gradual absorption of both the water and the atmosphere is also frequently referred to, and must be accepted as a fact. Nor has that other fact been wholly neglected, that, from its position in the solar system exterior to the earth, Mars must have taken planetary form much earlier than the earth, and is therefore, absolutely as well as relatively, a much older planet. Still, it must be admitted that much of the reasoning seems to be based on the assumption of a simultaneous start for the two planets in the race. This is so far from being true that it demands special emphasis.

The entire history of a planet may be divided into three periods. The first period extends from the time when it is thrown off from the parent body to that at which its crust has formed and the temperature of its enveloping waters has fallen to, or somewhat below the boiling point. The second extends from this latter date to that at which either its waters or its atmosphere or both have been absorbed and the planet has been wholly converted into solid matter. The third embraces the remainder of its existence.

We can form some conception of the length of the first period from the condition of our solar system. All the outer planets except the Asteroids and Mars are still in that period. Of the second period we know much more because it is the one to which our earth has attained. Mars is also still within it. It is probable that both Venus and Mercury are already close upon this phase. As to the third period, we are in complete ignorance of its duration. To all appearances it is eternal, though the human mind refuses to accept this view.

Of these three periods in the history of a planet we are at least safe in saying that the second or intermediate one is much shorter than either the first or the last. It forms relatively but a brief span in the vast cycle of ages. Nevertheless this is the stage in which all our interest centres, and for us it constitutes the life of the planet. And here we use the word *life* in its literal sense, for this is the period which embraces all life. In the case of the earth it also embraces the greater part of all that is treated as geology, and in the case of Mars it does the same for areology as I am using the term. Clearly to grasp this last science it is necessary to attend first to our own planet and glance briefly at those aspects of geology which throw light upon areology.

The most important fact connected with our earth at the beginning of this period was the origin of life. Whatever theory we may adopt as to the particular way in which life began, it is at least certain that in some way it did begin about as soon as the conditions of the earth's surface became such as to permit its existence. And we may well accept Professor Lowell's view, shared by many others, that for

the *origination* of life much higher temperatures were required than those which commonly prevail at the present time, although, after having once originated, owing to the slow rate at which the planet cooled, it easily adapted itself to much lower temperatures.

At this inchoate period there was no land, and all life was aquatic. There is probably still as much aquatic as terrestrial life, and the process of adaptation to terrestrial existence as the land areas rose and expanded was also a natural one. The greater diversity afforded and required by land life was favorable to development, and we accordingly find the highest types of life inhabiting the land and breathing air.

At present we are chiefly concerned with the length of the life period. Three classes of scientific men have discussed this question, viz., astronomers, physicists, and geologists. They have of course differed widely, but there has been a tendency toward substantial agreement. While most estimates make it at least 100,000,000 years, there are more conservative ones, even by geologists. Professor Haeckel, adopting the figure last mentioned, has proposed to call this life history of the earth its cosmic day, consisting of twenty-four hours, and he proceeds to reduce the several geological formations to this scale and to express them in hours, minutes, and seconds. The results are very striking. In other papers I have adopted his method, but it seemed best to use a somewhat lower estimate of the time, and 72,000,000 years seemed to be a fair mean to employ. The following table shows the results:

Geologic Period.	Years.	Hrs.	Min.	Sec.
Archean	18,000,000	6	—	—
Algonkian	18,000,000	6	—	—
Cambrian	6,000,000	2	—	—
Silurian	6,000,000	2	—	—
Devonian	6,000,000	2	—	—
Carboniferous	5,000,000	2	—	—
Permian	1,000,000			
Triassic ... Keuper ... ... / Muschelkalk ... / Bunter-Sandstein	3,000,000	1	—	—
Jurassic ... Wealden ... / Oolite ... ... / Lias	3,000,000	1	—	—
Cretaceous Upper ... ... / Middle ... ... / Lower	3,000,000	1	—	—
Tertiary ... Pliocene... ... / Miocene... ... / Eocene	2,675,000	—	53	30
Quaternary	300,000	—	6	—
Historic period	25,000	—	—	30
Total age of the earth ...	72,000,000	24	—	—
Age of written language ...	6,000	—	—	$7\frac{1}{5}$

DIAL OF THE COSMIC DAY OR LIFE HISTORY OF MARS.

DIAL OF THE COSMIC DAY OR LIFE HISTORY OF THE EARTH.

The extraordinary fact comes out that the human race, which probably had its origin in the Quaternary period, or possibly in late Tertiary time, has only existed between six and seven minutes of this cosmic day, while the extreme maximum estimate of the historic period does not exceed 30 seconds, and that of its recorded annals is a little more than seven seconds.

Striking as this result is, as thus presented, I thought it might be rendered still more so by exhibiting it in the form of a dial, and I accordingly prepared one which has been several times published. But it will bear reproduction, and I introduce it again here for comparison with parallel results which flow from a similar study of Mars, upon which we are now prepared to enter.

The term "Psychozoic age" was proposed by Prof. Joseph LeConte, to denote the age of man, and was made by him to begin with the Quaternary or Pleistocene period, which contains the oldest authentic remains of man. It is therefore the age in which we live, and may be supposed to continue as long as man shall inhabit the earth. But the term was wisely chosen, and is much better, for example, than *Anthropozoic*, used by some authors, because it applies to any psychic or intelligent being, though it be not man. It can thus be applied to Mars regardless of the nature of the intelligent being that we now know to inhabit that planet.

We perceive from the above table and dial that the Psychozoic age has only just begun upon the earth. The psychic or intelligent being man has but just arrived on this planet. How is this in the case of Mars? In the history of the solar system Mars left the central mass ages earlier than did the earth. How long was the interval between these two events? Mars is about fifty million miles farther from the sun than is the earth. At the time that it swung off the central mass had a diameter of 283,000,000 miles. By the time the earth was ready to be detached it had shrunk to 186,000,000 miles. To know how long this period was would require a knowledge of the rate at which a nebula contracts. This knowledge is not possessed by man. It probably diminishes rapidly with the diminution of the mass, but any one can see that the intervals between the births of the planets must have been immense. In venturing therefore to estimate the difference of age of Mars and the earth the chief danger lies in making it too small. In the scheme which follows I have placed it at 24,000,000 years, or a period equal to the entire Paleozoic age of the earth. This is probably much too small, but even thus the results, as we shall see, are astounding. This period must be added to the age of the earth to obtain the age of Mars. This assumes that the time required to reach the life stage was the same for both planets. But if, on account of its smaller size, Mars reached that stage much earlier, this would only increase the difference in their ages.

I have also assumed that the geologic time and length of the formations were the same on the two planets down to the time when Mars was in the same state that the earth is now in. This might be supposed to be less on account of the smaller size of Mars. But although the rate of contraction and the conditions of temperature would be thus affected, I am unable to see that size could have any influence upon the development of life, the formation of limestones, the erosion of the surface, or the deposition of sedimentary beds. We may suppose, then that the history of the two planets was practically the same for the first 72,000,000 years, or to the end of their Tertiary period. To this then we must add for Mars the time that has elapsed since it reached this stage, viz., the 24,000,000 years which represents the difference in the ages of the two planets. We thus have for the age of Mars 96,000,000 years. Calling this the cosmic day of Mars and dividing it into 24 hours, each hour will represent four million years instead of three million, as in the case of the earth.

Now we must apply the geological principle of uniformitarianism to all our calculations, and assume that Mars passed through substantially the same stages as the earth had done; that it, too, millions of years earlier, had its origin of life in the then uniform aqueous envelop that surrounded it; that later, as its crust formed and crumpled to fit the retreating interior, land and land life appeared, mountains rose and were worn down, building broad continents consisting of sedimentary deposits of great thickness; that these were each filled with the remains of the life characteristic of each great geologic epoch; and that thus, in the same manner as the earth, the Archeozoic, Paleozoic, Mesozoic, and Cenozoic periods succeeded each other, having substantially the same length as those of our younger planet.

This exact parallelism continued to the end of the Tertiary period and a short distance in the one that succeeded this. We have now the best reasons for supposing that at the beginning of this Quaternary period, as upon the earth, some one of the manifold forms of life on Mars developed a thinking faculty far in excess of all others, which gave it dominion over the rest and ultimately over its physical conditions as well. Thus was ushered in the Psychozoic age on Mars, upon which the earth is, as we may say, but just entering. From this point on, and during the vast eons that separate that remote period from the present, the parallelism ceases, and we have nothing on our planet with which to compare that portion of Martian history. We stand appalled before those 24,000,000 years, and what the course of this strange history can have been.

It is to the unveiling of this "mystery" that the recent revelations of the areographers have been pointing. Keeping constantly in mind the present state of our earth, and remembering that it represents the state of Mars at the corresponding period in its career, we perceive

that during that time all the irregularities of the surface of Mars have been removed and it has become a smooth orb. We also learn that the greater part of its water has disappeared. But two prominent features still remain. Mars still shows evidence of vegetable life and psychic life. Considerable portions of its surface are occupied by dark areas which can only be interpreted as due to vegetation, and the whole planet is covered with a network of dark lines having dark spots at their intersections, which can only be interpreted as irrigated strips and large oases in the midst of a desert of ochre-coloured sand·

The small amount of water on the planet is mostly precipitated in the form of snow or hoar frost about the poles during the respective winters of each hemisphere, from which the greater part of it melts away with the succeeding spring and summer. As the snow melts it forms an annular sheet of water at the base of the polar cap, and this water is conveyed by means of canals traversing the irrigated strips to all parts of the planet. All this is accomplished by the psychic life of Mars, and proves beyond a peradventure that on its surface there dwells a race of beings of great industry and high intelligence. This is to all appearances the same race that was developed at the beginning of the Psychozoic age and which corresponds to the human race upon the earth. It constitutes the characteristic life of that age which now assumes great geologic importance and constitutes the leading feature of Arean geology, or areology. All this is clearly brought out by the following table and by the Martian dial which follows, and which may now be directly compared with those of the earth.

Geological Periods	Years	Hours	Minutes
Archean	18,000,000	... 4	... 30
Algonkian ...	18,000,000	... 4	... 30
Cambrian ...	6,000,000	... 1	... 30
Silurian	6,000,000	... 1	... 30
Devonian ...	6,000,000	... 1	... 30
Carboniferous ...	6,000,000	... 1	... 30
Triassic	3,000,000	... —	... 45
Jurassic	3,000,000	... --	... 45
Cretaceous ...	3,000,000	... —	... 45
Tertiary	3,000,000	... —	... 45
Psychozoic ...	24,000,000	... 6	... —
Total age of Mars	96,000,000	... 24	... —
Probable future remnant of Psychozoic time on Mars	1,000,000	... —	... 15

As the parallelism is supposed to be complete to and some distance into the Psychozoic period, it is that period only which challenges our attention. It is its bare simplicity that excites our awe.

Can it be possible that an intelligent being has inhabited that world during a period as great as that which separates us from the Silurian? This would seem to be contrary to the whole course of the earth's geologic history. All the more prominent families of animals and plants that have lived on the earth since the beginning of Paleozoic time have been restricted to the ages in which they were developed. The Cambrian trilobites, the Silurian molluscs, the Devonian fishes, the Carboniferous insects, the Jurassic reptiles, the Cretaceous birds, and the Tertiary mammals, have for the most part belonged to families that disappeared at or near the close of their respective geologic epochs. The same is true of the great vegetable races. Only a few unspecialized forms of either animals or plants, such as Lingula and Equisetum, have persisted through two or several geologic periods. . How could a highly specialized being, such as the psychic occupant of Mars must be, have persisted unchanged through so immense a lapse of time?

We can only answer that we do not know, that perhaps that race itself has been transformed and re-transformed and no more resembles its Quaternary ancestor than the horse resembles the Eohippus. But certain it is, and the remark is now trite, that on this earth the psychic animal man has all but ceased to feel the transforming influence of his environment, and that, instead, it is he who has begun, and on a grand scale, to transform his environment. True, he has not probably as yet so altered the visible aspect of the planet he inhabits that the inhabitants of Mars could, even with such appliances as we now possess, see his work and recognize it as that of a rational being. This the Martians have done for us, and it marks a vastly higher social efficiency on their part than man has attained. But the question will obtrude: Given the origin of a rational being upon a planet, what reason exists why it should not continue to remain there as long as the conditions of existence permit? Those who insist that something else will terminate its existence are bound to point out what that something is.

What, then, is the lesson of Mars? It has a twofold form, but it is one lesson.

In the first place Mars teaches us in the most unmistakable manner that the earth must follow in its footsteps; that its mountains must be worn down and its seas filled up until it shall become a smooth ball; that its waters and its atmosphere must be absorbed and become incorporated in its solid crust, though in this respect it will remain long at the stage at which we find Mars to-day, its final death following that of Mars by the same time-distance as did its birth. In the above table I have assigned to Mars one more million years, which any one is at liberty to double or halve. On Mars we can, as it were, see with our own eyes a race of vast antiquity and supreme wisdom, clinging desperately to the orb that bore it, half gasping for breath, and hoarding every drop of its precious water, but doomed in the

relatively near future to face the lingering death of a dying world. This is indeed sad, and it is perhaps still sadder to reflect that such is the fate of all life including that of our own globe and our own race, and that the day must come which shall, to change two letters of a celebrated line of Corneille,

*Voir le dernier humain à son dernier soupir.**

But there is a reverse to this sombre medal. The human race is supposed to have existed between 200,000 and 300,000 years, let us say one quarter of one million years. It has been conscious of its existence only about 10,000 years, and really alive as a psychic being less than 5,000 years. The most that it has accomplished of any value to itself has been done within 2,000 years, and its great work within 200 years. In a word, relatively speaking, man has only just begun to exist. His golden age, as Saint-Simon said, is before him and not behind him. His history is but the threshold of the Psychozoic age. The whole of that immense period lies before him. The conditions of existence on this earth are now at their optimum. Abundance of air and water, heat and light, great variety of surface, soil, climate, mineral resources, and all the materials and forces of nature ready to yield to the magic wand of science. There are no indications that these conditions will change in an entire geologic epoch. These favourable conditions are certainly liable to last as long as the Tertiary period just closed has lasted, viz., 3,000,000 years. They may continue during the first half of the Psychozoic period of Mars, or 12,000,000 years. And what does a million years mean? Glance at the two dials and note the human period. Contrast it with any full geologic epoch and reflect upon its significance! For us the Psychozoic age, or any considerable part of it, means *eternity*. Thus viewed, man's prospects, instead of being dark, are fairly roseate, and the contrast with that old decadent orb that is now telling us its story, instead of depressing us, should inspire us with thankfulness that we are young, with faith in an unlimited future, and with buoyant aspirations for the progress of humanity.

1907 LESTER F. WARD

* To see the last human at his last sigh.

"It is wise to be sure, but otherwise to be too sure."

—SOPHIE IRENE LOEB.

"The bourgeoisie has every reason to fear the stupidity of the masses—so long as they remain conservative; and their intelligence —so soon as they become revolutionary."—MARX.

"The best information acquirable, the best mental training obtainable are requisite to steer through the existing chaos that the death-tainted social system of to-day creates all around us."

—D. DE LEON.

The Irish National Theatre

"THE aim of the Irish National Theatre," said a writer in the *New Statesman* recently, "has been to express the people of Ireland, and to create a drama which should rest upon realism and tower into poetry; and better than any other group of contemporary artists, its writers have succeeded in their common aim." It was no mean aim—to express a people in the terms of a single art. Its realization (so far, of course, as such an aim could ever be said to be realized) has been due in the main to the courage and enthusiasm of one man—W. B. Yeats.

Mr. Yeats's ideal was to "spread a tradition of life that makes neither for great wealth nor great poverty, that makes the arts a national expression of life, and that permits even common men to understand good art and high thinking." In 1892, he founded the National Literary Society; and under its auspices the Irish Literary Theatre was inaugurated in 1898. "We have to write or find plays," said Mr. Yeats, "that will make the theatre a place of intellectual excitement. . . . If we are to do this we must learn that beauty and truth are always justified of themselves, and that their creation is a greater service to our country than writing what compromises either in the seeming service of a cause." (If these words were not written after the production of certain of Synge's plays, they reveal a shrewd anticipation of hostile criticism.)

Associated with Mr. Yeats in the establishment of the Literary Theatre were Lady Gregory, Mr. Edward Martyn, and Mr. George Moore, the novelist. English actors were at first engaged, and the performances took place at intervals in a hall in Dublin. In 1902 a little company of Irish amateurs, led by Mr. W. G. Fay, gave performances. Two years later, Miss Horniman acquired the lease of the Abbey Theatre, rebuilt it, and presented it to the Society—henceforth called the Irish National Theatre Society. Thus came into being the "only theatre in any English-speaking country (as Mr. Yeats was able to boast) that is free to play what it thinks worth playing, and to whistle at the timid." More recently, Miss Horniman's annual subsidy has ceased, and the Abbey Theatre has now, like every other theatre, to pay its way or come to an end. Fortunately, its end does not appear to be in sight. Tours in America, and visits to London and the English provinces are now part of the Abbey Theatre company's annual programme; a second company having been formed to give performances in Dublin during the absence of the original players.

A word here is necessary concerning the acting of the Irish players. Mr. Yeats's aim included a simplification of acting—the substitution of quieter, more sincere methods than obtained in the ordinary theatre

How far the effectiveness of the methods of the Irish players depends on the quality of the plays they perform, or how far many of the plays themselves depend on the force and sincerity of the acting, is hard to say. But it is certain that the Irish players, as well as the Irish dramatists, have achieved notable things. "More than others," writes Mr. C. E. Montague, "they leave undone the things that ought not to be done. None of them rants or flares, trumpets or booms, or puts on intense looks for nothing . . . They know how to let well alone; they stand still when others would 'cross stage to right' to no purpose; when one of them has to be thrown up in high relief, the rest can fade into the background like mists at a dawn, or emit from their eyes an attention that fixes your eyes on the central figure more surely than the fiercest limelight that ever beat on an actor-manager. So each part is played, in a sense, by them all. . . . In a world of things overdone, like the stage, mere quietude has the value of epigram—like a thing soberly said in a newspaper." The actors, in short, like the dramatists, ignored convention, and aimed simply at sincerity.

The most characteristic feature of the plays produced by the Irish Theatre has been a type of drama aptly described by one critic as "kitchen drama." That type began with *The Shadow of the Glen*, the first play by J. M. Synge to be acted. In 1897, Mr. Yeats found Synge (then aged 26) living in an attic in the Latin Quarter in Paris—more interested in literature than in life. Both men must have respected the other. For Yeats saw that there was stuff in Synge, and told him to leave Paris and go to the West of Ireland. "Live there as if you were one of the people; express a life that has never found expression." And Synge left Paris, and went to the Aran Islands—a group of bleak rocks at the entrance of Galway Bay.

The Shadow of the Glen was produced in 1903. It was received with open hostility—for it treated the Irish peasant in no wise sentimentally and the peasant was "the time-honoured idol of the sentimentalists." There was another outburst on the production of *The Well of the Saints* in 1905; but both these demonstrations paled before the reception accorded to *The Playboy of the Western World* in 1907. The play was "calumny gone raving mad," said a Nationalist newspaper. After the first night there was organized interruption, and riots inside and outside the theatre. Mr. Yeats refused to withdraw the play; he roundly declared that literature should be national, not nationalist. And time has more than justified him. "It is tough work," writes a critic already quoted, "to keep a modern country from kicking away any quite great work of art that is laid at her feet. Shelleys, Ibsens, Whistlers,—there own receive them not, and when Ireland's turn came she did as the rest. But soon the hooting is over. Already from Galway to Prague Synge's eager and glowing genius has entered at open minds. To them the august and quiet sadness of *Riders to the Sea* has made the word 'tragedy' mean something yet more stirring and cleansing to the spirit than it did. In his harsh,

sane, earthen humour, biting as carbolic acid to slight minds, they find a disinfectant well worth having, at the lowest, in an ailing Theatre."

Synge died in 1909. He wrote only six plays—one of them left incomplete. Yet it is doubtful whether any artist of his generation will stand higher than he when the history of the renaissance of British drama comes to be written.

Lady Gregory's work obviously owes much to the influence of Synge. "The Irish are a race of talkers, and in her plays, too, the people talk a wonderful, ornate, fantastical language, in which it is possible to comment upon life and death without lameness or dryness of expression." She has faithfully observed Synge's dictum, that "in a good play every speech should be as fully flavoured as nut or apple." Her best work is to be found in her little one-act comedies. Written in the first place merely to fill up Abbey Theatre programmes, they have a charm and humour, and a technical dexterity, which are wholly delightful. And in a play like *The Gaol Gate*, or in *McDonough's Wife* (not yet produced by the Abbey company), Lady Gregory has displayed an almost equal mastery of poetic tragedy.

Mr. Yeats's work for the theatre has been mainly as director. His plays perhaps rank higher as poetry than as acted drama. Yet in *Cathleen ni Houlihan* he has written a little tragedy, which in simplicity, directness and dramatic power, ranks high among the productions of the Irish theatre.

The younger men who are writing for the National Theatre have for the most part adopted the method of realism. Mr. Lennox Robinson's *Harvest*, *The Clancy Name*, and *Patriots*; Mr. St. John Ervine's *Mixed Marriage*; Mr. T. C. Murray's *Birthright* and *Maurice Harte*, are all plays in which beauty of expression is subordinated to life-like character-drawing and dramatic situation. These writers, despite Synge's criticism of Ibsen's "joyless and pallid words," owe more to the great Norwegian than to their own countryman. Mr. R. J. Ray, also, whose powerful play, *The Gombeen Man*, was produced in London last month (June) is another dramatist who shows signs of Ibsen's influence. Mr. William Boyle has written one or two agreeable comedies, which, if less interesting than many of the Irish Theatre's productions, are full of sound character-drawing, and are, moreover, excellent acting plays.

It remains to be mentioned that the Irish Theatre was able, since the Censor exercises no sway in Dublin, to produce Shaw's *Shewing-Up of Blanco Posnet*. *John Bull's other Island* was written expressly for the Society, whose resources, however, were at that time insufficient for its adequate production.

So much for the past achievements; what of the future? During their recent season in London, the Irish Players came in for a considerable amount of criticism. Some of this criticism was, of course,

inevitable—being no more than the usual reaction from the unanimous chorus of praise which greeted their earlier efforts; some of it, however, one felt was deserved. A sensational success at the very commencement of an enterprise is difficult to "live up to," and the early discovery of a genius like Synge has to some extent been unfortunate for the younger dramatists of the school. After Synge's death came a Synge "boom"; a good proportion of the Abbey Theatre programmes was naturally made up of productions of Synge's plays. And all this meant that the influence of a peculiarly individual writer came to dominate the Irish Theatre to perhaps a regrettable extent. If that theatre is to make progress, it cannot rest content with what it has already achieved. One is tempted to wish that any productions of Synge could be vigorously barred for a year or two; and that the theatre had perforce to win its reputation anew by the production of the work of the younger men. Too few new plays were presented during the last six weeks season in London; and the constant repetition of too limited a repertoire (the usual list of plays presented is not more than a sixth of the total number of plays produced by the theatre since 1903) is bad for the acting, as well as for the theatre's reputation. Like every other enterprise—artistic, educational, or merely commercial—the Irish Theatre cannot stand still; it must make progress, or degenerate.

In place of anything in the nature of a peroration, let me mention that an excellent little book, *J. M. Synge, and the Irish Dramatic Movement*, by Francis Bickley, has recently been published by Messrs. Constable (1/6); and that all Synge's plays, and many of Lady Gregory's, Mr. Lennox Robinson's, Mr. T. C. Murray's, and Mr. St. John Ervine's are published by Messrs. Maunsel in inexpensive editions.

J. F. HORRABIN.

Freedom of Labour

THAT a Socialist Commonwealth would afford its members comfort and security has been admitted even by the foes of Socialism; "but," say they, "these advantages are bought at too dear a price; they are paid for with a total loss of freedom; the bird in a cage may also have sufficient daily food; it also is secure against hunger, the inclemencies of the weather, and enemies; but it has lost its freedom, and for that reason it is a pitiful being, that peeps through gilded bars into a world of dangers and want, and fain would struggle for its own existence." They maintain that Socialism destroys economic freedom and the freedom of labour; that it introduces a despotism in comparison with which the most unrestricted political absolutism would be freedom, because this would control only one side of man, whereas Socialism would control all the phases of human activity.

The charge is correct that Socialist production is irreconcilable with the full freedom of labour, that is to say, with the freedom of the labourer to work when, where, and how he wills. But so is this freedom of the worker irreconcilable with all planful, co-operative work, whatever the form which it may assume, whether the form be capitalist or socialist. Freedom of labour is possible only in small production, and even there only up to a certain point. Even where the small producer is freed from all social restrictions, he still remains dependent upon natural and social influences; the farmer depends upon the weather, the small industrialist depends upon the markets. "Freedom of Labour" is the ideal, the most revolutionary ideal, which the class of the small producer, unable to look beyond the horizon of small production, is capable of. This ideal had its good reasons a hundred years ago; to-day it has no economic bottom to stand on, and can only haunt the heads of such people as are unable to perceive the industrial revolution that has since then taken place. The downfall of the "Freedom of Labour" is necessarily connected with the downfall of small production. It is not the Socialists who destroy this "Freedom of Labour," but the resistless progress of large production. Oddly enough, the very ones on whose lips is found most frequently the declaration that "labour must be free," are the capitalists, i. e., those who have contributed most to the overthrow of that freedom.

"Freedom of labour" has come to an end, not only in the mills, but in all other places where the individual worker is only a link in a long chain of workers; it does not exist either for the manual worker or for the "brain worker" employed in any industry; the hospital doctor, the school teacher, the railroad employee, the newspaper writer, and so on interminably—none of these enjoy "Freedom of Labour"; they are all bound to certain rules; they must all be at their posts at a certain hour.

For all this, the working man does enjoy freedom in one respect under the capitalist system. If the work does not suit him in one factory, he is free to seek work in another; he can change his employer; in a Socialist Commonwealth, where all the means of production are in a single hand there is but one employer; to change him were impossible.

In this respect the wage worker has to-day what, superficially considered, may seem an advantage over the working man in a Socialist Commonwealth; but this advantage cannot be given the name of "Freedom of Labour." However frequently a working man may change his place of work to-day, he will find in each place substantially the same arrangements which hold the individual workers to certain rules and regulations, all of which are a technical necessity.

The freedom with the loss of which the working man is threatened in a Socialist Commonwealth, is, accordingly, not the "Freedom of Labour" but the freedom to change his master. Under the present

system, this freedom, where it still exists, is of no slight importance: it is a protection to the working man. But even this freedom is gradually destroyed by the progress of capitalism; the increasing number of the unemployed reduces ever more and more the number of jobs that are free, and throws upon the labour market more applicants than there are places. The idle working man is, as a rule, happy if he can at all secure work. Furthermore, the increased concentration of the means of production in a few hands has the steady tendency of placing over the working man the identical employer or set of employers, which ever way he may turn. Inquiry therefore shows that what is decried as wicked and tyrannical tendencies of Socialism are but the natural tendencies of the economic development which manifest themselves even in modern society.

It is not through Socialism, but through the economic development that freedom in the choice and opportunity of work is removed as much as freedom during work itself. Socialism does not mean to, neither could it if it would, check this development; but in this as in so many other respects, Socialism can obviate the evils that accompany the development. It cannot remove the dependence of the working men upon the mechanism of production in which they are one of the wheels; but it substitutes for the superadded dependence of the working men upon a capitalist, with interests hostile to themselves, their dependence upon a society of which they are themselves members, a society of equal comrades, all of whom have the same interests.

It can be easily understood how and why dapper lawyers, authors, and the like, may consider such a dependence unbearable to the modern proletarian, as a glance upon the trade union movement will show. The trade organizations of labour furnish a picture of the so-called "tyranny" of the Socialist system of which the foes of Socialism have so much to say. In the organizations of labour the rules under which each member is to work are laid down accurately and enforced strictly; yet no sane member of any such organization has ever complained that these rules were an unbearable restriction upon his personal liberty. Those who have found it incumbent upon them to defend the "Freedom of Labour" against this shocking "terrorism," and who have done so, often with force of arms and with bloodshed, were, be it noted, never the working men but their exploiters. Poor "Freedom!" What has it come to that it has to-day no defenders other than our modern slaveholders!

The lack of freedom in work does, however, not only lose its oppressive charcter, it also becomes the foundation of the highest freedom yet possible to mankind. This seems a contradiction, but the contradiction is only in appearance. Down to the day when large production stepped up, the labour employed in the production of the necessaries of life took up the full time of those engaged in

it; it required the fullest exercise of both body and mind; this was true not only with the fisherman and the hunter, it was also true with regard to the farmer, the mechanic and the merchant. The existence of the human being engaged in production was consumed wholly by his occupation. It was labour that steeled his nerves, that quickened his brain and made him anxious to acquire knowledge. But the further division and subdivision of labour was carried, the more one-sided did it make the producers. Mind and body ceased to exercise themselves in a variety of directions and to develop all their powers. Wholly taken up by the fractional labour of the moment, the producers lost their capacity to comprehend their whole surroundings. A harmonious, well-rounded development of physical and mental powers, a deep concern in the questions relating to nature and society, a philosophical bent of mind, i.e., the search after the highest truths for their own sakes—none of these could be found under such circumstances except among those classes who remained free from the necessity of toil. Until the commencement of the era of machinery this was possible only by throwing upon others the burden of labour, by exploiting them. The most ideologic, the most philosophic race that history has yet recorded, the only society of thinkers and artists, devoted to science and art for their own sakes was the Athenian aristocracy, the slaveholding landlords of Athens.

Among them all labour, whether slave or free, was degrading; and justly. It was no presumption on the part of Socrates when he said; "Traders and mechanics lack culture; they have no leisure, and without leisure no good education is possible. They only learn what their occupation requires of them; knowledge itself has no attraction for them. They take up arithmetic only for the sake of trade, not for the purpose of acquiring the knowledge of numbers. It is not given to them to see higher. The merchant and the mechanic say: 'The pleasure derived from honour and from knowledge is of no value when compared with money-making.' However able smiths, carpenters, and shoe makers may be in their own trade, most of them are animated only with the souls of slaves; they know not the beautiful, the good, or the just."

The economic development has progressed greatly since those days; the division and subdivision of labour has reached a point undreamt of then; and the increment taken by the system of production for sale has driven both the former exploiters and cultured people into the class of producers. Not unlike the mechanics and the farmers, the rich also are wholly taken up with their business. They do not now assemble in gymnasiums and academies, but in stock exchanges and markets; the speculations in which they are absorbed do not concern the questions of truth and justice, but the prices of wool, whisky-trust stock, corporation bonds, and dividends or coupons. These are the speculative thoughts that consume their mental activities. After these "labours" they have neither strength nor taste for any but the most grovelling amusements.

On the other hand, as far as the cultured classes are concerned, their education has become a merchandise. They, too, have neither time nor stimulus to indulge in disinterested researches after truth, or to strive after an ideal. Each one buries himself in his speciality, and considers every minute lost that is spent in learning something that cannot be reduced to terms of money.

Even among scientific men and artists, the instinct after a harmonious development in all directions is perceptibly losing ground. On all sides specialists are springing up. Science and art are degraded to the level of a trade. What Socrates once said of the mechanics, now holds good of these. Philosophy is on the decline—that is to say, within the classes that are here considered.

In the meantime a new sort of labour has sprung up—machine labour; and a new class—the proletariat.

The machine robs labour of all intellectual activity. The working man at a machine needs no longer to think; all he has to do is silently obey the machine. The machine dictates to him what he has to do; he has become an appendage to it. What is said of the machine holds good also, although to a slighter extent, of handicraft; the division and subdivision of labour in the production of a single article, which was once brought forth by a single man, among innumerable working-men, establishes the same conditions and paves the way for the introduction of machinery.

The first result of the monotony and absence of intellectual activity in the work of the proletarian is to dull his mind.

The second result is that he is driven to revolt against excessive hours of work. To him labour is not identical with life; life commences only when labour is at an end. To those working men to whom labour and life are identical, freedom of labour meant freedom of life. The working man, however, who can be said to live, i.e., enjoy life only when he does not work, can enjoy freedom of life only by being free from labour. As a matter of course, the efforts of this class of workers cannot be directed towards freeing themselves from all work. Labour is the condition precedent for life. But their efforts will necessarily be directed towards reducing their hours of work far enough to leave them to live.

A third result is that machine labour is deprived of mental activity. The intellectual powers of the proletariat are not exhausted by their labour as are the intellectual powers of those workers who are not lashed to the machine; with the proletarian the intellectual powers lie fallow or are suspended during work. For this reason the craving of the proletarian to exercise his mind outside of his hours of work is strong. One of the most remarkable phenomena in modern society is the thirst for knowledge displayed by the proletariat. While all other classes kill their leisure time with the most unintellectual pastimes, the proletarian displays a passion for intellectual

culture. Only he who has had opportunity to move among the proletariat can have any adequate conception of the ambition of its members to learn and enlighten themselves. But even he who stands far away may have some inkling thereof if he compares the papers, magazines. books, and pamphlets that circulate among the working men with those that are current in higher circles.

But above all, this thirst for knowledge is personally unselfish with the working man The worker at a machine will be able to assist his class through the knowledge he may acquire. In seeking truth he does not do so for its own sake, but for the sake of improving *social* conditions. Accordingly, he tries to embrace the whole; he seeks to under stand the whole society and the whole world. The hardest problems attract him most; carried on by this instinct he often loses himself in the clouds.

It is the desire to acquire knowledge that constitutes the philosopher. It is among the despised and ignorant class of the modern proletariat that the philosophical spirit of the most brilliant members of the Athenian aristocracy is revived. But the free development of this spirit is not possible in modern society. The proletariat is without sufficient means to instruct itself; it is deprived of sufficient opportunities for sytematic study; it is exposed to all the dangers and inconveniences of planless self-destruction; above all it lacks sufficient leisure. Science and art remain to the proletariat a promised land, which it looks upon from a distance, which it struggles to possess, but which it cannot yet enter.

Only the triumph of Socialism can render accesible to the proletariat all the sources of culture; only the triumph of Socialism can make possible the reduction of the necessary hours of work to such a point that the working man can enjoy leisure enough to acquire all the knowledge that he desires. The capitalist system of production awakens the desire for knowledge in the breast of the proletariat; only the Socialist system for production can satisfy it.

It is not the "Fredom of Labour" but the freedom *from* labour, such as machinery will make possible in a Socialist Commonwealth, that will bestow upon mankind freedom of life, freedom to engage in science and art, freedom to delight in the noblest pursuits.

Weekly People.

"The great end of life is not knowledge, but action. What men need is as much knowledge as they can assimilate and organize into a basis for action; give them more and it may become injurious. One knows people who are as heavy and stupid from undigested learning as others are from over-fulness of meat and drink."—HUXLEY

ANNUAL MEETINGS

CENTRAL LABOUR COLLEGE

AND

"PLEBS LEAGUE,

On Bank Holiday, Monday, August 4th, 1913.

MEETING OF C.L.C.

at 11 o'clock sharp.

"PLEBS" LEAGUE at 3 o'clock.

AGENDA:

Secretary's Report
Financial Statement
Other Business

N.B.—Members who are in arrears with League or Magazine Subs. should endeavour to clear their accounts before July 26th next, to allow of Accounts being prepared up to the end of July.

SOCIAL EVENING

Commencing at 7 p.m.,
under the direction of the Women's League, C.L.C.

MUSIC DRAMA REFRESHMENTS

All Meetings will be held at the College, 13 Penywern Road, Earl's Court, London, S.W.: near the Earl's Court Station, Underground Railway.

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, 74 Heavitree Road, Plumstead, S.E.
J. REYNOLDS, 13 Penywern Road, Earl's Court, S.W.

ORGANIZERS

NOAH ABLETT, 44 Glanville Street, Mardy, Glam.
J. ARMSTRONG, 12 Sinkers' Row, Cambois, Blyth, Northumberland
G. W. BROWN, 112 Bishop's Road, Bishopston
FRED BURGESS, 47 Clonbrock Road, Stoke Newington, London, N.
W. L. COOK, 41 Philip Street, Blaenavon, Mon.
EDWARD GILL, 83 Queen Street, Abertillery, Mon.
T. P. KEATING, 102 Clarendon Road, Luton, Beds.
J. LEACH, 37 Lyndhurst Street, Bolton
R. MELL, 54 Carton Street, Hull
J. PARKS, 11 Tulip Street, Prudhoe-on-Tyne, Northumberland
F. B. SILVESTER, 28 City Road, Birmingham
W. STEWART, 195 New Lodge Road, Belfast
CHARLES WATKINS, 19 Hall Road, Handsworth, Sheffield.
G. W. WATSON, 4 Macroom Road, Paddington, W.
W. M. WATSON, Weston Cottages, Cowdenbeath, Fife