

THE
“Plebs” Magazine

Vol. I.

December, 1909.

No. 11.

Copyright Entered at Stationer's Hall.

EDITORIAL

THE meaning of the term Labour Movement has been stretched and stretched until to-day, like the term Christianity, it may be said to cover a multitude of sins. As the latter is used to cover everything from Christian Science to Christian Socialism, so the Labour Movement is made to include everything from a militiaman to a millionaire. If the scope and constitution of the Labour Movement is regarded to be such a many-coloured mosaic of disparate characters it is not surprising to find existing much popular confusion with regard to the representation of that movement in its struggle for political power. And the net product of this confusion is traceable to one source; failure to understand the forces that have called the Labour Movement into being, the evolutionary character both of these forces and their creation, and their relation to each other. When such knowledge is absent there comes at the right time the “logician”! It is fortunate for these arrogant and illogical apologists that repentance is thus made logically possible for them ere the devil of direct representation appears again in their midst, disguised as a Labour representative. Indeed, it would seem as if already some brands had been plucked from the burning, as witness the advocacy of certain well-known Labour leaders to abstain from creating triangular contests at the impending General Election.

BEFORE we ask ourselves who should represent the Labour Movement let us determine what the Movement itself represents. The constituents of the Labour Movement are the Trade Unions.

**The Source
of
the Movement.**

The latter are organizations of wage-earners, in other words, a class which, being divorced from the means of production, depend for their livelihood upon the sale of their labour-power. The price of labour-power is called wages.

Wages on the average are equal in amount to the value of labour-power, i.e. of those things which are necessary for the maintenance of the labourer and his family. Labour-power being a commodity is subject to the laws that operate in the whole world of commodities. It possesses one peculiar property however—a property which is to the knight of the woful figure the Dulcinea of his dreams—in that unlike every other commodity *it is the source of more value than itself*. In other words *what labour produces* and *what it takes to produce labour-power* are two different quantities. The difference between these two quantities is the soul of capitalist production, the very acme of the present social system, and the special providence of our lordly "labourers" Avebury, Brassey & Co., Ltd. Wages then has a specific meaning corresponding to a specific economic condition. It represents that *part of the product of labour* which the labourer receives from his patron saint on the occasion of the weekly love-feast—pay-day. He who would bestow favours must himself be favoured. From whence and by what process these powers of patronage actually come has until now remained an Eleusinian mystery shrouded from the profane view of the patronized. But there is war in Eleusis and many of the initiate have been kicked out of the temple, a phenomenon which is not only painfully impressive to the fallen but also to those among whom they fall. An increased army of patron seekers, however dignified, leads to difficulties in the distribution of the favours. The halo departs from the head of the saint and the lustre from the love-feast. Things are found to be no longer what they once seemed. In short, it begins to be discovered that the capitalist is not in business either for his health or for philanthropic purposes, and that he *gives* at the pay-box, only because he previously *gets* in the workshop. For him the precept runs, "It is more blessed to give *less* than you receive, for this is the law of the *profits*." Wages and profits; around these two distinct items swing the lives of the two distinct classes in present-day society—the *wage-earning class* and the *profit-taking class*. Between these two classes there is a great and ever widening cleavage, an irrepressible struggle that can only end with the extinction of the economic conditions that produce this antagonistic relationship. The Trade-Union is the product of this class conflict. It is the economic weapon of the

wage-earners, all its imperfections cannot obscure the source of its birth—the wages system. The problem and the materials for solution arise and develop simultaneously from the same economic reality.



It is only when the foregoing economic facts are clearly understood that the scope and character of the Labour Movement becomes intelligible. It is seen to be nothing more or less than a movement

**The Line
of
Demarcation.**

of the wage-earning class marked off from the profit-taking class by the wages-system. The purpose of the Labour Movement is at once derived and defined from and by this system. The line of conflict that separates the sellers of labour-power from the buyers of labour-power in the workshop, the mine or the railroad, which separation finds its concrete expression in Trade-Union organization, on the one hand, and the Employers' Associations on the other, is the same line that separates the Labour Party from the Liberal and Tory Parties. Economic interests translate themselves into political interests. Industrial rule is faithfully reflected in political power. From top to bottom of the whole social structure this class cleavage extends. He who represents Labour represents the interests of the wage-earner. He who represents capital represents the interests of the capitalists. And by virtue of the irreconcilable antagonism that exists between those two categories of interests *no one can represent both.*



BUT let us to our logician, to whom both the functions of logic and language appear to be the prevention of thought. To him "representation" is the thing just as in a similar way "leather" was

**The
Representation
of Logic.**

to another ancient party. The *purpose* of Labour representation does not therefore trouble our "thinking man" who must post haste get down to fundamentals. That he never gets there does not matter. Intention is the thing. How far he realizes the intention (?) is of course irrelevant according to the "New Logic." "He circling goes who navigates a pond." To him the term Labour is unintelligible. To one who is troubled about who represents "the distinguished scholar," or whether J. T. Macpherson or Harold Cox represents "Labour," *Time* is the only doctor. It does not follow that because an individual is returned to Parliament even by wage-earners that he represents their interests. And yet that seems to be the "strange logic" of our still more strange logician. If it were true, then the

present Parliament and every one before it represents "Labour," because it has been "constitutionally and democratically elected." Granting this for sake of argument, who then represents "Capital"? Either it is not represented or the elected members represent both capital and labour. Which horn will you be impaled upon Mr. Logician? It is not "the turn of a vote that makes a man competent to represent" the wage-earning class, but the adoption and promotion of a special and independent policy. Hence the formation of an independent political organization opposed to both the orthodox parties in and out of Parliament. The wages-system is the touchstone to which *bona-fide* Labour Representation must ring true.



No one can deny that Labour Representation has many shortcomings. But these imperfections are not due to a lack of logic nor can they be overcome by a definition and a syllogism. Logic has its sphere of usefulness only when it takes its departure from the material reality and not from behind the curtains of temples or from the brains of logicians. The defects in Labour Representation are derived from defects in the Movement from which it takes its shape and draws its strength. The Trade Unions, although products of the class struggle, have until now only instinctively apprehended their class character. The uncontrollable nature of capitalist production obscures the working of laws, as assertive as that of gravitation, until the last act in the drama of its existence. Once these laws are observed, the real nature of the capitalist process stands revealed and all ideas of reforming the relations between the working class and the capitalist class fade away. The vendors of quack ointments guaranteed to remove the social evils are then no longer regarded as the "friends of the people," "progressives," &c. All these fantasies are eliminated from the domain of the Labour Movement with the growing consciousness of the worker that the social problem finds its cause in wage-labour and its solution in the abolition of wage-labour. Just in proportion to this development will the general policy of the Labour Movement and its Representation be relieved of the fantastic impedimenta of infancy. "To understand is to leave behind."

Of the whole rabble of thieves the fools are the worst, for they rob you of both time and peace of mind.—*Goethe*.

Easy Outlines of Economic Science

No. 10—Economic Rent.

IN orthodoxy the treatment of economic rent remains, with slight modifications (enfeebled and disguised as "producer's surplus" by the Utility School), just as Ricardo left it. We shall therefore summarize the Ricardian theory and afterwards summarize the Marxian contribution. This is all that can be done in a short article.

RICARDO'S THEORY :—"On the first settling of a country in which there is an abundance of rich and fertile land a very small proportion of which is required to be cultivated . . . there will be no rent. It is only . . . because land is not unlimited in quantity and uniform in quality, and because in the progress of population, land of an inferior quality, or less advantageously situated, is called into cultivation that rent is ever paid for the use of it." (*Principles* pp. 46-7.) There is only one price on the same market, so the produce of the least fertile land having to be sold, its price rules the market. Say that on the least fertile land £100 capital and labour (old style expression) will produce 2 quarters of wheat, while the same capital on the most fertile land produces 3 quarters of wheat. Then the difference, one quarter, will constitute—Rent. This will be paid to the landlord of the best land for the use "of the original and indestructible powers of the soil." No rent will be paid to landlord No. 2, until land of the third best quality is cultivated, which—assume—produce with £100 only 1 quarter. Then landlord No. 2, will get price of 1 quarter wheat as rent, while the rent of landlord No. 1, will rise to price of 2 quarters. "With every step in the progress of population which shall oblige a country to have recourse to land of a worse quality, to enable it to raise its supply of food, rent on all the more fertile land will rise (*Ibid*, p. 47). In short, the differences in the fertility of land constitutes—Rent. The same thing applies when additional capital is applied to the same piece of land. If £200 is applied to a piece of land where formerly only £100 was applied, the returns to "Capital and Labour" are not twice as much. If £300 is applied the return is proportionately still less, &c. This is called diminishing returns. The difference in the productivity of the several doses of capital also constitute Rent. Thus Ricardo!

MARX'S THEORY :—Rent passes through four successive stages, Labour Rent, Rent in kind, Money Rent, and Capitalist Ground Rent. The first three are merely modifications of each other, and indicate that society is passing through the successive stages of

slavery and serfdom, and Money Rent indicates agricultural production in capitalist society before it has been converted to the form adapted to the ruling mode of production. But Capitalist Ground Rent is distinctly marked from either of its predecessors, the difference being that in each of these earlier forms, rent was merely surplus value (as indeed it must be) whereas in Capitalist Ground Rent the rent is the surplus *over and above* the average rate of profit obtained in industrial production. The problem to Marx was:—Where does this surplus come from? Why this difference between agriculture and industry? Ricardo did not—could not—see the problem, as to him there was only one form of rent, viz. Capitalist Ground Rent, which had always existed since the "first settling of a country." Marx thoroughly analyses the whole of this difficult problem, and finds, contrary to Ricardo's idea, that there are two forms of rent (1) Differential Rent (the only kind known to Ricardo which we have stated in the summary of Ricardo's theory), and (2) Absolute Rent, which we shall explain, after criticizing the form of differential rent expounded by Ricardo. According to Ricardo cultivation proceeds from the most fertile to the least fertile soil (see *Ibid*, p. 49). Marx shows that this is unnecessary and gives historical examples to the contrary. Granting Ricardo's old-fashioned notion about the first "settling of a country," then fertility may well be of not so great importance as situation. The most fertile land may be so far away, and the means of transportation so undeveloped, that it would be more economical to cultivate the nearer though less fertile soil. Again, since the time of agricultural chemistry, fertility can to some extent be artificially acquired, and poorer soils thus become the most fertile soils. But even so, this point, so far as we have inquired, is of little importance, as a mistake of Ricardo, because competition would soon re-adjust matters.

But the next step of Ricardo's argument (showing the real importance of the criticism) goes on as follows:—"The best land being first cultivated pays *no rent* until the second best land is cultivated, when the difference is paid to landlord No. 1. The next best land brings landlord No. 2 into the rent receiving category, and so on *ad infinitum*. Here, then, we see the phenomenon of one land (the least fertile) paying no rent at all. Is this a signal instance of landlords' philanthropy? Whether or not, the absurdity has remained in economic science practically without question. Marx mentions the few cases, which have also been seized upon by some economists, where this strange state of affairs is possible:—(1) When the landlord becomes his own capitalist and cultivates the land himself (i.e. his labourers do), and (2) Where some parts of the land do pay a rent, and others do not, on account of differences in fertility in the same piece of land. But these examples are insufficient to explain the difficulty. To do this a term must be used which has not previously been

explained in these articles, and which can only now be briefly described. That term is the "Price of Production." The Marxian analysis concludes with the explanation that commodities are sold not at their values (except in certain cases) but at their Prices of Production, that is, the cost to the capitalist, plus the average rate of profit.

Example:—Commodity to be produced takes £80 machinery and raw material, and £20 wages = £100 cost to the capitalist. The average rate of profit—assumed—is 15 per cent. Then on the average that commodity is sold on the market at £115. Assume surplus value is 100 per cent, then £80 machinery and raw materials + £20 wages + £20 surplus value = £120, so Value would be £120, while Price of Production (market price average) would be £115. Value is reduced to Price of Production through the equalization by competition of all the separate capitals engaged in social production (otherwise capitalist production could not exist). Now the rise of Capitalism in industrial production found a great difficulty in trying to convert agriculture to its own methods. That difficulty was the pressure of the landlord. The peasant or serf had always paid his surplus produce to the landlord, who was not likely to forego his due.

How to make the farm into a factory and the farmer into a capitalist employing labourers and yet pay compensation to the landlord? No capitalist would employ his capital in agriculture unless he could receive the same average profit that he could get in industry. But Capital is the lord of production and agriculture must become capitalist. The workers' means of subsistence comes largely from agricultural products. It is therefore of paramount importance that these products be cheapened so that wages can in consequence be also cheapened, and therefore profits be increased. The price to be paid for this is—Capitalist Ground Rent. This takes place in the following way. The profits made on agricultural capital *does not enter into the equalization of profits* as is the case with industrial capital. In agriculture the proportion per £100 paid in wages may be considered to be larger than in industry. This means that surplus value (which is reckoned on wages or variable capital) is therefore greater. The capitalist farmer exacts his average rate of profit, but the surplus over this average, instead of entering into the general equalization of profit, and so increasing the average rate, has to be handed over to the landlord. Thus the landlord levies his toll on capitalism, which is at the bottom of antagonism between Lloyd George and Balfour over the present Budget (see their speeches).

This answers the problem as regards the differential rent, and we can say more fully than Ricardo could, that though the differential rent is based on differences of fertility of soils, yet rent is due to the

action of competition in social production. "Rent comes from society not from the soil." But we were considering the phenomenon of rentless land. What is the state of affairs as regards the worse land—the so-called no-rent land? This is the problem of Absolute as distinct from Differential Rent. We have shown that the proportion per £100 paid in wages may be greater in agriculture than in industry. This means that the individual Price of Production is lower to the capitalist farmer than it is to the industrial capitalist, assume, as before, agricultural product = £120 in value. Price of Production = £115. But Price of Production on same composition of capital in industry is, say £118. So on the market the price is £118. The difference, or £3, is paid to the landlord of the worst soil, (absolute rent) and in consequence is added to the differential rent of the more productive soils. While £2, i.e. the difference between the social price of production £118, and the value of the commodity £120, enters into the general equalization process.* Thus there is no rentless land except in the imagination of orthodoxy, where in time it will stand as one of the most prominent of superstitions evolved by a science that tries to serve the God of Science and the Mammon of Capitalism at the same time.

This is only the barest of outlines and those who desire to enter more deeply into the marvellous analysis of Marx (one of his most exhaustive and elaborate) should consult the third volume which can now be obtained in English for about six shillings.

The answer to the problem which we started out with then is:— That surplus profit which becomes rent has as its basis (1) the different fertility of the soil acting on the equalized market price through competition, and (2) the escape of the landlord from the equalization of profit to an average rate on capital applied to his land. This is the cause of rent and of the consequent antagonism between landlord and capitalist, and ought to make clear many of our present political squabbles. As Marx admirably expresses it— "We can understand such economists as Mill, Cherbulliez, Hillditch and others, demanding that rent should be handed over to the State to be used for the remission of taxation. That is only the frank expression of the hate which the industrial capitalist feels for the landed proprietor, who appears to him as a useless incumbrance, a superfluity in the otherwise harmonious whole of bourgeois production."

NOAH ABLETT.

Next Month :—*The Great (?) Contradiction.*

*Whether this £2 will or not enter into the general equalization depends upon supply and demand. If rent equals excess of value over price of production not a penny will enter into equalization. For a fuller explanation see Vol. III., *Capital*, p. 885.

Education and Progress

ADDRESS BY PROF. LESTER F. WARD

(Brown University, U.S.A.)

At the Annual Meet of the "PLEBS" LEAGUE, Aug. 2nd, 1909.

(Continued)

IT may be said that I have worked that out theoretically; it is not entirely theoretical. I have observed as long as I have lived; but I have never had brought before me any facts that showed with such power and cogency the demonstration of that principle as my experience of the last two days and these last few moments before this audience.

Of course you cannot help seeing the bearing of all this upon the problem of education, but you will all remember—those of you who read my old *Dynamic Sociology* of 1883 know—what I mean by education, because education is not the same thing with me at all as it is with Oxford University. Education with me is exactly that one thing, of imparting to the great mass of mankind, all mankind, an equal amount of the essential knowledge that has been brought into the world.

When you all have that there will be no social classes. Social classes are artificial; they are all made by man; they are all the products of social organization and social phenomena. They are all natural in one sense, in the sense that they have to be, the same as everything else has to be; they have been produced, but they are not natural conditions. Social classes are all artificial. I will go farther, and say that social classes are based entirely—of course you will see the large ellipsis I have to make here—upon inequalities in intelligence, and are the effects of those artificial inequalities of intelligence on different classes of mankind—on different men.

These inequalities tend, necessarily and essentially from their very nature, to produce social stratification; in fact, artificial inequalities have what I call a vertical effect on the stratification of society, raising one man above another in a similar manner to the geological strata of the globe laid down in the sedimentary rocks. That is what happens under existing social conditions and which constitutes the difference between the amount of intelligence possessed by different individuals.

I have said I have come to the conclusion that there is no difference in the native capacity of mankind so far as classes are concerned ; that all mankind are equal ; that the brain power of the world is the same at every level ; even the lowest slaves and serfs that have ever existed on the globe have the same power for exercising their faculties, the same faculties as those who have had them under control, those who have owned them, those who have whipped and flogged them, those who have robbed them of their rights and liberty—there is no difference.

It is sometimes maintained ; it has been a stock argument ; that if we were to abolish the social classes, it would only be a question of time when the natural inequalities of mankind would bring about a stratification such as existed before. There is nothing more false in the whole domain of social sophism. One single fact will show it ; you have here in England—and there have always been here and in all countries where they have had higher and lower classes of society—these inequalities, these natural inequalities, in the higher classes just as much as in the lower. You know perfectly well that a man being a lord of England does not ensure his being a philosopher ; and I make bold to say that there is just as much difference in the higher classes, in your nobility, as there is in the lowest strata of your people, the common day labourer who has not so much as the skill of a trade—they all differ.

You ask me, do I deny natural inequalities ? Not at all ; I admit their influence much farther than those who maintain that they are the cause of social stratification. The great value of human life resides in the fact that the native capacities of mankind differ. And the simple answer is this : that the differences are qualitative and not quantitative. If every man had exactly the same kind of mind as every other man, the world would only have done one thing. But there are millions of men with different kinds of minds, and the consequence is that they have done millions of different things ; and that is what I mean by asserting the intellectual equality of mankind, whilst maintaining the essential natural inequalities of mind. There are inequalities in the qualities of minds, and a great number of different kinds of minds ; and if we were only supplied with data for exercising those minds we should have in them the bulwark of progress.

I use for the opposite of the natural inequalities the term horizontal, in distinction from the analogy of stratification, as, instead of producing a stratification, the tendency of the natural inequalities is to broaden out the functions and activities of mankind so that every object in the world will be looked into, everything in the world will be heard and seen and known ; every thought of the world will be brought out, and the progress of the world will be a broad swath which sweeps over the whole of creation.

If I knew how many persons there were in this room I could tell how many different kinds of minds there were in this room ; and, as all minds differ, every one will do something that no one else has done, and so broaden the course of human progress. That is what I mean by natural inequalities ; and if there were no social inequalities there would be nothing to interfere with the full exercise of all those capacities of all mankind.

If we look at the question from this point of view, we can readily see what this great natural principle of inequality, or, as I call it, intellectual individuality, or individuality in achievement, is. Achievement has been the result of the immense individuality that has entered into it, due to the vast number and the great difference of human minds.

Now, the only thing that is needed is that all these minds shall be supplied with the means for their exercise. Human minds—admitting again for the sake of argument that these inequalities of the human mind exist—differ entirely in what they hold and not in what they are ; and therefore, the great effort is to supply all minds with all knowledge. Of course you know that that is an ideal, but I adhere to that expression ; that all mankind should possess all knowledge. I have not time here for the explanation of what I mean by universality, nor can I say now what I mean by universal education ; but it is the same thing : a curriculum should actually embrace all the knowledge of the world.

I had intended to go into some other points, but the time is too short. One of these points refers to the proposition that all mankind are equally capable, no matter what position the social conditions may have placed the individual in. I will refer to two, and only two, further points. In the first place, the hereditarian philosophers ; those who preach eugenics, and teach heredity, and insist upon an increase in the calibre of mankind : all admit that there have been self-made men all through history, and that there are hundreds of them at the present time. By self-made men they mean men who have risen from the lowest ranks of life to the very highest. What does that mean ? It means that down in the very lowest ranks there are just as good brains as in the highest.

The second great proof, for any one who has studied the history of the world, is obtained from history itself. It is from the study of history that we have the knowledge that we now possess of these artificial social classes that have existed during human history. In Greece, at the time of its highest splendour, there were at least ten slaves to one freeman, probably more ; in Rome it was about the same. What has become of those slaves ? They are now in the other classes of society, they are completely mingled. What became of all the slaves of Europe when slavery and serfdom were abolished ? They have all been mingled with the other classes of society. And

have they not shown the same ability as their masters did before them? History shows nothing else more clearly than this: that class after class has been rising, one class after another; and the lower classes taking the powers of social organization under their control, taking the reins of human life in their hands, supplanting the other classes.

I trace it back to the system of caste in India, and I have shown that the classes of the eighteenth century were nothing but the holdovers of the old system of caste; that the lords spiritual and the lords temporal were nothing but the representatives of the Brahmins and the Kshatriyas, the spiritual caste and the warrior caste. Those classes have always existed; they existed down to the eighteenth century, and exist in some form to-day in some parts of Europe.

Then take the middle class: that class became, even in India, the business class of society; but in modern Europe that business class took the form of what are called in France the *bourgeoisie*, what you call in England the commons, and they gained the mastery. You know that the middle class, the third estate, came forward and assumed the power in society, and has held that power ever since. The third estate to-day contains and holds the brains of the world.

Many think the present social movement has to do with the French Revolution, that it is a verification of the old falsehood that history repeats itself. Nothing of the kind; the French Revolution had nothing to do with the fourth estate; it was carried on exclusively in the interests of the third estate. To quote Abbé Siéyès: "What is the third estate? Everything. What does it possess? Nothing. What does it desire? To become something." Before the French Revolution the third estate was nothing; it is everything to-day. The rise of the third estate was the French Revolution, and it was a grand work; and it showed that the third estate was capable of supplanting the first and second estates, and it has done so in France. What is the movement to-day? It is nothing but the same great movement. The first and second estates were supplanted by the third, and now the fourth estate is coming on and will ere long supplant the third estate. What do we hear all over the world? Nothing but the subterranean roar of that great mass of mankind, infinitely larger numerically than all the other classes put together; that class is rumbling and seething and working, and coming to consciousness; and when they do come to consciousness they will take the reins of power in their hands, and then will have been abolished the last of all the social classes.

Millionaires who laugh are rare.—*Carnegie.*

The senses do not deceive, it is the judgment that deceives.—*Goethe.*

Mr. Seed in the following articles, is presenting the material which had to be kept out of the pamphlet "THE BURNING QUESTION OF EDUCATION" on account of space.—Ed.

The Case against Ruskin College

Proved by Documentary Evidence

I.—THE TWO TENDENCIES

TWO parties have been struggling for the upper hand at Ruskin College ever since its foundation ten years ago. The ideal of the founders was, in the broadest sense of the word, a Socialist one, although their perfectly tolerant spirit welcomed the co-operation of any one who professed a desire to promote the education of working people on lines which would assist them "to raise, but not to rise out of their class." In this way they early attracted many with whom they had no kinship of spirit. In consequence two tendencies have been apparent from the outset. The late Professor York Powell presided at the opening ceremony, and his speech was in marked contrast to those of the founders and of the Labour men. The Professor gently reproved the critics of Ruskin Hall, as it was then called, remarking that at their commencement the other Colleges, now so beautiful in the eyes of these very critics, were innovations, and none could have prophesied their future. Mr. Walter Vrooman, who was the leading spirit at that time, gave nobody any excuse for thinking that he expected the new institution to follow in the footsteps of the University. He predicted that its students would be taught "methodically and scientifically to possess the world, to refashion it, and to co-operate with the power behind evolution in making it the joyous abode of, if not a perfected humanity, at least a humanity earnestly and rationally striving towards perfection." "The Ruskin students come to Oxford," he continued, "not as mendicant pilgrims go to Jerusalem, to worship at her ancient shrines and marvel at her sacred relics, but as Paul went to Rome, to conquer in a battle of ideals." The Socialistic speech of Mr. James Sexton and the presence of Mr. G. H. Roberts (now M.P. for Norwich), Mr. Ben Tillett, Mr. Dan Irving, and other Labour leaders showed that the Labour Movement understood Ruskin Hall to be a very different institution from the other Oxford Colleges so far as its ideals and probable future developments were concerned.

In the early years no attempt was made to dissociate the Hall from the Labour Movement, not even in political matters, a glaring contrast to the present attitude of the Council. An Oxford Labour Party was formed at a meeting convened by Mr. Lees-Smith at Ruskin Hall, and that gentleman acted as secretary to the new party. He is now standing as Liberal candidate for Northampton in opposition to Mr. Harry Quelch.

As time went on the institution had to depend less and less on the support of the founders, and when that was entirely withdrawn it had to depend on money subscribed by trade unions and upon private individuals, chiefly the latter. This may account for the fact that the Labour note became fainter and fainter both in *Young Oxford*, the unofficial journal of the movement, and in the teaching of the College. In *Y. O.* for September, 1901, only two years after the foundation of the institution, Mr. J. M. K. MacLachlan, of the I. L. P., drew attention to the drift of things in an article which does great credit to his far-sightedness. About the time that *Young Oxford* disappeared a circular was sent round to the University asking for subscriptions. It was signed by three of the most influential Professors (Goudy, Powell, and Edward Caird), who had interested themselves in the institution. This appeal, however, failed, and in the following March a letter was sent out by the Trade Union Congress Parliamentary Committee asking the constituent bodies to support the College. "Now for the first time in history," it declared, "there is a college at Oxford whose purpose it is to equip those who wish to serve in any section of the Labour Movement with a grounding in Labour problems as complete as that hitherto obtained only by the privileged few." The letter continued as follows :—

"You will see from the Booklet we enclose that Ruskin College has been incorporated by the Board of Trade and its supreme management vested in a Council consisting of representatives of the Trade Union Congress, the Co-operative Union, the Amalgamated Society of Engineers, and the London Trades Council, together with other prominent leaders of the Labour Movement and educational authorities. By this means it is ensured that the College cannot depart from its original object and that public confidence cannot be abused.

"The bulk of the money for the foundation and the support of Ruskin College has hitherto come from private friends; *but we, as representatives of the various branches of the Labour Movement, feel that the time has now come for the Labour Movement itself to take the College in hand and make it an assured success. Now that Labour is showing that it is determined to take its rightful position in the country, it more than ever needs the knowledge and training necessary to maintain that position. There can be therefore no better investment for our*

money than the maintainance of the Labour College. Ruskin College is one of the greatest assets in the Labour Movement, and the Labour Movement must show that it understands the value of education.

"If this appeal meets with an adequate response from the Labour Movement, the Council of the College will be able to build a college for us, as well equipped for all practical work as any of the historic colleges of Oxford.

"The recent attack on the Trades Union and Co-operative Movement, copied, as it was, by a large part of the Provincial Press, and followed, as it was, by an equally embittered attack on municipal enterprise, enhances the urgent necessity of Ruskin College being utilized by the workers. The effect of from 25 to 50 men with sound economic knowledge, with true ideas of citizenship, with a power to express such clearly as a result of their residence at Ruskin College will prove of incalculable value in advancing the cause of the worker when they get back to their workshop, when attending Trade Union, Trade Council, Congress, Conference, or General Meeting of a Co-operative Society."

Needless to say a totally different impression as to the whole purpose and tendency of the institution was intended to be created by the appeal which went forth to the University. No Professor in Oxford would put his name to an appeal for an institution which was intended to strengthen the Labour Movement. In succeeding articles I hope to give even more flagrant instances of this duplicity.

WILLIAM H. SEED, *Ex-Student.*

Let us beware of losing our enthusiasm.—*Brooks*

A grievance never disappears. You can muzzle it, you can hide it, but you cannot destroy except by curing it.—*W. L. George.*

You need not be a bookworm because you are a book-lover.—*Anthony Hope.*

It is not given to the most impartial man to be a proper judge in his own case.—*Blaise Pascal.*

There are numbers of people who read merely that they need not think.—*Lichtenberg.*

'Tis with our judgment as with our watches,
None go just alike, yet each believes his own.—*Pope.*

Fight On

THE crush of the city is in my heart
 Like the voice of a long North night,
 And fear-spent eyes like an icy dart
 Chill my own sick heart with fright.
 'Tis a fear of the end, of the flitting years,
 Of a time when smiles are few ;
 When my own spent eyes are a mist of tears,
 And all life is a bitter rue.
 'Tis a dreary fight, 'tis a fight to death,
 Yet the heart cries out in a sobbing breath,
 "Fight On!"

The crush of the city is in my breast
 Like the surge of a turbulent sea ;
 The hopeless hurry, the white unrest
 Blast the hope in the heart of me :—
 What use to toil with a nerveless hand
 In a day so blight with woe ?
 And how may the hope of an afterland
 Steal the sting of a world we know,
 When the end so near is fraught with death ?—
 Yet the heart cries out in a sobbing breath,
 "Fight On!"

The crush of the city is hushed and still,
 But the darkness is aflame
 With the flashing lights from a tireless mill,
 Which hums in the slumbrous air.—
 Grind on, you wheels, till the remnant soul
 Is lost in the rattle and hate !
 Toil on, you men, till the funeral toll
 Sounds the last cold knell of fate !
 For we're all in the fight, 'tis a fight to death,
 And we all will sob in the last short breath,
 "Fight On!"

ERIC DALE.

Correspondence

[The following letter has been sent to the Amalgamated Society of Engineers' General Secretary. No reply has been received. Ed.]

CENTRAL LABOUR COLLEGE,
3 BRADMORE ROAD, OXFORD.

24-11-09.

DEAR SIR,

One of your Sheffield Branches have had forwarded to me a copy of the article that appears in the November number of the *A. S. E. Report* on the Ruskin College dispute, with a request that an answer be forwarded for the consideration of the Branch. Some of the statements contained in the *Report* are made in such a way as to create a false impression. Others are *absolutely false*. Your members have a right to know the *truth*. I am therefore asking if your E. C. would permit me the use of a few pages in the next month's number of the *Journal* to reply to the writer of "R. C." article. I also formally challenge your E. C. member, Mr. A. Taylor—the writer of the article—through you, to meet me before any branch or district of the A. S. E. to discuss the points raised in the article.

Yours faithfully

MR. JENKIN JONES,
Gen. Sec. A. S. E.

GEO. SIMS.

Reports

FELLOW PLEBS,—Just a few lines to indicate the support that the C.L.C. is gathering in the Operative Bricklayers' Society, to which I belong. A few words are necessary as to our relation to Ruskin College. About two years ago we voted on, and carried, a penny levy to send students to Ruskin College. However, just as we were selecting them, the plaintiff in The Osborne *versus* Amalgamated Society Railway Servants' case won an appeal. Our Council at once met and decided to cease the levying and collection and distribution of all political funds. Our educational levy was brought under this head. Our officials have retreated at the first firing of the enemies' guns. Since then the Ruskin College crisis has resulted in the establishment of a new and definite Labour College. Therefore, a few of us have provoked a discussion on the question of transferring our levy and fund (now some £200) to the Central Labour College. Various letters have appeared in our monthly Trade circular, and we have been rewarded by branches sending up resolutions asking a vote to give effect to the transference. I have visited a few London branches, and especially addressed them on this question. At each meeting the keynote has been,—direct Labour control. If bricklayer Plebeians will persist in demanding a vote we shall soon be enrolled on the scroll of the Central Labour College. At the meetings I have disposed of five dozen of the Burning Question. Now Bricklayer Plebeians a good strong pull and we shall win.

B. T. AMES, London.

A NEW SOCIETY

THE NEW ERA UNION recently started in Abertillery, Monmouth, is of sufficient interest to call for a short notice in the magazine, and to interest our readers. It was founded by Mr. J. Morris Evans, formerly a local Baptist Minister, whose ideas of social service were evidently too broad to permit of them being attempted within the bounds of his ministerial work. Hence the formation of the New Era Union, whose aims and principles are as follows :

Its Aims :—The application of the best knowledge, energies, and methods to the perfecting of humanity *Its Principles* :—The Religion and Government of the people, by the people, for the people. *Its Laws* :—The Rules of Right add Reason. *Its Membership* :—The membership of the Union is open to all who are willing to co-operate with its Aims, Principles, and Laws. *Its Management* :—The management of the Union shall be vested in a Council, consisting of the Superintendent, Secretary, Treasurer, and seven members elected by the ballot of the members annually.

The plan of organization is simple—but ambitious. There are seven departments, e.g. Social Work, Literary, Publicity, &c. Each member of the Council is Chairman of one these, in addition each department has its own secretary, treasurer, and committee, whose work is reported to the Council from time to time by the Chairman.

One part of the work will particularly interest all "Plebs," that is Educational Classes. Mr. Morris Evans is taking one class, the text-book in this being *The Origin of the Family*, by the late F. Engels ; Mr. Edward Gill of the "Plebs" is taking a class in Economics, the text-book being *Marxian Economics*, by Ernest Untermann. These classes therefore have quite an international flavour—books by Germans, published in America, (Kerr & Co., Chicago), and classes in Wales.

The success of the movement seems assured if we can judge by the powerful backing it has received from the local organized Labour Movement, some notable leaders being among those who are taking a prominent part in the work.

By the Way

League Membership Subscriptions are again due. Cards of membership will be issued to members on receipt of the nimble "bob." Will branch secretaries please note ?

Bound volumes of the Magazine for the year will be ready early in January. Will all members desiring same please notify the Editor as early as possible? The price of Volume I will be three shillings, bound in half leather.

A seasonable present for the League would be a lengthy addition to the list of members who have paid the Special Levy.

We wish all the Members of the League and all our readers the Compliments of the Season.

THE GOLD SICKLE,

OR

Hena, the Virgin of the Isle of Sen

A TALE OF DRUID GAUL

BY EUGENE SUE,

Translated from the Original French by DANIEL DE LEON.

CHAPTER VIII.—*Continued.*

JOEL did as ordered by the stranger in the name of the druids of Karnak. The call was carried from mouth to mouth, from the nearest to the most distant tribes; all were notified to meet that evening in the forest of Karnak when the moon rose.

While some of the brenn's family were hurriedly gathering in the wheat harvest that still remained heaped on the fields, in order to deposit a portion of it in cellars that the labourers were digging on dry ground, the women, the girls and even the children, all working under the direction of Margarid, were as busily engaged disposing of salted meats into baskets, flour into bags, hydromel and wine into pouches; others were filling coffers with lint and balsam for wounds; others were adjusting broad and strong tent cloths over the chariots. In all wars considered dangerous, the tribes threatened by the enemy, instead of waiting for, usually went out to meet him. The houses were abandoned; the field oxen were hitched to the war-chariots, all of which contained the women, the children, the clothes and the provisions of the combatants. The horses, ridden by the full grown men of the tribe, constituted the cavalry. The young men, being more agile, went on foot as an armed escort. The grain was hidden away; the cattle, let loose, pastured where they pleased and returned instinctively every evening to their usual stables. Generally, the wolves and bears devoured a part. The fields remained untended and scarcity followed. Often the combatants who went to war in defence of their country, encouraged by the presence of their wives and children, and having nothing to expect from the enemy but disgrace, slavery or death, drove back the invader beyond their frontiers, and returned home to repair the disasters of the fields.

Knowing that his daughter was due at the house, Joel returned home towards sun-down. He also expected to be able to take a hand in the preparations for the war,

Hena, the virgin of the Isle of Sen, soon arrived. When her father, mother and other relatives saw her enter it seemed to them never before had she been so beautiful. Never before did her father feel so proud of his daughter. The long black tunic that she wore was held around her waist by a brass belt, from which, on one side, hung a little gold sickle, and on the other a crescent in the shape of the waning moon. Hena had dressed herself with special care in honour of the celebration of her birthday. A necklace and gold bracelets inlaid with garnets ornamented her arms and neck, whiter than the driven snow. When she took off her caped cloak it was noticed that she wore, as ever at religious ceremonies, a crown of green oak leaves on her blonde hair, plaited in braids over her chaste and mild forehead. The blue of the sea, when lying calmly under a clear sky, was not purer than the blue of Hena's eyes.

The brenn stretched out his arms to his daughter. She ran into them joyously and offered him her forehead, as she also did her mother. The children of the family loved Hena dearly and contested with each other the privilege of being the first to kiss her hands—sought with greed by all the little innocent mouths. Even old Deber-Trud gamboled and barked with joy at the arrival of his young mistress.

Albinik the mariner was the first to whom Hena offered her forehead to kiss after her father and mother; she had not seen her brother for a long time. Next came the turn of Guilhern and Mikael and then the swarm of children, whom, stooping to them, Hena, sought to hold all together in one embrace. The young priestess then tenderly greeted Henory, her brother Guilhern's wife, and expressed regret at not seeing Albinik's wife Meroë. Nor were the other relatives forgotten; all, down to Stumpy, otherwise every one's butt, had a kind word from her.

The general exchange of greetings being over, and happy at finding herself among her own, in the house where she was born eighteen years before, Hena sat down at her mother's feet on the same stool that she used to occupy when a child. When she saw her child seated at her feet, Mamm' Margarid called the maid's attention to the disorder that reigned in the house due to the preparations for war, and she said sadly :

"We should have celebrated this day of your birth with joy and tranquility, dear child! Instead, you now find confusion and alarm in our house that soon will be deserted . . . War threatens."

"Mother is right," answered Hena sighing; "Great is the anger of Hesus."

"And what say you, dear child, you who are a saint," inquired Joel, "a saint of the Isle of Sen? What must we do to appease the wrath of the All-Powerful?"

"My father and mother honour me too much by calling me a saint," answered the young virgin. "Like the druids, myself and my female companions have meditated all night under the shadows of the sacred oak-trees at the hour of moon rise. We search for the simplest and divinest principles, and seek to spread them among our fellow-beings. We adore the All-Powerful in His works, from the mighty oak that is sacred to Him, down to the humble moss that grows on the rocks of our isle; from the stars, whose eternal course we study, down to the insect that is born and dies in one day; from the sourceless sea, down to the streamlet of water that glides under the grass. We search for the cure of diseases that cause pain, and we glorify those among our fathers and mothers who have shed lustre upon Gaul. By the knowledge of the auguries and the study of the past, we seek to forsee the future to the end of enlightening those who are less clear-sighted than ourselves. Finally, like the druids, we teach childhood, we inspire the child with an ardent love of our common and beloved fatherland—so threatened to-day by the wrath of Hesus, a wrath that comes down upon them because they have forgotten that *they are all the children of the same God*, and that a brother must resent the wound inflicted upon his brother."

"The stranger who was our guest and whom this morning I took to the Isle of Sen," replied the brenn, "spoke to us as you do, dear daughter."

"My father and mother may listen as sacred words to the words of the Chief of the Hundred Valleys. Hesus and love for Gaul inspire him. He is brave among the bravest."

"He! Is he the Chief of the Hundred Valleys?" exclaimed Joel. "He refused to give me his name! Do you know it, daughter? Do you know which is his native province?"

"He was impatiently waited for yesterday evening at the Isle of Sen by the venerable Taliessin. As to his name, all that I am free to say to my father and mother is that the day on which our country should be subjugated will also be the day when the Chief of the Hundred Valleys will see the last drop of his blood flow from his veins. May the wrath of Hesus spare us that disastrous day!"

"Oh, my daughter, if Hesus is angry, how are we to appease him?"

"By obeying the law. He has said—*all men are the children of one God*. By offering to him human sacrifices . . . May those that are to be offered to-night calm his wrath."

"The sacrifices of to-night?" asked the brenn; "which are they?"

"Do not my father and mother know that to-night, when the moon rises, there will be three human sacrifices at the stones of the forest of Karnak?"

"We know," answered Joel, that all the tribes have been convened to appear this evening at the forest of Karnak. But who are the people that are to be sacrificed and will be pleasing to Hesus, dear daughter?"

"First of all Daoulas the murderer: he killed Houarne without a fight and in his sleep. The druids have sentenced him to die this evening. The blood of a cowardly murderer is an expiation agreeable to Hesus."

"And the second sacrifice?"

"Our relative Julyan wishes, out of friendship, to rejoin Armel, whom he loyally killed in a contest. This evening, glorified by the chant of the bards, he will go, agreeable to his vow, and join Armel in the unknown worlds, The blood of a brave man, voluntarily offered to Hesus, is agreeable to him."

"And the third sacrifice, dear child?" asked Mamm' Margarid "Who is it?"

Hena did not answer. She dropped her blonde and charming head upon the knees of Margarid, remained a while in a reverie, kissed her mother's hands and said to her with a sweet smile that brought back old remembrances:

"How often did not little Hena, when still a child, fall asleep of an evening on your knees, mother, while you spun at your distaff, and when all of you now present, except Albinik, were gathered at the hearth, narrating the virile virtues of our mothers and our fathers of old!"

"It is true, dear daughter," answered Margarid caressingly passing her hand over the blonde hair of her child; "it is true. And here among us we all loved you so much for your good heart and your infantine grace, that when we saw you had fallen asleep on my knees, we all spoke in a low voice not to awake you."

Stumpy, who was among the crowd of relatives, put in:

"But who is that third human sacrifice, that is to appease Hesus and deliver us from war? Who, Hena is the third to be sacrificed this evening?"

"I shall tell you, Stumpy, when I shall have had a little time to meditate upon the past," answered the young maid dreamily, without leaving her mother's knees; and passing her hand over her forehead as if to refreshen her memory, she looked around, pointed to the stone where stood the copper bowl with the seven twigs of mistletoe and proceeded saying:

"When I was twelve, do my father and mother remember how happy I was at having been selected by the female druids of the Isle of Sen to receive in a veil of linen, whitened in the dew of night, the mistletoe which the druids cut with a gold sickle at the moment when the moon shed its clearest light? Do my father and mother remember how, bringing home the mistletoe to sanctify our home, I was taken hither by the ewaghs in a chariot decked with flowers and greens while the bards sang the glory of Hesus? What tender embraces did not my whole family lavish upon me at my return! What a feast it was in our tribe!"

"Dear, dear daughter," said Margarid, pressing Hena's head against her maternal breast, "if the female druids chose you to receive the sacred mistletoe in a linen veil, it was because your soul was as pure as the veil."

"It was because little Hena was the bravest of all her companions, she almost perished in the attempt to save Janed, the daughter of Wor, who, as she was gathering shells on the rocks along the shore of Glen'-Hek, fell into the water and was being carried away by the waves," said Mikael the armourer, tenderly contemplating his sister.

"It was because, beyond all others, little Hena was sweet, patient and kind to the children; it was because, when only twelve, she instructed them like a matron at the cottage of the female druids of the Isle of Sen," said Guilhern in his turn.

The daughter of Joel blushed with modesty at the words of her mother and brothers; but Stumpy insisted:

"But who is that third human sacrifice that is to appease Hesus and deliver us from war? Who is it, Hena, who is it to be sacrificed this evening?"

"I shall tell you, Stumpy," answered the young maid rising; "I shall tell you after I have once more looked at the dear little chamber where I used to sleep when, having grown unto maidenhood, I came here from the Isle of Sen to attend our family feasts." And stepping towards the door of the chamber, she stopped for a moment at the threshold and said:

"What sweet nights have I spent there after retiring for the evening, regretful of leaving you! With what impatience did I not rise in the morning to meet you again!"

Taking two steps into the little chamber, while her family felt ever more astonished at hearing Hena, still so young, thus dwell upon the past, the young maid proceeded, taking up several articles that lay upon a little table:

"This is the sea-shell necklace that I entertained myself making in the evening sitting beside my mother . . . These are the little dried twigs that resemble trees, and that I gathered from our

rocks . . . This is the net which I used when the tide was going out to catch little fishes with ; how the sport used to amuse me ! . . . There are the rolls of white skin on which, every time I came here, I recorded my joy at meeting my relatives and again seeing the house of my birth . . . I find everything in its place. I am glad of having gathered these young girl's treasures."

Stumpy, however, whom these mementos did not seem to affect, again repeated in his sour and impatient voice :

" But who is to be the third human sacrifice that it is to appease Hesus and deliver us from war ? Who, Hena, is to be sacrificed this evening ? "

" I shall let you know, Stumpy," answered Hena smiling. " I shall let you know after I shall have distributed my little treasures among you all,—you among them, Stumpy."

Saying this, the daughter of the brenn motioned to her relatives to enter the chamber, and in midst of the silent astonishment of all she gave a souvenir to each. Each, even of the little ones who loved her so much, and also Stumpy, received something. In order to make her gifts reach around, she loosened the sea-shell necklace and split up the dry twigs, saying in her sweet voice to each :

" Keep this, I pray you, out of friendship for Hena, your relative and friend."

" Joel, his wife and three children, to all of whom Hena had not yet given aught, looked at one another all the more astonished at what she did, seeing that towards the end tears appeared in her eyes although the young maid gave no other token of sadness. When all the others were supplied, Hena took from her neck the garnet necklace that she wore and said to Margarid while kissing her hand :

" Hena prays her mother to keep this out of love for her."

She then took the little white skin that had been prepared for writing on, handed them to Joel and kissing his hand said :

" Hena prays her father to keep this roll out of love for her ; he will there find her most cherished thoughts."

Detaching thereupon from her arm her two garnet bracelets, Hena said to the wife of her brother Guilhern, the labourer :

" Hena prays her sister Henry to wear this bracelet out of love for her."

And giving the other bracelet to her brother the mariner she said :

" Your wife, Meroë, whom I love as much for her courage as for her noble heart, is to keep this bracelet as a souvenir from me."

(To be continued)