Vol. VI, No. 2 March, 1914

The PLEBS MAGAZINE

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

MONTHLY TWOPENCE

The "Plebs" League

Object

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

Methods

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

Membership

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

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

Management

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

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

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

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

G. SIMS, Secretary-Treasurer

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

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

The PLEBS MAGAZINE

Vol. VI March, 1914 No. 2

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL

THE Balance Sheet of the Benefit Tickets effort which appears elsewhere in the Magazine reminds us of another exceedingly acute crisis recently passed safely owing to the splendid resource and energy displayed by Mr. E. Edwards, N.U.R., and chairman of the C.L.C. Board. Readers of the Magazine will remember that the College was compelled last year to appeal to the National Union of Railwaymen's Executive for a Loan to meet current expenses. The Executive were quite willing to advance the £200 asked for but it was discovered that the Rules of the Union would not permit of this being done. A further appeal from the College resulted in the Executive advancing this year's scholarships fees, £104. While this advance achieved its immediate purpose it was really only a postponement of the difficulty. The present College year opened with a considerable amount outstanding in debts to tradespeople, fewer students, and with a part of the income already spent. And more than once before, and immediately after, Christmas it appeared as though the College had, at last, to admit defeat and

Mr. E. Edwards Saves

close its brief and strenuous career. That this danger was safely passed is due almost entirely to Mr. Edwards' efforts through the medium of the Benefit Tickets. Three or four times when apparently the College was at the very end of its resources, timely cheques from this source saved the situation. However much some of us may regret the apathy of the workers' organizations which makes such a method of raising funds necessary, all who are interested in the continuation of the College and its work will join with us in offering hearty congratulations and thanks to Mr. Edwards and friends for the exceptionally fine return from their efforts. Only those who have undertaken this kind of work, all too frequently demanded of the Movement in some direction or other, can fully appreciate the immense labour it involves, that the result has been so successful will both repay and be pleasing to Mr. Ernest Edwards himself, one of the most enthusiastically consistent supporters of the College from its inception.

⁂ ⁂ ⁂

If the above mentioned matter provide some amount of gratification the necessity for immediate financial assistance is nevertheless pressing. With some five months of the present College yet to come the present year's income is practically exhausted.

What will YOU do?

It behoves all our readers to buckle to and assist in some measure the solution of this financial problem. We can all do something, however small, towards this end. If every reader would be responsible for £1 payable in five monthly instalments the problem would disappear. And this need not fall directly on the individual. There are very few readers who could not interest at least three people in the College to the tune of 3d. a week, and if the number were increased the effort needed, even for workers, would be very small. What is wanted is a little added enthusiasm, a little more regular effort, and the game is won. Who will start? Suppose we open a Monthly List in the Plebs for this purpose, straightaway! **We hereby invite all our readers who are sufficiently interested to make a little sacrifice to save the Central Labour College to obtain 4/- a month till July next, or pay £1 in the most convenient form.** Cards will be supplied for this purpose by the College if desired, and all money forwarded to us or the College by the 25th of each month, as a result of this appeal, will be acknowledged in the next issue of the Magazine.

Is it worth while; can the College pull through? Yes! and it will. We have repeated this yarn with unfailing and unfaltering regularity and assurance since September, 1909. We *were* right; we *are* right; the College is orlrite. We have said so before, we say it again: the College *will* pull through. In the meanwhile much good work is impeded because of the present problem of: How to Live over this term. Help to solve this problem. If 500 of our readers were to guarantee a £1 each by July, the College would

finish the present year free of debt. And that would give it a good start for the first time in its career It has struggled on gamely under most adverse circumstances, it is now on the up grade, and will continue to improve its position, **provided** its friends make one more real good effort.

Will You Help?

If you can't *give* cash you can *get* cash. Where? From your organization, from your friends, by your perseverance in presenting a collecting card, anywhere, everywhere, only get it—and quickly. Its money the College wants, if not yours, then somebody else's. Shaw and the Salvation Army get it, mostly from unwilling victims, by beating the Big Drum and the exercise of Will Power—perhaps you can find out a better and easier way. Try!

Central Labour College

Special "Benefit Ticket" Fund, 1913

BALANCE SHEET

INCOME.

Dr.	£	s.	d.
To Donations, Collections, &c.	31	13	8
,, Sale of Tickets	316	0	9
Total Income	£347	14	5

EXPENDITURE.

Cr.	£	s.	d.
By Books & Station'y		18	7
,, Carriage of pcls.		11	5
,, Postage of packets ...	12	11	4
,, Single Letters, P'cards & Receipts	4	7	8
,, Printing	8	8	3
,, Prizes (part of) ...	3	16	8
,, Advertisement ...		5	10
,, Cheque Book ...		2	6
,, Bank Charges ...		5	0
,, Total Expend.	£31	7	3
,, Remitted to the Central Lab. Coll.	316	7	2
Total...	£347	14	5

Audited and found correct,

WM. ROSE & J. H. PRATT, *Auditors.*

ERNEST EDWARDS, *Hon. Secretary.*

Marx and Engels

KARL MARX was born at Treves, the oldest town in Germany, on May 5th, 1818. He died at 41 Maitland Park Road, Kentish Town, London, on March 14th, 1883, aged 65 years.

FREDRICH ENGELS was born at Barmen, Westphalia, in the Rhenish Province, on November 28th, 1820. He died at Regent's Park, London, on August 5th (Bank Holiday), 1895.

Marx was of Jewish parentage. His father being German and his mother Hungarian. His father was a man of some public importance, a well-known lawyer and a public notary. Of the school days and early home life of Marx we know little—the same is true of Engels. Neither of them had the time or desire to put on record facts relating thereto, so that we shall probably remain ignorant of this phase of their career for all time. What little has drifted down to us of Marx's school days pictures to us a youth overflowing with animal spirits and, in a school-boyish way, a satirical pen. His daughter tells us he was both loved and feared by his companions. Possibly we might translate this to a little loved, a little admired for his boyish pranks, and a great deal feared. He was a Jew and a Jew was then considered a legitimate object for baiting. Jews are generally expected to take this baiting in the spirit of the Nazarene. This boy didn't. On the contrary, he carried the baiting into the enemy's camp and in the doggerel of childhood satirised his tormentors.

A word here about the social conditions in the Rhine Province, it will help us to understand the lives of the two people with whose careers we are dealing. The Rhine Province, as is known, is situated with easy reach of France, Belgium and England. For some 20 years this part of Germany had been under the control of the French Revolutionary Government. Its position made it peculiarly susceptible to the growth of trade and this had been emphasized by its wealth of coal and mineral deposits, with the Rhine as a natural transport service. This had no doubt contributed to the attention bestowed on it by France. In its turn France had contributed to its development, materially and intellectually, and in particular contributed to the emancipation of the Jews there from some of the disabilities they had suffered from in Europe for centuries. From all these causes this part of Germany was the most developed industrially, and this development was not to be kept under by the overthrow of the Napoleonic power in the Province, in 1812, owing to the military successes of the "Holy Alliance." After this success the Prussian Government attempted to stamp out the ideas of Freedom imported from France, and a few months after Marx's birth issued an order that none but baptised Christians could hold public offices. This meant that Marx's father had to face the loss of his position or abandon his religious con-

victions. He elected to adopt Christianity—how little the change of religious profession cost him we can guess by the knowledge that his favourite authors (he was an exceedingly cultured man) were Voltaire and Racine. Nevertheless we may be certain that this action of the Prussian Junkers had its effect on the development of Marx's character.

In continuation of his studies Marx entered Bonn and later Berlin Universities. His principal study was Law, with a view to fitting him for an official position under the Prussian Government. For his own personal pleasure and profit he studied Philosophy and History. All these subjects were destined to be of immense value to him in later years. On leaving Berlin University he proposed to take up a post as lecturer in philosophy at Bonn University. This was in 1842. However, for political reasons the plan was never carried out. A new field had meanwhile opened up for our young hero and he promptly accepted the chance offered. The development of affairs in the Rhine Province had made it necessary that the industrial classes there should enter upon a struggle with the State power on purpose to maintain the necessary freedom to develop their commercial pursuits. Part of the propaganda of this agitation naturally was Press work, and the lack of literary talent among the bourgeoisie led them to turn to the group of intellectuals known as the Young Hegelians for help. Their choice fell upon Marx. He more than fulfilled their hopes. A paper, *The Rhenish Gazette*, was started in the late summer of 1842. Its entire existence was a turbulent and precarious one. Apart from the theoretical controversies carried on against the reactionary Press of the governmental party, and the struggle between the conflicting views of its own supporters, it carried on a continuous fight with the Censor. In this struggle the young revolutionary intellectual, Marx, proved more than a match for the authorities. Month after month the revolutionary gospel was spread, first under the guise of philosophical criticism, and later under the cloak of religious disputations. A second Censor was appointed — the provincial governor. All to no purpose, however. Finally the government secured by force that which it could not secure by wit —the paper was suppressed. Marx was prepared to carry on the fight, but the bourgeois proprietors were not altogether inconsolable at the Government's action, for the fight had led them dangerously near the precipice of revolution, of an attack on private property. So in March, 1843, Marx finished his meteoric career as a bourgeois editor.

Among the earliest friends of Marx's family were the Westphalens. The elder Westphalen influenced Marx's literary tastes by cultivating his love for the writings of Shakespeare and Dante : and his children, Jenny and Edgar, were Marx's companions and playmates. In after years Edgar became a reactionary Government official and his friendship with Marx ceased. After the suppression of the

Rhenish Gazette, Jenny became Marx's wife and the young couple made their way to Paris. In Paris, Marx collaborated with Arnold Ruge in the production of a magazine called the *German-French Yearbook*. It had but a short career and its chief interest for us lies in the fact that Marx here first outlined his views on historic evolution in an article on Hegel's *Philosophy of Law*, and a clever article on the Hebrew Question in which he shows the economic basis of the Jewish question. At this time began the association with Engels, through an article, written by the latter, on *Outlines of a Critque of Political Economy*, originated an association that was destined to be fraught with such far-reaching results to the proletarian movement.

Of Engels' early life, as we have already mentioned, little is known. It seems to stop short at the bare mention of studies at Barmen, by which he acquired a knowledge of physics and chemistry. He wished to study economics and so proceeded to the "Gymnasium" at Elberfeld. The family desired him to go in for an official position under the State, but his distaste for State politics led him to choose the life of a merchant. He followed up his philosophical studies while in a mercantile house at Bremen and Berlin. Later he entered the firm of Ermen and Engels at Manchester, of which his father was a partner. He remained in Manchester from 1842-1844. Here he interested himself in economic conditions and gathered the material for his book on *The Condition of the Working Class in England in 1844*, a classical historical study, still to be obtained as a double-volume of the *Science Series* now published by George Allen, price 3/6. He wrote this work at his home in Barmen and here it was he realized the immense gulf that separated him from his family. He therefore decided to throw in his lot with the revolutionary party then assembled in Paris, which included Heine.

In Paris Marx also made the acquaintance of Proudhon and attempted to teach him the principles of the Hegelian dialetics with what results we shall see.

After the passing of the *German-French Yearbook*, came Marx and Engels' first literary association—on the Paris *Vorwaerts* (advance). As a sort of opening they wrote a work called *The Holy Family* in which they criticised Young Hegelian theology. While in Paris Marx was still carrying on, by manifestoes, his struggle with the Prussian Government, and in 1845 the French minister, Guizot, was prevailed upon to banish him from France. He went to Brussels, Engels apparently accompanied him, or followed soon after, for here they again collaborated in the writing of two large volumes on Philosophy, in which they finally squared their accounts with the German philosophical schools and presented their own philosophical creed in definite form. This was written in 1845-6. It was never published, but for this neither cared, as their object was achieved, for as Engels says :

> We were no way minded to whisper the new scientific results to the learned world exclusively, on the contary, we were both deep in the political movement. We had a certain following in the educated world, namely, in West Germany, and much sympathy among the organized proletariat. We were in duty bound to found our views scientifically, but quite as important was it for us to win to our conviction the proletariat of Germany. As soon as we were clear ourselves we went to work. We established a German Labour Union in Brussels and succeeded in dominating the *German-Brussels Gazette*. At the same time we were in co-operation with the Brussels Democrats (Marx was Vice-President of the Democratic Society), and also with the French Social Democrats, through the *Reforme*, to which I furnished news of the English and German movements. In short our connexions with the radical and political organizations and Press were all that could be desired.

During his stay in Brussels Marx wrote his famous work *The Poverty of Philosophy*, in answer to Proudhon's request for a criticism of his work, *The Philosophy of Poverty*. In an appendix to the work, written for the *Social Democrat* of Berlin, 16, 17, 18 January, 1865, Marx humourously remarks: "Proudhon informed me of it (*The Philosophy of Poverty*) in a long and detailed letter, in which among other things he said: 'I await the blow of your critical rod.' And very soon this fell upon him in such a fashion as to for ever shatter our friendship." Some addresses to the German Workingmen's Club of Brussels, in 1847, resulted in the publication of *Wage Labour and Capital*, which seems to be only part of the series. The reason this one is preserved being that it was intended to reprint the whole of the lectures in the *New Rhenish Gazette*, but for reasons to be mentioned later only this part appeared; an address on *Free Trade*, given to the Democratic Association of Brussels, January 9th, 1848, was also issued latter in pamphlet form. Many articles were written to German papers by Marx and Engels from time to time, particularly Marx, during the years 1843 to 1848, that these would be the vehicles for much matter of a permanent character we can rest assured, that they were not ineffective for their immediate purpose is shown by the relentless persecution of the Prussian Government. In the early part of 1848, on account of representations from the Prussian authorities, Marx was expelled from Brussels.

During the Brussels period the League of the Just, a body of working men of a semi-secret character got in touch with Marx. They accepted the constitution of the German Workingmen's Clubs, and through Noll, a watchmaker, who made the acquaintanceship of Engels in London, they asked for a conference to be called and a Manifesto issued. Marx and Engels gladly assented. Engels attended the conference in London and it was decided to call a further conference in November, 1847, and invite Marx. The conference was duly held and the Manifesto, as outlined by Marx and Engels, was

authorized to be issued. It was sent to London for publication a few days before the outbreak of the February Revolution of 1848 in Paris, and appeared under the now famous title of, *The Communist Manifesto.*

By this time the February Revolution had disposed of the pretentions of the French Government that had expelled Marx; and the new Provisional Government on 25th February, through his friend Flocon, editor of *Reforme*, invited the "brave and loyal Marx" to return to the country whence "tyranny had banished him, and where he, like all fighting in the sacred cause, the cause of the fraternity of all peoples" would be welcome. The invitation was accepted and for a month he lived in Paris. Here he took a hand in the work of the revolutionary movement, mainly in the direction of combating anarchist reaction. However the French upheaval had precipitated matters in Germany and in March he was back again in Prussia and soon had a paper going in Cologne—*The New Rhenish Gazette*—among the editors being Engels, Freiligrath, Wilhelm Woolf (to whom he dedicated *Capital*, vol. I) Ferdinand Woolf, Weerth the poet and others. The policy was condensed by Engels in these words: "an indivisible Republic and war with Russia, including the restitution of Poland." The policy is interesting in view of the lifelong fight Marx made against the pretentions of the Russian autocracy. Says Engels:—

> The *New Rhenish Gazette* was the only paper within the democratic movement of that time defending the standpoint of the proletariat, as witnessed by its unrestricted championing of the Paris July-insurgents of 1848, whereby it estranged nearly all its stockholders. Vainly the *Journal of the Cross* pointed to the 'Chimborazo-impudence' with which the *New Rhenish Gazette* attacked everything holy, from the king and the administration of the realm down to the policeman, and that in a Prussian fortress containing a garrison of 8,000 men. Vainly the Rhenish philisterium of Liberals, [the employers of Marx as editor of *Rhenish Gazette* in 1842-43] turned suddenly reactionary, showed a passionate resentment: vainly the martial law in Cologne suspended the paper during a rather long term in the fall of 1848; vainly the Frankfort Imperial Department of Justice denounced article after article to the State prosecutor for legal prosecution—the paper was calmly edited and printed in plain view of the main guard house. The circulation and reputation of the journal increased with the violence of the Government and bourgeois attacks. When the Prussian coup d'etat followed in November, 1848, the *New Rhenish Gazette* called on the people, at the head of every issue, to refuse the taxes and to meet force by force. In the spring of 1849, brought before a jury an account of this and some other articles, it was declared 'not guilty' both times. At last, after the May-revolutions of 1849 in Dresden and the Rhineland had been suppressed and the Prussian campaign against the uprising in Baden

> and in the Palatinate was inaugurated by the concentration and mobilization of considerable troops, the government felt itself strong enough to suppress the *New Rhenish Gazette* by force.

In the first trial the defendants were Marx, Engels, and Korff: in the second trial, Marx, Schnaffer, and Schneider. The accused were charged with "inciting the people to armed resistence of the Government and its officials." Marx mainly conducted the defence and delivered a brilliant speech. Says Bernstein :—

> Marx refrains from all oratorical flourish; he goes straight to the point and without any peroration ends with a summary of the political situation. Anyone would think that Marx's personality was in nowise concerned, and that his only business was to deliver a political lecture to the jury. And, in fact, at the end of the trial, one of the jurymen went to Marx to thank him, in the name of his colleagues, for the instructive lecture he had given them.

The first number of the paper appeared on June 1st, 1848, the last on May 19th, 1849. This last was the famous Red Number, printed on red paper and contained at the head the famous poem of Freiligrath, the "Death of the *New Rhenish Gazette*."

This occurence probably accounts for the loss of the other parts of *Wage-Labour and Capital* referred to above.

This was the beginning of the end of the European revolutions. They were compelled to take up arms or be crushed by the victorious counter-revolution. Engels elected to take part in the Baden and Palatinate campaigns, where he served as adjutant. After three stiff fights the reactionaries triumphed, and Engels made his way via Switzerland to England. Marx went to Paris and took part in the June uprising there. In the fiasco that followed Ledru Rollin fled the country, as Louis Blanc had done in 1848, and Marx was given the choice of going to Bretagne or clearing out of France altogether. He went to London.

During the first year of their life in London both Marx and Engels were terribly poor. Where Engels lived we have no record, but Marx first went to Camberwell. Owing to the householder they resided with flitting, a part of their home was seized to pay the landlord's claims. In June, 1850, they moved into two rooms at 28, Dean Street, Soho. About this time Engels' poverty compelled him to enter the Manchester firm, of which his father was a partner, and it seems that the father took care that his salary was not sufficiently large to allow him to assist Marx. Marx meanwhile had secured a position as London correspondent of the *New York Tribune*. He was practically its European editor, contributing articles to the paper upon the prominent social movements during the next 20 years. During the first ten years his only income was from this source, and amounted to £1 a week! and this in spite of the fact that his weekly articles became a feature of the paper and aroused interest all over the world. So penetrating and powerfully written was all his "copy"

that they were frequently utilized as leading articles—sometimes even his private correspondence with Dana, the editor, suffered a like fate —journalese not shying at "doctoring" where the matter was too *red*.

Among the articles contributed from time to time to the *New York Tribune* were those now collected in book form, viz., *Revolution and Counter-Revolution*: *Secret Diplomatic History of the 18th Century: The Life of Lord Palmerston: The Eastern Question.* The immense labour entailed in some of these books will be understood when we realize that the last three named were the result of reading up all the Blue Books of the Foreign Office for the period 1807 to 1850! And the reward was £1 a week. To-day, it is said, the editor of a Labour daily is getting £1,000 a year and the Leader writer of the same paper £400 for their devotion (?) to self-sacrifice and for the Labour Movement!

In 1850 Engels and Marx revived the *New Rhenish Gazette* and published it in Hamburg—Marx acting as Editor. However the wave of commercial prosperity passing over Europe effectually put the "capper" on it and it ceased publication after a few months. Among the articles published in it were sketches, by Marx, of the events then happening in France, these articles later formed the basis of the *18th Brumaire:* whilst Engels contributed a series of articles on the military aspects of the European counter revolutions; *The English Ten Hours' Bill;* and a series of articles on *The German Peasants' War.* It was quite clear to both Marx and Engels that another revolution was quite impossible for some years, and in a review of the events from May to October, written November 1st, 1850, the following passage occurs:—

> In the midst of this general prosperity where the productive powers of the bourgeois society are developing as luxuriantly as is possible within bourgeois relations, it is impossible to talk of an economic revolution. Such a revolution is only possible in a period when these two factors—the modern productive powers and the bourgeois form of production—come into conflict. The various quarrels in which the representatives of the different Continental factions are now engaged, so far from giving rise to new revolutions, are themselves only possible because of the security of the immediate relations, and further—what the reaction does not know—just because these relations are so bourgeois. In face of these relations all bourgeois efforts at reactionary restraint are as helpless as all the moral indignation and the spiritual proclamations of the earlier democrats.

Such plain speaking is bitter swallowing for the utopian schools. The people who believe that all that is necessary for a revolution is the Will and Enthusiasm rose up against Marx and Engels. The paper died: and the factions were suppressed by the State forces, and some of the German members thrown into prison.

To be continued.

BLESSED ARE THE MEEK!

The Boss :—"Lie down, can't yer? 'Ow the 'ell do yer expect me to walk comfortably through life, if yer will keep lifting yer 'eads up?"

[Drawn for *The Plebs* by Harold Batho.

Shaw on Himself

"IT is only the man who has no messsage," Mr. Shaw has declared, "who is too fastidious to beat the drum at the door of his booth." He himself has done more than beat a drum—though he has done that, as he does most things, with admirable effect; but having attracted popular attention by his vigorous solos on that instrument, he has gone on to deliver lengthy addresses to the crowd assembled in front of his booth, on the subject of the unique entertainments to be enjoyed within. And the address, moreover, is not seldom as entertaining as the entertainment itself. There is only one serious rival to a Shaw play, and that is a Shaw preface. Why, one wonders, does not Mr. Shaw add 'Prologue' to the list of characters on the play-bill, and let that gentleman (or lady) speak or read the preface before the curtain goes up on the play proper? *

Last month, in reviewing *The Quintessence of Ibsenism*, we saw Mr. Shaw beating the drum at the door of another man's booth. And in this present article, in which we propose to distil the quintessence of Ibsen's most famous disciple, Shaw himself, we can still (by reason of the prefaces) have Shaw as interpreter.

Let us begin by permitting him to tell us how he became a playwright. In the first of his prefaces (that to the *Unpleasant Plays*) he assures us that he never lacked the dramatist's gift.

> As far as that is concerned, I have encountered no limit but my own laziness to my power of conjuring up imaginary people in imaginary places, and finding pretexts for theatrical scenes between them. But to obtain a livelihood by this insane gift, I must have conjured so as to interest not only my own imagination, but that of at least some seventy or a hundred thousand contemporary London playgoers. To fulfil this condition was hopelessly out of my power.† I had no taste for what is called popular art, no respect for popular morality, no belief in popular religion, no admiration for popular heroics. . . . I was neither a sceptic nor a cynic in these matters:

* As usual, Mr. Shaw has anticipated any such suggestion by actually doing this in the case of *Cæsar and Cleopatra*. When Forbes-Robertson revived that play at Drury Lane last year, a new character, the Great God Ra, spoke a highly diverting prologue, which it is to be hoped will soon be included in the published version of the play.

† But he has managed it since!

I simply understood life differently from the average respectable man ; and as I certainly enjoyed myself more—mostly in ways which would have made him unbearably miserable--I was not splenetic over our variance. . . . .

One of the worst privations of life in London for persons of serious intellectual and artistic interests is the want of a suitable playhouse. I am fond of the play, and consequently, when I found myself coming across projects of all sorts for the foundation of a theatre which should be to the newly-gathered harvest of the 19th century what Shakespeare's theatre was to the harvest of the Renascence, I was warmly interested. But it soon apppeared that the languid demand of a small and uppish group for a form of entertainment which it had become thoroughly accustomed to do without, could never provide the energy necessary for the establishment of the New Theatre (we of course called everything advanced "the New" at that time). That energy could only be set free by the genius of the actor and manager finding in the masterpieces of the New Drama its characteristic and necessary mode of expression, and revealing their fascination to the public. Clearly the way to begin was to pick up a masterpiece or two. Masterpieces, however, do not grow on the bushes. The New Theatre would never have come into existence but for the plays of Ibsen. . . . . Ibsen was the hero of the new departure. It was in 1889 that the first really effective blow was struck by the production of *A Doll's House*. . . . Mr. Grein followed up the campaign with his "Independent Theatre." It got on its feet by producing Ibsen's *Ghosts;* but its search for unacted native dramatic masterpieces was so complete a failure that in the autumn of 1889 it had not yet produced a single original piece of any magnitude by an English author. In this humiliating national emergency. I proposed to Mr. Grein that he should boldly announce a play by me. Being an extraordinarily sanguine and enterprising man, he took this step without hesitation.

In this wise was *Widowers' Houses* produced; henceforth Shaw was "infamous as a dramatist."

The first Performance was sufficiently exciting ; the Socialists and Independents applauded me furiously on principle ; the ordinary playgoing first-nighters hooted me frantically on the same ground ; I, being at that time in some practice as what is impolitely called a mob orator, made a speech before the curtain ; the newspapers discussed the play for a whole fortnight not only in the ordinary theatrical notices and criticisms, but in leading articles and letters ; and finally the play was published, with an introduction by Mr. Grein, and a long preface and several elaborate controversial appendices in the author's most energetically egoistical fighting style. . . . I had not achieved a success ; but I had provoked an uproar ; and the sensation was so agreeable that I resolved to try again.

Ibsen became a propagandist through being a playwright; Shaw, you will notice, became a playwright because he was a propagandist. Ibsen gradually became aware of his own philosophy in the course of writing plays. Shaw started play-writing with a more or less complete philosophic equipment. This saved him considerable time; for he had not, like Ibsen, to 'find himself' by experiments in poetic dramas and chronicle-plays, but plunged straight into a criticism of contemporary life and a discussion of 'topical' ideas.

> All the highest literature is journalism (he writes in *The Sanity of Art*). The writer who aims at producing plays which are 'not for an age but all time' has his reward in being unreadable in all ages; while Plato and Aristophanes, trying to knock some sense into the Athens of their own day; Shakespear peopling every country with Elizabethian mechanics and Warwickshire hunts; Ibsen photographing the local doctor and vestrymen of a Norwegian parish, are still alive and at home everywhere, among the dust and ashes of many thousands of academic, punctilious, most archæologically correct men of letters and art who spend their lives haughtily avoiding the journalists' vulgar obsession for the ephemeral. I also am a journalist, proud of it, deliberately cutting out of my works all that is not journalism, convinced that nothing that is not journalism will live long as literature, or be of any use while it does live.

What now is the gospel according to Shaw? It is expressed for us, lucidly and concisely enough, in the preface to the volume of *Pleasant Plays*.

> To me the tragedy and comedy of life lie in the consequences, sometimes terrible, sometimes ludicrous, of our persistent attempts to found our institutions on the ideals suggested to our imaginations by our half-satisfied passions, *instead of on a genuinely scientific natural history.*

There it is! even more clear-cut and precise than his quintessence of Ibsen's working creed—to which it is sufficiently obvious, it owes not a little. But Shaw has the advantage over Ibsen of having a better grasp of that 'genuinely scientific natural history,' and of viewing life from the standpoint, not of a solitary individualistic thinker, but of a modern Socialist, conscious of the vast underlying influence of economic and social forces over the lives of individuals. To Ibsen's somewhat idealistic appeal for an aristocracy of will, of character, Shaw is able to add a clearer prevision of how that aristocracy may be, will be, evolved. To Ibsen's insistence that Ideals should be subordinated to Facts, Shaw adds a more scientific analysis of both Facts and Ideals, and of the process by which both came to be what they are. What in Ibsen remained to the last a half-intuitive grasp of modern problems, becomes in Shaw a more consciously intellectual understanding based on a fuller scientific knowledge. Ibsen, one may put it, was a great self-taught genius, discovering for

himself, after infinite pains, no inconsiderable part of the truth. Shaw, on the other hand, had the good fortune at an early stage of his career to come across the syntheses made by modern scientific thinkers—by Marx in particular. And just because he is more scientific, he is more complex. Ibsen asserted, reiterated his gospel. Shaw discusses it, permits his intelligence to play around it, sees it from every side.

> The way to get at the merits of a case is not to listen to the fool who imagines himself impartial, but to get it argued with reckless bias for and against.

Moreover, as G. K. Chesterton has quite truly pointed out, Shaw's philosophy is all the more puzzling to certain sober-minded people inasmuch as he has combined "life-long positiveness and finality of assertion with a life-long capacity for growth and change of view." And finally, Shaw—much unlike Ibsen—is a wit. "The race is not to the swift, but to the good-humoured," observed Felix Grendon, in an article reprinted in *The Plebs* two months ago. "Our schoolmasters still teach that the truth is pedantic, solemn-visaged, stuffy, austere; our radicals and revolutionists that it is angry, belligerent, rebellious, iconoclastic, terrible to behold. It has remained for Shaw to teach us that the most serious truth is full of fun." But we must let Shaw speak for himself:—

> My method has been to take the utmost trouble to find the right thing to say, and then say it with the utmost levity. And all the time the real joke is that I am in earnest.
>
> My way of joking (says Peter Keegan in *John Bull's Other Island*) is to tell the truth—it is the funniest joke in the world!

In the preface to *Cashel Byron's Profession*, he remarks:—

> Silence may be the right policy on a dropped subject; but on a burning one every word that can cool the fervour of idolatry with a dash of cold fact has its value.

And when the dash of cold fact is applied good-humouredly, as Shaw applies it, its value is trebled.

It is time we turned to one or two individual plays. We are to remember, in considering them, that their aim, just as that of Ibsen's, is to attack ideals and idealism—usually described by Shaw as Romance. Thus in *Widower's Houses* he attacks romantic notions of individual conduct in relation to social problems; in *Mrs. Warren's Profession* he contrasts romantic idealisations of woman with the actual facts; in *Arms and the Man*, he mocks at the romance of war and the warrior; in *Candida*, at the romantic illusion of the stern, strong protecting man and the soft, clinging wife—and so on. But we must remember also that the weapons of Shaw are not the weapons of Ibsen, and that we see in Shaw's plays, not a direct frontal attack on the ideals with heavy artillery, but a subtler—more Fabian!—method of warfare, by means of which the enemy is enticed by any and every art to walk blindfold into cunningly-laid ambuscades

In the earliest plays, to be sure, (those labelled "Unpleasant") the attack is a little more direct and obvious than in his later work. In *Widower's Houses*, he tells us he has shewn

> middle-class respectability and younger son gentility fattening on the poverty of the slum as flies fatten on filth.

The onslaught is plain and direct—not the most obtuse enemy could miss it. And, as we have seen, the enemy did not miss it, and hit back vigorously.

> The reason why Shakespear and Moliere are always well-spoken of, and recommended to the young (Shaw writes in the preface to the Brieux plays) is that their quarrel is really a quarrel with God for not making men better. If they had quarrelled with a specified class of persons with incomes of four figures for not doing their work better, or for doing no work at all, they would have been denounced as seditious, impious, and profligate corruptors of morality.

And Shaw, as he himself says of Brieux,

> wastes neither ink nor indignation on Providence. The idle despair that shakes its fist impotently at the skies, sublime blasphemies, such as
>
> "As flies to wanton boys are we to the gods,
> They kill us for their sport"—
>
> does not amuse him. His fisticuffs are not aimed heavenward ; they fall on human noses for the good of human souls.

In *The Philanderer*, his second play, he shews us

> the grotesque sexual compacts made by men and women under marriage laws which represent to some of us a political necessity (especially for other people), to some a divine ordinance, to some a romantic ideal, to some a domestic profession for women, and to some that worst of blundering abominations, an institution which society has outgrown but not modified.

In *Mrs. Warren's Profession*, his point of attack is

> the fact that, as Mrs. Warren herself puts it, 'the only way for a woman to provide for herself decently is for her to be good to some man who can afford to be good to her.' I believe that any society which desires to found itself on a high standard of integrity of character in its units, should organize itself in such a fashion as to make it possible for all men and all women to maintain themselves in reasonable comfort by their own industry, without selling their affections or their convictions.

All these three plays he describes as 'unpleasant'; their attack is open and direct. Thenceforth he adopts the subtler methods we have mentioned; writes 'pleasant' plays; and endeavours rather to make the enemy look a fool than to prove him a criminal. In *Candida*, perhaps the finest play of all, he applies (as we have already noted) a dash of cold fact to the 'strong-man-weak-woman' romance. Candida, the wife, does not go out and slam the door after her as

Nora did (in *A Doll's House*). With an even more biting irony, Shaw makes her stay with her husband, because she knows—and he at last realises—that without her to shield him from the hard facts of life, he would be as helpless as a babe. Candida is the first of that series of women characters in Shaw's plays who commands, what scarcely a single male character commands, our complete respect. Nor has he idealised women—idealised, that is, those qualities usually described and accepted as 'womanly.' To the orthodox, indeed, many of his women doubtless appear as unsexed and shameless females. Candida's calm assumption that she had the right to choose between her husband and another man—is by no means consistent with the romantic ideal of womanly conduct—which implies (though it may not say so openly) that a woman commits her intellectual and her moral judgment, as well as her person, into another's keeping.

But we cannot study every play in detail, though every one is a play with a purpose.

> Great art (Shaw has said) is never produced for its own sake. It is too difficult to be worth the effect. All the great artists enter into a terrible struggle with the public, often involving bitter poverty and personal humiliation, and always involving calumny and persecution, because they believe they are apostles doing what used to be called the Will of God, and is now called by many prosaic names, of which 'public work' is the least controversial.

The laughing philosopher is in deadly earnest. Not one of the Victorians was ever more filled with a burning desire to do the 'Will of God.' If throughout all Shaw's work any one doctrine is insisted on continually, it is the doctrine that *character*, *will*, founded on clearness of purpose, is the one thing that matters.

> This is the true joy in life, the being used for a purpose *recognised by yourself* as a mighty one; the being thoroughly worn out before you are thrown on the scrap-heap; the being a force of Nature, instead of a feverish, selfish, little clod of ailments and grievances, complaining that the world will not devote itself to making you happy. . . . .
>
> In heaven you live and work, instead of playing and pretending. You face things as they are; you escape nothing but glamour; and your steadfastness and your peril are your glory.

The quintessence of Shaw's gospel? On its destructive side, it is an attack on false or outgrown ideals, on romantic notions as opposed to facts ascertained by science. On its constructive side, it strives for a "genuinely scientific natural history" which will replace those discarded ideals, and which will transform the mere blind Will to Live working in all men into a conscious Will, inspired by a clearly-understood Purpose.

That big drum has a heartening sound!

J. F. HORRABIN.

The Rise in Prices

THE cause of the rise of prices in recent years is of great importance to the workers, particularly since such cause correctly defined enables us to accurately estimate whether the rise will continue, and generally to judge of the posssible effects of this movement of prices on the immediate future of the Labour Movement. Since Winston Churchill stated a cause of the rise of prices to be the cheapening of the cost of production of gold,

> New goldfields have been discovered, new processes of extracting the gold have immensely widened the area of profitable gold industry . . . . that means that gold has become less valuable, that means that a sovereign buys less clothes, less food, or less fuel than it did in former days, and the increase of the gold output, which is no doubt useful to commerce and to credit, produces a rise in prices. And here is where one of the hardships which affects labour comes in. Because while prices can be raised quite easily to meet the new conditions which are gradually produced, wages move only very slowly and very jerkily, and very often after fierce quarrels between employer and employed.—*Daily Chronicle*: October 4th, 1911.

much ink must have been spilled and more talk indulged in on the relation of Gold and Prices. Professor Ashley, in a series of articles to the *Evening News* (London), produced evidence in favour of the Churchill contention; on the other hand J. A. Hobson, in *Gold, Prices and Wages*, doubts whether the cheapening of gold is even a contributary cause. These arguments For and Against the effect of the cheapening of gold upon prices mainly centres round the question of credit. There is no doubt that there has been a general development of the credit system and a considerable extension of the limits formerly imposed upon loans on goods partly produced or waiting to be sold. The main points of the discussion on the subject is the effect of an increased gold supply on this loan mechanism. Sir Edward Holden, Professor Ashley, and others, argue in favour of gold being responsible for this development of credit: Barker, Hobson and others, deny this contention. That, is so far as the Capitalist theorists are concerned. Among the Socialists opinions are likewise divided, and very opportunely comes an English translation of a little book by Kautsky, the great Marxian theorist. The book is a reprint of some discussions on Gold and Prices in the German Party Press and in its present form is issued by Kerr & Co., under the title, *The High Cost of Living*, price 1/7 from PLEBS League. The translation is by Austin Lewis, who gives an admirable table, drawn up by the U.S.A. Bureau of Labour Statistics, showing the relative prices of commodities, by groups, for the period 1890-1912. The body of the book also contains tables of statistics of similar importance for the discussion of the prices question, and also an admirable chart, showing at a glance the evolution of the production of gold for the last 100 years. Kautsky's book separates the inquiry into four divisions, viz.: the effect of changes in the productivity of gold in

(1) pre-capitalist society, (2) capitalist society, (3) the circulation of money, (4) prices and poverty. The main negative point of the opposition in the discussion last referred to seems to have been: that the production of gold does not automatically operate to produce changes in the value of gold; because the banks corner all the gold that comes into the world market, and therefore, no lowering of the value of gold can take place. Kautsky replies that this would seem to give the gold problem a specific character under the modern capitalist system. This he denies. He further boldly declares that the banks play no part in the economic role of gold in connexion with this question of prices. If the opposition wish to prove that changes in the method of producing gold cannot bring about changes in the price of commodities, historical examples are quoted to refute such a contention. The real problem then is, to show how such changes operate in exchange relations. The starting point of such an investigation is simple commodity production. Then follows an investigation of the determining factors of simple reproduction of commodities. The conclusion is: that an additional gold supply is always an imperative to increased production of commodities and the raising of prices. And always as a multiple of the value of the additional gold supply in an ever increasing ratio, since all increase of productive activity also implies greater facilities in the exchange mediums. The effect of this stimulated gold production on the distribution of labour in the various industries and occupations is then illustrated by historical examples: the point of this part of the discussion is to show the part played by attraction and repulsion of occupations in simple societies as a means of averaging the results of given labour activities, since it may be urged that in a society without an effective surplus army of labourers the gold industry may hold a superior position among the industries. In reality the attraction to the gold industry is an ever present phenomenon in all forms of society and, therefore, the forces of attraction to it and the increased demand for commodities are concurrent. The attraction to the gold industry is likewise shown to be altogether incommensurable to the returns for the labour expended in its production, socially considered.

Kautsky then proceeds to consider the main positive contention of the opposition viz. that the improvements in the methods of gold production only result in an increase in differential mining rents. If this were true the ground rents for mining would ere this have become greater than in any other method of exploiting land, whereas all the evidence seems to point to the contrary. Adam Smith and Marx both agree that, as a general rule, the return to mines-rent is not affected by development in mining. Again historical illustrations are used to point the moral and adorn the tale.

In this section and elsewhere are thrown out very useful hints for historical research work of the effect on great social movements by the rise and decline of the mining industry e.g. the presence and loss of mining populations on the Protestant Reformation, and the effect

on Chartism by the opening up of the Californian and Australian goldfields. "One can see how transformations in the methods of producing gold cause transformations in prices, in the method of producing goods, and finally in the relative position of classes."

So far simple production: now for the effect of an increased gold supply on prices under capitalism. It alters nothing that the producer is now a wage slave and that the returns go to his employer, the said employer, having to use the gold in some way, he must use it for his own personal wants or for investments—directly or indirectly through the financiers. In any case it means an increased demand for the products of other industries and a raising of the prices of these products. That the gold industry does not hold a unique profit-paying position is shown by statistics, the implication being that in the competition between gold-owners and other commodity-owners the former do not secure any advantage because of the nature of their commodity. A veiled hint is given as to "dirty work at the cross roads" on the part of the mining promoters towards the gullible stock-purchasing public—a relation not confined to mining! That the mining industry suffers (!) from over-capitalization is axiomatic, and statistics prove that the lot of the average shareholder is not "a 'appy one."

Predicating a knowledge of *Capital*, Vol. I, Chapter XXIV, particularly section 4, Kautsky goes on to show the effect of this law of capitalist development as applied to gold mining: step by step he traces the effects and counter-effects of these new supplies of gold; effects on the turn-overs of ordinary capitals and their analogous results in gold mining, the variations and similarities of these movements, which effect all sorts and conditions of capitals alike, until finally he clinches the arguments by appeals to recorded facts, provided by history and statistical researches.

The immense importance of this question of gold production on the development of peoples is ever present to Kautsky, and in view of his own experience as a prophet one can apppreciate his tribute to the foresight of Marx and Engels on the same subject.

> Marx and Engels were the first to point out the significance of the Californian gold discoveries. About 1850 they declared the discovery of these mines to be 'more important than the February Revolution.' It brought to England 'that amazing increase in wealth and power' of which Gladstone spoke in his speech on the Budget, and which Marx one year later quoted in his inaugural address to the International. This was the brilliant period of the French Empire. A rain of gold seemed to pour on 'good society.' We find simultaneously a glittering movement in business and a fever in promotion and speculation. Finally, that period laid the foundation stone for the development of the great industry of Germany which from that time developed rapidly.
>
> From 1860 the rise in the production of gold came to a stop, but began again some time after. From 1870 to 1874 we find a marked falling off in gold production, a fall in prices notably followed and, then, with the stagnation in gold output to the beginning of the

nineties a period of lower prices and continued dulness in trade that caused many of us, I admit that I was one, to think that the capitalist system had already fallen into a condition of chronic over-production.

But suddenly arose a new development of gold production such as was never seen in the world before. In the year 1886 the first mine in the South African Rand was opened. In 1890 the cyanide process was introduced, in 1897 the goldfields of the Yukon in Alaska were discovered. In proportion as this advance in the production of gold made itself felt, stagnation waned, prices began to rise, and capitalism entered with full force upon a brilliant phase of its development. The mutual connexion of these phenomena is obvious to-day.

This section closes with a consideration of the effects of increased gold production in shaping industrial crises.

The third section deals with the problem propounded therein: how is it that such a comparatively insignificant product as gold wields such an immense power in the social system? Which is in reality an inquiry into the nature of gold as a medium of circulation, and how, and in what way, the development of the credit system has effected industrial evolution? In two important points the money commodity is differentiated from all other commodities, viz. (1) it has a use value for every one under all conditions, and (2) it does not necessarily disappear from the market after any individual act of exchange. For this reason no comparison is possible, in quantitative form, between the year's production of gold and the annual product of other industries. The year's production of gold circulates a greater quantity of products than is represented by its own value, and in addition it goes to swell the mass of gold continuously acting as the money medium. In addition, any comparison of the yearly production of gold as against commodities has to make allowance for the gold hoarded and that used industrially, and then place the balance in opposition to the increased production of other commodities over the previous year. Then the apparent disproportion is considerably minimised. The great difficulty in any investigation of this kind, is the lack of reliable statistics upon which to build comparatively exact estimates. So far as estimates do exist they favour the views of Kautsky, and these estimates and deductions are reinforced by historical data.

Another factor dealt with is the velocity of circulation, a velocity that increases rapidly with the development of the various forms of credit and the perfection of transportation and communication; and a relatively detailed analysis of the forms these developments assume is here given. Valuable data are also given with regard to the division of the year's output of gold into money and industrial raw material; and the evolution of demonetized circulation mediums. Next comes an investigation into the part played historically by hoarded gold; the nature of present hoards; and the possibility of any considerable release in the near future of hoards from less industrially developed countries. As for banks

The tendency of banking has no more influence than any of the other factors which we have mentioned in weakening the importance of

> the increase in the production of gold. The contrary is true. It is true that the measure and conditions of gold production are not alone in marking the height of the economic effect of additional money. But all factors which are determinate of it—speed in the circulation of goods, the industrial employment of gold as an intermediate between hoarding and circulating money, finally the introduction of substitutes for gold in the different functions of money and credit, have all developed in the last twenty years so as not to weaken but to strengthen the influence of the increased production of gold upon economic life and the prices of commodities.

The last section is an exposition of the salient points of this gold and prices controversy and its possible effects on the present and future activities of the working-class; in contradistinction to the earlier parts of the book which presupposes some knowledge of economics, it might be issued as an independent popular summary of the Marxian views on this much discussed subject—though it would be quite unfair to class the earlier sections as difficult for the average student of economic subjects. Messrs Kerr & Co. are to be congratulated on their forethought in placing this very able work at the disposal of the English-speaking proletariat who would be otherwise unable to enjoy and profit by it in its original garb. Those who wish to speak as "having authority and not as the scribes" had better secure a copy.

A Letter from Dietzgen to Karl Marx in London*

SIR,—

Permit me, an obscure person, to offer you my homage for the inestimable service you have rendered, especially to the working class, by your scientific investigations. Already in my early youth, when I was only capable of admiring the exuberance of your writings, and scarcely of understanding them; I became captivated and could not refrain from reading them again and again until I acquired a clearness that satisfied me. The enthusiasm which the study of your work [*Capital*], recently issued in Hamburg, now excites in me urges me to the perhaps impertinent presumption of testifying to you my appreciation, my veneration and my gratitude. I studied with much industry the first part of *A Critique of Political Economy* at the time it first appeared in Berlin, and I acknowledge that never has a book, however voluminous, brought to me so much new positive knowledge and information as this small work. I have therefore awaited its continuation with much impatience. Therein was stated for the first time in clear, irrefutable, scientific form, what the tendency of historical development will be, *viz.*, to subordinate the hitherto blind natural force of the social process of

* First published in the *Neuen Zeit*, 20th year, Vol. II, No. 4.

production to the human consciousness. Your undying fame is to have clearly demonstrated what was formerly instinctively perceived *viz.*, that our production is anarchic. Time will and must bring to you universal recognition for this achievement. Between the lines of your work I read that the presentation of your fundamental economics forms a fundamental philosophy. Inasmuch as I have worked much on the latter subject, I cannot, despite the knowledge that I am only a working tanner, elementarily educated, refrain from giving you a brief exposition of my scientific attempt.

My object has been from my early days onward, to acquire a systematic world outlook; Ludwig Feuerbach has shown me the way thereto. I am indebted mainly, however, to my own labour, so that I may indeed say to myself that the universal things, the nature of the universal, or the being of things are scientifically clear to me. What remains for me to know are the particular things. Inasmuch as I know some particulars, I say to myself that it is too much for one man to know everything.

The basis of all science consists in a knowledge of the thought-process.

Thought implies the development, out of the impressions given by the senses, of the general from the particular. The phenomenon forms the necessary material of thought. It must be given before the essence, universal or abstract, can be found. The understanding of this fact is the key to all the philosophical riddles. If the world be only the presentation, not the result of thought or wisdom, then the question, for example, as to the beginning and end of the world does not belong to science.

The nature of thought is number. All logical distinctions are clearly quantitative. All existence is more or less constant appearance, all appearance is more or less constant existence.

All causes are effects, and all effects are causes. Within a series of succeeding phenomena that which generally precedes is the cause. For example, in consequence of a shot, out of five birds four fly to and fro. Hence the shot is called the cause that four fly, and fearlessness the cause that one sits. But, on the other hand, if one flies and four sit, the cause of flight appears no longer to be the shot, but fright. A celebrated physicist writes: "We cannot perceive heat in itself; we only conclude from the phenomena the presence of this agent in Nature." I conclude, on the contrary, from the imperceptability of the heat itself, the absence of this agent, and I understand the phenomena or effects of heat as the material out of which the mind forms for itself the concept, heat. Just in the same way, from the concrete sense-perceptible matter,

we arrive at the concept, force. In the weighing of a bale of goods, the gravity will be handled by the pound without regard to the material weighed. The insipid Büchner says: "What I want is facts." In reality he does not know what he wants, for science is not so much concerned with facts as with the explanation of facts, not with materials, but with forces. Though in reality force and matter are identical, nevertheless there is a distinction. The distinction between the particular and the general is even more warrantable. "Force does not allow itself to be seen"! Yes, sight itself and that which we see is pure force. We see indeed not the thing "itself," but only its effects on our eyes. Matter that is imperishable only means that above all and at all times it is matter. Matter appears, and the appearances are material. The difference between appearance and essence is only quantitative The faculty of thought brings together out of the many the one, out of the parts the whole, out of the perishable the imperishable, out of the accidents the essentials.

Morality :—By morality the world understands the consideration that man pays his fellow man with a view to his own welfare. Different men and circles of men determine in different ways the number and order of these considerations. Given these limits, the faculty of thought is able to distinguish the universal or general from the particular right. Was it end? Was it means? In relation to human welfare in the abstract, all ends are a means, and inasmuch, the maxim, "the end justifies the means", is of unlimited value. If lack of erudition did not prevent me, I should write a book on this theme, so many new aspects of truth do I believe it to reveal.

Pardon me, my dear sir, for presuming to take up your time and attention. But I think you will be glad of this evidence that the philosophy of a hand-worker is more clearly cut than that of our present day professors. I should value your approbation more highly than any honours any academy could bestow upon me by admission to its membership.

I conclude with a repeated assurance that I associate myself most intimately with your own far-reaching exertions on behalf of our age. Social evolution, the struggle towards the dominance of the working class, interest me to a far greater extent than do my own private affairs. I am only sorry that I am not able to co-operate therein. *Allons enfants pour la patrie!* ["Forward! children, for the fatherland!"]

(Signed) JOSEF DIETZGEN,
Foreman of the Vladimir Leather Factory,
24 Oct. (5 Nov.), 1867. Wassili, Ostrow, St. Petersburg.

The "Plebs" League

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

Executive and Officers of "Plebs" League:

SECRETARY-TREASURER

GEORGE SIMS

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

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

ORGANIZERS

NOAH ABLETT, 44 Glanville Street, Mardy, Glam.
J. ARMSTRONG, 12 Sinkers' Row, Cambois, Blyth, Northumberland
G. W. BROWN, 112 Bishop's Road, Bishopston, Bristol
FRED BURGESS, 47 Clonbrock Road, Stoke Newington, London, N.
W. L. COOK, 41 Philip Street, Blaenavon, Mon.
EDWARD GILL, 83 Queen Street, Abertillery, Mon.
T. P. KEATING, 80 Clarendon Road, Luton, Beds.
J. LEACH, 15 Church Street, Bolton
R. MELL, 54 Carlton Street, Hull
J. PARKS, 11 Tulip Street, Prudhoe-on-Tyne, Northumberland
F. B. SILVESTER, 8 Evelyn Street, Sparkhill, Birmingham
W. STEWART, 195 New Lodge Road, Belfast
CHARLES WATKINS, 3 Laverack Street, Richmond Road, Handsworth, Sheffield
G. W. WATSON, 4 Macroom Road, Paddington, W.
W. M. WATSON, Weston Cottages, Cowdenbeath, Fife