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THE SOCIALISM OF KARL MARX.

PART I.

KARL MARX, THE SOCIALIST.
1818-1883.

I.

YOUTHFUL DAYS.

At number 664 Bruckergasse, in the ancient town of Treves, Karl Marx was born on Tuesday, May 5th, 1818.

Karl Marx, whose name has become world-known, whose theories have become the rock-basis of modern Socialism, was the second child of Heinrich and Henriette Marx. His father, Heinrich Marx, was a lawyer of Jewish birth, a descendant of a long line of Rabbis, and an official of the Prussian Government, as well as a Justice of the Peace. Heinrich Marx was a man of intellect, possessing culture and knowledge, but yet, as might be expected of one in his position, he was a loyal Conservative and a patriotic upholder of the Prussian State. He represented a type common among a section of the middle class—a type breathing kindness, culture, and broadmindedness on his intellectual side and in his home circle; but outside of that, in the harsh world of everyday existence, was dominated by the "practical side" of things—the "hard cash basis." Really a liberal by virtue of thought and reading, but a tory because of the worldly advantage accruing therefrom.

In this atmosphere of cultured thought and worldly wisdom young Marx was reared. His father, though never backward in urging his son to strive ever for social advancement—to get sufficient of the "cursed" but all-necessary gold—yet led the boy through the shining gates of the world of beautiful, daring thoughts. The youthful Karl was allowed and encouraged to read the masterpieces of Voltaire, Rousseau, Liebnitz, Goethe, Homer, Shakespeare, Lessing, Cervantes, and Dante, etc., etc.

The influence of this broad educational policy must undoubtedly have influenced the thoughts of the future philosopher of Socialism. At the age of sixteen Karl graduated at the high school at Treves, earning the praise of masters and parents for the thoroughness of his studies and his accomplishments. He entered the University of Bonn in 1834, ostensibly to study for the legal profession—for his father had great hopes that his son might become a great luminary in the legal world—but the heart of the youthful student was not in his studies. He detested jurisprudence, and so spent his time at Bonn in
youthful escapades and follies and in weaving the romantic pictures of illusioned youth. Disappointed with his son’s year at Bonn, the father transferred him to the University of Berlin, urging him to take up such serious studies that would befit him for a place in the social world.

About this time there came into the life of Karl that dawning instinct of love that comes ever into the life of normal youth. The object of Karl’s affection was the beautiful and gentle Jenny Von Westphalen, daughter of Baron Von Westphalen, an official of the Prussian Government and a close friend of the Marx family. This charming girl was four years older than Karl, and her family occupied a higher social position than did Marx’s family, but youthful love and impetuosity will not be denied, and so before Karl left home for Berlin he and Jenny had pledged their troth in secret.

At Berlin, Marx made but mixed progress. He worked hard but studied irregular. He hated legal study, but delighted in wandering through the realms of philosophy, metaphysical speculation, and historical and literary romanticism. But all this led to no practical result. Marx studied, read, and dreamed. He sketched out great plans of future success as poet, as author, as dramatist, and indeed scribbled volumes of poetry, novels, plays, and essays, but could not bring himself to pass the necessary college examinations and earn the academic degrees that would open up a practical career. His father became vexed at his unworldly son dreaming and bemusing his time away, and many angry letters Marx senior wrote to his son reproaching him for his conduct.
THE MAKING OF A REVOLUTIONARY.

Karl himself, far from being careless, was greatly troubled, and passed through many an hour of mental agony, torn between thoughts of love and filial duty and the burning unsatisfied desires of his romantic nature. Added to his turbulent thoughts was the haunting picture of his faithful true love, Jenny, who was waiting on Karl to achieve such success as would warrant her parents consenting to their marriage. In distress and disgrace he came home to his parents' house, Easter, 1838. His father, unhappy at his son's conduct, was lying in bed in the throes of an incurable disease. Heinrich Marx, rigid old Prussian that he was, loved his son affectionately, and in turn was held in reverence by Karl; but the trouble lay in their generations and in the chasm of intellectual differences that had sprung up. His father sank in his illness, and died on the 10th of May, 1838, leaving his son to tread revolutionary paths and thorny roads which would have caused the old lawyer many heartaches had he lived to see it.

Karl Marx's mother did live to see this, and oft was almost heartbroken at her rebel son, defying the forces of Governments and giving forth to the world the revolutionary message of Socialism. She was a simple, gentle soul whose influence lay in homely charms. She ever held a place in the heart of her turbulent brilliant son, although she asserted no intellectual influence over him. Years after, comrades in the international movement who knew Marx personally said that Karl Marx worshipped three saints—his father, mother, and his wife.

II.

THE MAKING OF A REVOLUTIONARY.

When Marx went to Berlin, the great philosopher, Hegel had been dead but four years, and young Marx, like many who came under the influence of the philosopher's ideas, became a pronounced Hegelian. The substance of Hegel's philosophy is that nothing happens in historical social evolution but what is necessary and therefore justifiable. His famous saying "All that is real is reasonable, and all that is reasonable is real," sums up his philosophy in a sentence. That sentence has been taken as justifying established evils and tolerating unjust governments merely because the existence of these things is undeniable and therefore real and reasonable. Thus Hegel's philosophy has been twisted to bolster up autocracy and social evil. In reality the essence of Hegel's philosophy is revolutionary.

Marx joined the party of young Hegelians, men of radical opinions who opposed the reactionary and supernatural tendencies of Hegelian philosophy and sought to cut the knot of conservatism that used Hegel as a prop to propertied interests. Marx realised that there was more in the great philosopher's ideas than toryism, and he saw that they constituted a revolu-
tion in historical ideas. He saw clearly the importance of Hegel's contribution to human knowledge. Hegel's philosophy demonstrated that nothing is absolute or final, but that the world is always in continual change. "Nothing is," said Hegel; "everything is becoming." Thus all historical stages of society are but changes in an evolutionary process which goes on throughout the ages. The basis of historical change is necessity. Thus circumstances change, and with changed circumstances new social forms come into being. Everything happens because of given conditions. It is necessity that makes any particular society real and therefore reasonable; but when the first conditions that brought that particular social form into being cease to exist, then that particular form ceases to be real in the right sense of the word because it is no longer socially necessary. Then a new form will arise and, overthrowing the old will establish itself in its place.

Thus Hegel laid the basis of Marx's historical philosophy—the philosophy that points out that society changes when the means of production change. Old social conditions become outworn, and new conditions bring new forms of social government.

Another brilliant young Hegelian—a contemporary of Marx—was Ludwig Feuerbach. It was Ludwig Feuerbach who stripped away the supernatural from Hegel's philosophy. He cut away the excrescence of idealism and interpreted the world by reason, not superstition, and declared that the senses were the only real source of knowledge. Feuerbach marked another step in the mental development of Karl Marx, and indeed in the formulation of the whole theory of Socialism. It was Feuerbach who demonstrated the fallacy of pure idealism. It was he who stripped Hegelianism of superstition and phantasy, thus clearing the way for the development of the materialist conception of history with its application of the Hegelian dialectic method of reasoning to the problems of the world and of the universe.

But to return to the personal. Marx, after his father's death, returned to Berlin, and there he made the acquaintance of Bruno Bauer, one of the leaders of the Young Hegelians. Bauer was transferred to the University of Bonn in 1839, but prior to his departure to Bonn he had become greatly attached to Marx, and he and Marx, both interested in advanced thought, were planning the establishment of a radical magazine. Bauer hoped to get a professorial chair at Bonn, and he urged his friend Marx to get through the necessary examinations and secure a Chair of Philosophy, for only then would they be in a position to start their projected journal.

In April, 1841, Marx did take his degree as Doctor of Philosophy at the university of Jena. But, alas, it little availed him, for the publication of a book by Bauer brought down the wrath of the Government, and Bauer was dismissed from the University, and a policy of repression was begun that made an academic
career impossible for Marx. Marx turned to journalism for a living, and in 1842 accepted the post of Editor-in-Chief of a radical daily paper, the "Rhenische Zeitung." This paper became the focus of the political and social discontent of the times. Germany at this period was in a state of unrest; the newly arisen capitalist classes were chafing under the feudal restrictions of autocracy, whilst the dull mass of the proletariat were suffering from the miseries accompanying the transformation of peasants into wage workers. The "Rhenische Zeitung," under the editorship of Marx, became boldly outspoken against the Prussian Government, and in audacious language the social wrongs of the times were denounced. Inevitably the paper drew down the wrath of the Government, Marx was compelled by the timid shareholders to resign, and finally, in January, 1843, the paper was completely suppressed. In the summer of 1843 Marx married Jenny von Westphalen, and, harassed by the attentions of the authorities, the newly married couple went to Paris to settle. There Marx mingled with the revolutionaries of that time, making the acquaintance of many notable Socialists, including Heinrich Heine (the poet), Proudhon and Bakunine (the Anarchists), and many other notable men. During his time in Paris, Marx contributed to a revolutionary journal, the "Franco-German Year-Book." In September, 1844, Marx met Frederick Engels, the man who became his close friend and fellow-revolutionist. Engels, the son of a manufacturer of Barmen who had a factory in Manchester, England, was interested in the social question, and had published a book on the "Condition of the Working Class in England in 1844." Thenceforth he and Marx studied and struggled in common, and collaborated on many a point. Together they produced their first joint work in 1845, under the title of "The Holy Family," an important little work marking the advancement of Marx and Engels towards the theory of historical materialism.

Marx was not left long in peace in Paris. The Prussian Government, incensed at the publication of a radical journal—"The Vorwaarts"—by the German exiles in Paris, induced the French Government to expel the whole staff of the paper—Marx among them.

Marx removed to Belgium with his wife and first child, Jenny, then eight months old, and there, at Brussels, his second child, Laura, who afterwards became the wife of Paul Lafargue, was born. During his stay in Brussels, Marx earned a hard and precarious living by political journalism, and it was there that Marx wrote a work that brought him to the forefront of the revolutionary movement. In 1846 the French anarchist Proudhon wrote his well-known work "The Philosophy of Poverty." Marx, who until then was a friend of Proudhon, received the work, and, perceiving the fallacies and absurdities with which Proudhon's book abounded, he sat down and wrote his famous book "The Poverty of Philosophy"—a complete answer to Proudhon,
which shattered at one stroke Proudhon's theories and Proudhon's friendship. The "Poverty of Philosophy" marked another step in the development of Marx's ideas. It is an anticipation of some of Marx's later economic theories, and is a great step forward towards a correct statement of the truths of historical materialism.

Marx was not allowed to rest in Brussels, however, and in 1847 the Prussian police spies again got on to his track and forced him to leave Belgium.

III.

MARX: THE SCIENTIFIC SOCIALIST.

After the publication of the "Poverty of Philosophy" Marx stepped forth as one of the accepted spokesmen of the revolutionary communist movement. In 1847 a conference of communist clubs was held in the Working Men's Communist Club in Great Windmill Street, London. Various nationalities were represented. Engels attended as a delegate, and there a fight took place between the adherents of Marx and the other elements, but Marxism triumphed. In November a second conference was held, and Marx attended, and there laid before the delegates the substance of the world-famed "Communist Manifesto." With the publication of this manifesto by Marx and Engels, these two young men stepped forth as the acknowledged heads of the Communist Movement. With the establishment of the Communist League—the first Internationale—modern scientific Socialism was born. No longer a utopian dream or a sentimental phantasy, Socialism became what it is today, a conscious well-balanced movement based on sociological and economic laws.

The Communist Manifesto was born in the revolutionary days of 1848. It was then the first rumblings of proletarian discontent began to resound throughout Europe. In Paris, in February, 1848, the revolutionary elements overthrew the monarchical government and established a republican provisional government. In England the Chartists rallied, and revolutionary demonstrations were the order of the day. In Vienna the people arose and overthrew the despotic government. In Berlin and other German towns there were great outbreaks and days of open revolt.

All Europe was in the grip of revolutionary ferment—a ferment that swept many of the communists off their feet, shouting that the Social Revolution was already here. Marx returned to Paris during the revolutionary period, but, realising the true character of the revolts, he pointed out that the revolutionary elements were composed of different interests, bound together only by the common tie of opposition to absolutism. He saw
in the revolution but the triumph of the middle class and capitalist forces, swept into power by working-class discontent, and he knew that such success was not the social revolution, but a prelude to a bourgeois rule and a new, acuter class struggle.

He was right. No sooner did the bourgeois gain their half-hearted concessions in the direction of political representation and freedom of expression than the revolution fell in pieces. The betrayed workers were bludgeoned into submission, and elements hostile to the working class were once more swept into power. In a fine little work entitled "Revolution and Counter-Revolution in Germany in 1848" Karl Marx records the events of '48 and analyses in masterly fashion the underlying social causes.

IV.

EXILE AND POVERTY.

Marx went to Cologne in May, 1848, in order to help in the struggle against the Prussian Government. Here he became editor of the "Neue Rheinische Zeitung," a journal which became the organ of the revolutionary and democratic forces. Again history repeated itself: like its predecessor, the "Rheinische Zeitung," the "Neue Rheinische Zeitung" fell under the ban of the Government and the paper was suppressed. On February 7th Marx and Engels and the manager of the paper stood in the dock to answer charges of libelling the police. The charge was dismissed, but two days later Marx was again placed in the dock, this time to answer the charge of inciting to armed resistance against the Government. Again the jury refused to convict; but the baffled authorities were not to be outdone, and a police order was issued expelling Marx from Germany and forbidding him to return. Marx left Cologne and returned to Paris, but that city was again in the hands of the reactionaries, and was no longer a haven for the harassed revolutionary. He stayed a month in France, and then was ordered by the Paris police to leave the city. The struggles and the wanderings of the last few years had impoverished him and left him under the dark cloud of poverty. He had chosen to defy the forces of legalised oppression, and now was suffering as many such noble spirits had had to suffer in the past—he was paying the penalty of his unpopular opinions.

To England he turned—the only country now open to him, save perhaps America. In June, 1849, Marx and his family of three children settled in London, taking lodgings in apartments at Camberwell. Then followed a period of struggle and suffering for him and his loved ones. Everywhere reaction was triumphant, and the remnants of the revolutionary forces were hastening as fugitives to America or England. Marx felt the iron hand of poverty. Workless and almost penniless, and an exile in a strange land, his early days in England were a terrible period for
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EXILE AND POVERTY.

Family troubles overtook him in the shape of illness, and death laid its grim grip on the exiled family, taking away the latest addition to the family—Francisca—at the age of eight months. Things became so bad that, in the spring of 1850, unable to pay the rent of his lodgings; his furniture, even to the baby's cradle, was seized and the Marx family turned out into the streets homeless. Cheaper lodgings were obtained at 28 Dean Street, Soho. There they occupied two rooms. Assistance was obtained from some friends, but still the problem of gaining a living pressed hard on Marx. It was in this house Marx was to spend the next few years of his life, and here it was that he penned the notes of his "Critique of Political Economy," and later of his master-work "Das Kapital."

Marx eventually obtained a situation as the London correspondent of the "New York Tribune," for which he received £1 per week; this, supplemented by other scant literary earnings, constituted the sole income of the Marx family for many years. Despite his troubles, Marx could not rest, and he again entered the active working-class movement. He lectured to working-men's clubs and spent many long, long hours in deep study at the British Museum preparing for his life's work—"Capital."

The years passed, and Marx the father seemed to loom larger than Marx the Socialist. Marx was always what is termed a "good family man"—a rare thing both in his time and ours. He loved his children intensely and idolised his wife. His affection extended to all children, and many affecting stories are told about him at this period. How the children in the district hailed him as "Daddy Marx" and romped and played with him! How he hated to see children ill-treated or abused, and how many a time his impetuous nature got him into difficulties for intervening in cases of child-cruelty. Liebknecht in his "Memoirs" gives many human pen pictures of this side of Marx's life.

Yet Marx was not inactive in the movement, and his little house was the centre of Socialist activity. Many illustrious men of the day paid visits to the little house where the great exile lived in order to exchange opinions and learn of the political views of Marx. Marx published his "Critique of Political Economy" in 1859. In 1861, on the outbreak of the American Civil War, the "New York Tribune" suspended its London correspondence, and black poverty once more treaded the floors of the Marx household. Marx became in debt, and then, worn by incessant struggle, his health became undermined and he was stricken ill. Then, as though not enough, his wife was stricken down. These happenings compelled Marx to alter his grand plans that he had made for the publication of an elaborate work on political economy, and so he began instead the first volume of "Capital."

An action for libel which Marx brought against a creature called Vogt was lost, due to the prejudices against Marx shown
by the Prussian court. This action plunged Marx deeper into debt, which debt was added to by Marx undertaking the exposure of Herr Vogt in the publication of a book of two hundred pages entitled "Herr Vogt." In this work Marx piled up evidence to prove that Vogt was a paid man of the reactionary governments. This was afterwards placed beyond doubt by the publication by the Communards of Paris in later years of the record of the Napoleonic secret service funds, with the item "Vogt.--Received, August, 1859, 40,000 francs."

During this time he corresponded with Lassalle, the brilliant but erratic leader of the German working-class movement at that time. In 1863 the Socialist movement in Germany took definite form, and in 1864 the Second International was founded, and Marx and Engels became its foremost champions. The history of the International would fill many pages. The next few years of Marx's life were given up to a struggle on behalf of the International, and through this and his health, his work of writing "Capital" did not make the progress he had planned. In 1865, at one of the meetings of the General Council of the International Association, one of the members named Weston gave an address in which he put forth the idea that it was foolish for the workers to strike for increased wages, in as much as prices always automatically increased with wages, and so things remained as bad as ever despite the increase. Marx combatted this position by publishing his brilliant little pamphlet "Value, Price, and Profit." Another incident of note occurred in Marx's life in 1867. It is recorded that in that year Prince Bismarck, through the medium of one of his tools, a renegade revolutionist named Bucher, attempted to buy Marx—the man whom Bismarck's government had been unable to silence or crush. The story is that Marx was offered a position on the "Prussian State Journal" and a blank cheque laid before him for him to fix his own terms. But Bismarck and his tools under-estimated the high principles of Karl Marx, the revolutionary exile. Marx refused peremptorily, preferring poverty to the sacrifice of his Socialism.

The first volume of "Capital" saw the light in 1867, but from that date the health of Marx gradually declined. This did not deter him from activity, and it is interesting to note that Marx championed the cause of oppressed Ireland at this period, doing what he could to raise opposition to the execution of the Manchester Martyrs in 1867.

Illuminating, too, especially in view of recent events, is his views on Russia. He wrote, as is known, articles, pamphlets, and books on Russia and the Eastern Question. It has often been urged against Marx that he was Anti-Russian. This impression gained currency because of his loathing of Czardom and autocracy, and because of his opposition to the erratic and dangerous anarchism of many of the Russian revolutionaries of that time. In an article published in a Russian revolutionary
journal, "The Fatherland Record," Marx made the following statement:—

"National choice is an important factor in social evolution. If Russia chooses it might get the fruits of the capitalist system without going through the tortures connected with it. It was open for it to take the most convenient opportunity ever offered to a people to evade all the features of the capitalist system. Russia might develop according to its own peculiar historical environment. Its system of communal land ownership might become the basis of a communistic development."

V.

THE COLLAPSE OF THE INTERNATIONAL.

The outbreak of the Franco-Prussian War saw Marx well advanced with the second and third volumes of "Capital." His economic position was also bettered—he had received legacies from his mother on her death in 1868, and his friend Engels was now a partner in his father's business at Manchester, and able to assist his comrade now. In 1869 Marx visited Germany, paying visits to his brother-in-law, and also to Joseph Dietzgen, the tanner, and philosopher of the Socialist movement. 1872 saw the collapse of the Second International. The intrigues of Bakunine and his anarchist friends endangered the cause of international solidarity, so, on the advice of Marx, the headquarters of the International Council was transferred to America. But the organisation was already on the high road to break up. The events of the Paris Commune had weakened its organisation; and it was once more evident to Marx that the international movement was falling away under stress of reaction. The International held its last conference in Philadelphia in 1876. Eleven delegates attended, and they formally dissolved the organisation.

VI.

CLOSING YEARS.

After the downfall of the International, Marx, disappointed at the turn of events following the suppression of the Paris Commune, and suffering from repeated ill-health, devoted the remaining years of his life to his literary work. He removed to No. 1 Maitland Park Road, near Hampstead Heath, a locality of which he was fond; but it was evident to the distress of his friends that the grand old man of Socialism was gradually but surely failing. He followed the events in Germany—the growth of the Socialist movement there, and the election of his friends Bebel and Liebknecht to the Reichstag—with interest and
pleasure. It is well to note that Marx was bitterly hostile to the compromise entered into at the congress at Gotha in 1875, when the Marxists and the Lassallians united to form the Social Democratic Working Men's Party of Germany. He denounced the fusion as a compromise of principle, and predicted failure of the S.D.P. movement as a result. Many have pronounced Marx mistaken on this point, but the events of the last few years have shown them to be only too well grounded. The German S.D.P. founded on compromise has become the most signal failure in the international movement. The chickens hatched in the years of opportunism and compromise have come home to roost with a vengeance.

Another important point was Marx's hostility to H. M. Hyndman and the men who founded the S.D.F. in 1881. He distrusted Hyndman and denounced him as a political adventurer. Those of us who have witnessed Hyndman's anti-Socialist outbursts in the capitalist press, together with the anti-working-class actions of many of the old S.D.F. men, realise that Marx had a rare insight into character that was hardly ever mistaken.

The year 1881 was a sad year for Marx, for, after a long and painful illness, his wife died. This was a bitter blow to him, for he loved her dearly. Engels said on learning the news—"Mohr is dead too" (Mohr was an affectionate name for Marx). And so it was. Two years of broken health and broken heart followed, and on the 18th March, after a long illness, the ravages of which, visits to Paris and Karlsbad failed to stay, Marx fell asleep in his favourite chair in his study, and when Engels called he found him there with a smile on his face, sleeping his last sleep.

Karl Marx, the great thinker, the man whose name had become a terror to all the Governments of Europe, was dead.

He was buried at Highgate Cemetery three days later. A small band of friends gathered and listened to the pathetic tribute of the distressed Engels. There, over the dust of his friend, in a voice broken by sobs, Engels recounted the life-work of Marx, linking his name with Darwin in achievement, and placing his work among those of the greatest of the wonderful Nineteenth Century.

And so it has become. The name of Karl Marx is known to millions of workers all over the world. His portrait adorns the walls of thousands of Socialist homes in all lands; but, greater than all, the Socialism he gave his life for grows and extends from pole to pole.

In 1848, when the slogan "Workers of the World, Unite!" rang out, Socialism was but a name and the Socialist movement a minute motley band of fantastic and varied opinions. To-day Marxian Socialism has grown, despite hostility and despite treachery, until all lands possess a vigorous growing party of Marxist Socialism. Aye, and in Russia we have the world's first
Marxian Government—a government of the workers, challenging international capitalism and preaching social revolution to the workers of all lands.

The name of Marx will go down as the idealisation of the modern working-class movement. We Socialists do not worship great men, but we recognise individual worth, and we recognise, also, that every great man is the product of his times. Marx was the man around which the idea of historic scientific Socialism became crystalised. We know that the trend of events must produce its Marxs and its Engels even as it produced its Galileos and its Darwins, etc. It is given but to few to become the standard-bearers of new social forces. It needs men of sterling calibre and unimpeachable worth to take the lead.

Brave Soul! Intrepid Revolutionist! Personification of the spirit of human advancement! We greet thee and thy work on this centenary of thy birth, and we pledge ourselves to carry forward the message of hope and enlightenment; to carry on the struggle of our class until success adorns our banners. We will not rest until the slogan "Workers of All Lands, Unite!" is indeed accomplished; until the human race is freed from the spectre of greed, famine, and exploitation, and, in the place of soul-destroying capitalism, the REAL INTERNATIONAL is established. The International of Labour and of Humanity. The dawn of a new human epoch.—SOCIALISM.

"Not in chiselled stone nor in moulded metal stands Karl Marx's monument, but in the live pulsating ever-growing movement of the militant working-class."

Karl Marx's Grave in Highgate Cemetery.
WHY MARXIAN SOCIALISM?

WHAT is this Socialism of Karl Marx, and what is its concern to the working class of to-day?

We will explain.

You are a worker; you toil with your hands or your brain in the factory or the workshop or the warehouse or on the railway line or in one of the other different spheres of production—where men labour together and produce the useful things of life or do the useful work of society. You realise, do you not, that it is your labour-energy and the labour-energy of all the rest of your class that creates all the wealth, produces all the food, clothes, and good things that men need in order to live? In short, that all the wealth of modern society is the product of Labour! You are aware, also, that you are poor; you own no shares in the great factories where wealth is produced, and own no portion of the land which you till and cause to grow food. You are compelled because of this poverty to labour for a living. You have to work for wages at another man's bidding. And you are not allowed the least control over your conditions of labour nor the amount of your wages, unless, indeed, you are sensible enough to unite with your fellows and fight for these things. Instinctively you feel that you are the victim of certain social conditions, for you are not a wage-worker because you will it, but because there is no other means of gaining a living. The struggles you have with your employer, the strikes for better conditions, force you to admit that your interests are very much opposed to his interests.

You may have realised all these things and have a sense of the wrongness of modern social conditions. You may have been forced to recognise the class oppression that goes on, the tyranny and injustice of the masters and their governments. You may have become hurt by the poverty and the misery that surrounds working-class life, and you have come to feel that a change is necessary, that things want improving one way or the other. Thus you may become an instinctive Socialist: you may not call yourself a Socialist, or, on the other hand, you may call yourself a Socialist; but a Socialist you are. You are a Socialist not so much because of any ideas you have been influenced by, but because the conditions under which you live—the capitalist system—and the class to which you belong, are training schools for Socialism. Actually, Socialism is born of the very conditions of everyday life under which you live.

But your Socialism, unless based on a correct knowledge of the nature of the conditions under which you work and live,
and on an understanding of what has gone by in history, will not achieve much. Not being well balanced and not being founded on correct scientific principles, it will become a mere expression of sentiment, a blind following of the devious delusions of every reformer, politician or knave who honestly or venally comes along with notions of social reform or political catch-vote schemes. A Socialism founded on sentiment or mere discontent can be swayed hither and thither, and, because of the ignorance of its adherents, can be easily side-tracked by the capitalist class. What is needed is a scientific basis to Socialism. A Socialism founded on the experience of the past and a knowledge of the present.

Such a Socialism is Marxian Socialism. In fact there is no real Socialism but that of Marx. All other schools of Socialism are really either sentimental outbursts against the system or cleverly manipulated schemes of reform propagated in the interests of capital, of tinkering with the effects and ignoring the cause. Socialism is a science: it goes into the roots of the matter, discovers the mainspring of human progress, and acts accordingly.

In the next few pages will be set forth the essential points of the Socialism of Karl Marx, which is the Socialism of the modern working class, crystallised around the name of the great Socialist thinker. Not to him alone is due the founding of Socialism. That is the product of the times and not of an individual. Not to him alone is due the discovering of these theories that bear his name. Credit is due also to men like Engels, L. H. Morgan, Ricardo, Adam Smith, Hegel, and a long, long line of thinkers whose accumulated knowledge was assimilated by Karl Marx, and then cast into definite form and presented to the working-class movement.

II.

THE THREE CARDINAL POINTS OF MARXIAN SOCIALISM.

1.—The Materialist View of History.
2.—The Theory of Surplus Value.
3.—The Class Struggle.

MARXIAN Socialism gets down to rock-bottom every time. Its three chief pointers to the road of working-class emancipation are:—(1) The materialist view of history, known as historical materialism. (2) A knowledge of the real workings of capitalist production, of what constitutes value, and of what wages and capital are and from whence comes profits. This knowledge is termed Marxian Economics. (3) The demonstration of the historical function of the class struggle and the important necessary tactics of the working-class movement that flow therefrom.

We will take up each of these distinct phases of Marxism and explain each as simply as possible.
We will take this first of all.

The kind of history usually taught consists of a circus display of kings, queens, and lords, dancing about in gold and motley, or strutting through events with the bravado of Punch and Judy puppets. Their little personalities fill up the pages of the school history-books, and we are taught that these are the people who made history. In reality it was history that made them. Chanticleer, the cock, stood on the dung-hill, and because he crowed at sunrise he began to imagine that it was he that made the great sun rise each morning. Our “great ones” of history are like Chanticleer. They are the corks floating on the restless waves of history. When they loom up large it is not because of their importance, but because the seething undercurrent of history thrusts them up high on the crests of the waves. The undercurrent of history is the vast mass of voiceless people who toil and delve and do the real work of the world. Real history is the record of this work, of the social activities of the times, and the ways in which people lived, and the means whereby they lived. It is these ways and means that mould the lives and ideals of all classes. It is the way men and women gain their livelihood that determines progress.

Historical materialism is summed up in the classic words of Marx and Engels:—“In every historical epoch the prevailing mode of economic production and exchange, and the social organisation necessarily following from it, forms the basis upon which is built up and which is explained the political and intellectual history of that epoch.”

This means that the basis of society is the means and methods whereby the mass of the people, socially, gain their living. All changes that have occurred in human history such as changes from savage communism to chattel slavery, from chattel slavery to feudalism, from feudalism to handicraft production, and from that to capitalist production have occurred because this basis of production and exchange has changed.

With every one of us the most important thing in life is the struggle for bread and butter—that is, for the material things of life. No one can deny that the question of food, clothing, and shelter looms the largest in life. So with society. The methods of production were very much different in feudal days to what they are to-day. This difference is reflected in the differing form of government controlling society and in the differing ideas, religious outlook, morals, ethics, and general point of view of all who compose the different classes in society. It is the dominant mode of production that determines all else. Thus the importance of historical materialism.
The proof of the pudding is in the eating, and the proofs of the materialist view of history lies in the events of history. If you were asked to state what marks off one stage in human history from another, could you give any other reason other than a change in economic conditions? Could you explain, for instance, how it is that ideas considered wrong centuries ago are considered right to-day, and vice versa? Could you explain why ideas have changed and why the outlook of men generally has changed? The only answer lies with historical materialism. Man has ever advanced, has ever changed because of necessity, because of alterations in his methods of procuring food, clothing, and shelter. New conditions have bred new ways of thought, new ideas, and so in the measure that man has progressed physically so he has progressed mentally.

A glance over the work of a scientist like Prof. Lewis H. Morgan will bring ample proof of the truth of historical materialism. In his epoch-making book, "Ancient Society," he describes the different stages in social evolution. Mankind were at one time naked savages roaming the forests, dwelling in trees and caves, living off nuts, roots, and fruit, etc. They lived always on the border of starvation; they possessed but crude and scanty tools, and their mental outlook scarce distinguished them from the rest of the brute world. Only a very primitive form of society existed, crudely communistic, based on blood-kinship.

Improvement began with the discovery of fire. This led to the use of fish for food, and with this the habits of man were altered. No longer confined to forests and to a nut and fruit diet, they spread out over the country and settled by lakes and seas and rivers. Then came such inventions as the bow and arrow, improved spears and weapons. With these, men could roam the forests and hunt and slay the wild animals therein, and a new source of food in the shape of meat was added, and new clothing in the shape of furs and skins was the result of these improvements. These things had a far-reaching effect over the lives of primitive man. They enabled him to wander into districts he dare not have gone into before, and security in livelihood led to more settled social life on the basis of tribal communism. At this period cannibalism crept in. First it was a case of necessity: men would be eaten when there was a shortage of other food; but later custom and tradition would justify it as being "right," even as custom justified slavery, and even as to-day it tries to justify capitalist exploitation.

One important discovery led to another. The improved hunting weapons led to the domestication of animals—no doubt through the capture of young animals, which would be reared and tamed. With the domestication of animals the first signs of surplus wealth were seen. When men lived by hunting and fishing they lived in tribal communism; private property was unknown; they shared food and danger alike; and all stood as equal blood-brothers bound by kinship in one gens or social-
unit. With surplus wealth sprang up social classes. The rich men, those who owned the biggest flocks, stood as masters of those who owned nothing. Then, too, slavery began; the poor brethren entered service to tend the flocks and do the work of the richest. Also, prisoners taken in battle were no longer slain and eaten, but kept as slaves to labour for their captors.

In this period (the pastoral period) the artistic side of life had its beginnings. Secure from immediate want, and spending their lives on the wide, open plains and hillsides under sunny skies and starry nights, poetry and song had its birth and the science of astronomy arose. The domestic arts of making pottery and ornaments also began. Such a period as this was the period when the Greek poet Homer lived.

Animals require regular food. Attention to this led to the cultivation of plants and cereals. Ground was tilled, and races settled in fixed areas and built stone and brick houses. Thus the first cities arose.

Ever onward and ever upward man marked out a path of progress. With cities and settled life there began the cultivation of arts and the development of manufacture and exchange. But along with these improvements came the complete break-up of communism and the establishment of class government and class oppression. Society became divided on the lines of those who owned the means of life and those who had to labour for those owners. Slaves and masters was the division, not blood and kinship or nationality. Henceforth the history of society would be made up of the records of the struggles of class against class.

Always economic development has determined the rate of human progress. All human institutions have been moulded upon the economic basis. In primitive society the family was communistic; men and women married each other in groups; a male of one group was considered to be the husband of all the females of the complimentary group, and vice versa. Prof. Morgan gives interesting instances of the working of this among the natives that inhabited the region of the Kamarilo River in Australia. The social organisation was the gens made up of all who were akin to each other; these gens formed a phratry with those of near kinship; the phratries formed the tribe, and so on. The form of government was communistic. There being no property interests to conserve at this stage, government was of a free character, and men and women enjoyed free and equal democratic rights.

With private property, government became the government of a class. The class owning the means of production became the ruling class, and government became but an instrument to keep the rest of the population enslaved. Thus the class state was established. With private property the family became altered too. The dominance of the propertied class extended into sex, and the property owner became the owner of wives.
and concubines, and thus the enslavement and degradation of women came with the advent of private property.

Thus right through history runs the brand of social slavery. Governments have represented the brutal dominance of the wealthy, and the State has been an instrument for keeping the workers in subjection.

History, too, presents itself as the workings and struggles of diverse economic interests. Thus the struggle between the King of England and the barons that culminated in the granting of Magna Charta was a class struggle. The barons refused to pay the "scutage" or the tax levied in lieu of service of arms for the king. They demanded freedom from the absolutism of monarchy, and so the clash of arms.

The peasants' revolt in 1381 was another instance of clashing class forces. Its religious reflex was the Lollard or Protestant movement.

The events of the "spacious days" of Elizabeth—the Reformation and the revival of learning and culture—were the outcome of economic development. The land enclosures, the discovery of the new route to the east via the Cape of Good Hope, the fall of Constantinople, and the opening up of America, were events that marked a turn in social progress.

The rise of the commercial class led to the English Revolution of 1688. This was a struggle of early capitalism against the landed aristocracy led by King Charles.

The American Civil War and the movement for the abolition of chattel slavery was a struggle between the conflicting interests of the feudal slave lords of the south and the rising manufacturers of the north.

The present world war has its roots deep in antagonistic economic interests, as has been shown by writers such as Newbold¹ and Boudin.*

And while this clash of various capitalist interests occurs, there also is the struggle of working-class interests against those of the capitalist class as a whole. The social nature of production—that is, the employment of vast numbers of workmen all under one roof or all inter-connected and dependent on each other—has increased the social consciousness of the workers, and this makes for class-consciousness. The workers become class-conscious when they recognise that their interests are at variance with their masters, and when they recognise this they organise to secure social control over the things they socially produce. Industrial organisation with a revolutionary objective comes into being: the workers organise to wrest power from the master class and to establish Socialism.

¹ "How Europe armed for War."—Newbold.  
* "Socialism and War."—Boudin.
Thus Socialism is the heir of historical processes. It is no child of the imagination, but is the next step in human progress. Socialism is inevitable because the tools have reached that stage of perfection that make abundance of food, clothing, and the good things of life open to each and every member of the human family. Class struggles have been inevitable in the past by the insufficient development of the means of life. The last phase of class struggle is now at hand: the working class must necessarily organise to wrest private property in the means of life out of the hands of the one small class and place the means in the hands of the collective people. Socialism spells the freeing of the entire human race from poverty and human bondage. The social conditions are ripe for the next step in human progress. The historical conditions are there all right. All that is wanting is the consciousness of the human element—the working class. The workers must recognise their class interests and play their part in the great revolutionary movement of emancipation.

FELLOW-WORKER, WILL YOU PLAY YOUR PART?

IV.

MARXIAN ECONOMICS—THE THEORY OF VALUE.

This is a study of the workings of capitalism.

Everything produced to-day and put on the market for sale is termed a commodity. Think of anything and everything you have seen displayed in shop windows, or stored in warehouses or being manufactured in factories. Think of the machinery those factories contain; the raw material lying in field, farm, or dock; the mighty engines and steamships that transport goods from place to place; the great buildings of the cities and the humble dwellings of the workers; and in each and all of these objects are to be seen the substance of modern wealth. All these things are commodities—together they form what Marx terms the sum of commodities, the wealth of modern society.

A commodity is defined as a useful thing which satisfies human wants and is produced by human labour for sale or exchange.

It always puzzled the economists to explain what determined the value of a commodity. They were puzzled to explain why so many of one commodity exchanged for so many of another commodity. For instance, why is a ton of coal equal, say, to 10 yards of silk? Why, for instance, do we get equations something like this:

10 yards of silk equal 1 ounce of gold equal 5 silk hats equal 50 cloth caps equal 20 yards of linen, and so on.
Obviously it is not the quality of these things that determine the reason why these things exchange in such proportions. It is not quality that determines their value. All these things are commodities, and all are useful. They must be useful to someone or they could not come on to the market for sale. But their usefulness cannot and does not measure their value. The five silk hats and the fifty cloth caps exchange for each other—five of one is equal in value to fifty of the other—yet as a covering for the head one cloth cap is just as useful as one silk hat.

What, then, is the measure of value and of exchange value? Karl Marx answers the question by stripping away and putting out of sight the useful qualities of commodities. No standard can be found by which to measure quality, but a standard is needed in order that we may measure the varying value of the different things. When the usefulness and the quality of a commodity is laid aside there then remains but common property left, and all commodities possess this common property. This common property is that all commodities, no matter how they vary and differ in usefulness and quality, are all the products of human labour-power. They are all the result of expended labour: it is this labour that forms the substance of value. In fact, embodied labour is value.

Thus when we say that one commodity equals so much of another commodity, we simply mean that each contains the same average amount of human labour.

Human labour can only be measured by time, yet there are different qualities and varied kinds of human labour. For instance, the labour of the joiner differs in quality from the labour of a bootmaker. We cannot measure the difference in quality between the labour of the shoemaker and the labour of the joiner, for there is nothing in the particular kind of labour that can stand as a basis for comparison. But if we lay aside the varying qualities of different kinds of labour we do get down to rock-bottom and find that it is all labour—all common and simple human labour. Not only that, but in speaking of labour as the substance of value we cannot select the labour of one particular man or one particular trade, but we are compelled to think of all the labour that is expended right throughout society, and so to be correct we find it is not individual labour nor any particular kind of labour that forms the substance and unit of value, but average abstract socially-necessary labour.

The shoemaker's labour differs from the joiner's or the engineer's labour, but all are labour notwithstanding, and they, together with all the workers who labour to-day, are responsible for the social production of commodities. Thus their labour in its essence is simple, abstract, and social. Its measure is the socially-necessary time that it takes to perform the tasks of production—the time, for instance, it takes the average workmen, with average skill, working under average conditions, to produce a commodity.
We have mentioned exchange value. This coincides in the long run with value. But at times, owing to the inequalities of supply and demand, we get commodities of unequal values exchanging for each other. The money name of exchange value is price. Thus, for instance, when we hear of things selling above their value or below their value it simply means that the law of supply and demand is deflecting the exchange value of the commodities away from their true value, which is, of course, based on the social labour contained in the commodities.

There is no other theory that explains correctly the determination of value except the Marxian one. The Marxian theory of value is very important to the workers, for from that theory flows the theory of surplus value, the crowning point of Marxian economics.

Amongst the other things sold on the market is human labour power. The means of life are owned by the capitalist class, yet the worker must live, and so he sells the only thing he possesses his labour-power or physical energy. This he sells in the same manner as the possessor of butter, or cheese, or iron sells his particular commodity: he sells to the highest bidder and in accordance with the conditions of the market.

The worker bargains to give a week's labour-power for a certain price—for so much wages—and as he cannot separate his power to labour from himself, he goes humbly into the workshops and labours at whatever task his master thinks suitable. Literally, as Marx wittily observes, he sells his hide, and, having sold it, receives only what he can expect—a hiding.

The worker's labour-power sells on the average at its value—that is, the amount of socially-necessary labour it costs to produce. This socially-necessary labour is the amount of food, clothing, and shelter needed to maintain the worker and allow him to bring up a family judged by the average of the social conditions of the times and district he lives in. In short, the value of his labour-power rests on the cost of subsistence.

Suppose we say £2 per week maintains the labourer! This £2, then, is the money equivalent of the value of the labourer's labour-power. But labour-power is a commodity, and it may be sold under its value or over its value. If there are more men wanting jobs than there are jobs for them, then wages will fall below the value of the worker's labour-power. Or if labour is scarce, as is the case with some forms of skilled labour, then we get wages rising above the value of the worker's labour-power. Again the worker, if he be wise, has the power to force up the price of his labour-power by doing as do the owners of other commodities—by taking advantage of the market or by making a corner and controlling the supply of his commodity. The intelligent worker, by organising with his fellows in an economic union, can force up the price of labour-power, but the extent to which he can go depends on the efficiency of the organisation, the intelligence of the members, and also on the powers of resis-
The commodities that the worker produces go on to the market and they realise, on the average, their value; and lo! when that value is realised an apparent miracle happens. Say that the worker receives in wages £2 per week for 48 hours' labour, and let us suppose that the things he makes realise on the market £8. Then we have a difference of £6 between the value of the worker's labour-power and the value of the things he has produced. This £6 the kind capitalist pockets as if he had a right to it. From whence comes this £6, this surplus? Has not the labourer already received the full value of his labour-power—the £2?

Consider for a minute!

The labourer has certainly received the full value of his labour-power—that is, the amount necessary to feed, clothe, and shelter him, and to allow him to reproduce his kind, but he has not received the full product of his labour-power, the full value of the things he has produced.

He has sold 48 hours of labour-power for £2, but in the 48 hours he produces value to the amount of £8. He reproduces in 12 hours the value he receives in wages: hence the remaining 36 hours and the value created in them constitute surplus value. This surplus value is created by the worker but appropriated by the capitalist class. We can put it this way:

\[
\begin{align*}
48 \text{ social labour hours} & \text{ equal } £8 \\
12 \text{ social labour hours} & \text{ equal } £2 \\
36 \text{ social labour hours} & \text{ equal } £6 \text{ (surplus value taken by the capitalist)}.
\end{align*}
\]

All the value represented by the £8 was created by the worker, but under the conditions of wage-slavery the worker is forced to give the hours of surplus value to the capitalist. This surplus value appropriated by the capitalist comprises rent, interest, and profit.

The inferior economic condition of the workers, the dominance of the capitalist class and its ownership of the tools, perpetuate this plundering of surplus value—the exploitation of Labour.

Two things flow from the existence of surplus value. One is the accumulation of capital and with it the development of the social side of production. With new machinery labour becomes more productive and thus the mass of surplus value increases. This increase becomes capital, and as capital it seeks to earn profits. This it can only do by employing labour and
increasing production. With the intensification of production there occurs, first, competition among the owners of capital, and later the dominance of big capital—or trustification.

Economic conflicts, civil and foreign wars, together with financial crises, and alternating periods of "good" and "bad" trade, then inevitably occur.

The large aggregations of capital or the trusts eat up the smaller capitals, and thus the unprofitable or the least profitable methods of production are eliminated. The trust is the highest development of capital: it turns out the greatest number of articles with the least expenditure of labour.

Thus production is socialised and brought to the highest pitch of efficiency, awaiting the social revolution that will transfer social production into social service, and change the monster of inhuman exploitation into the minister of human needs and happiness.

The second thing that flows from the theory of value is the class struggle. This we will deal with in the next section.

V.

THE CLASS STRUGGLE.

The history of mankind ever since the establishment of private property has been the history of class struggles. These class struggles have been contests for material things, for economic advantages, and the line of division has been along the line of class ownership and class control of the means of life.

In ancient Babylon, Egypt, Greece, and Rome, the basis of society was chattel slavery. There, to the tune of the crack of the slave-driver's whip, the dull mass of the population toiled and suffered to create wealth for the few.

Discontent or soulless apathy prevailed among the slave ranks. Oftimes revolts broke out, as in the instance of the slave rising at Laurium, B.C. 413, the revolt of Spartacus in Rome, B.C. 74-70, the slave-rally under Eunus in Sicily, B.C. 140, and thousands of other instances. Doomed struggles were these, pathetically unavailing against the forces of slavery—doomed because of the undeveloped stage of production—the pitiless law of social progress that requires highly perfected social production ere the ban of slavery can be lifted from all mankind.

In ancient Rome there was also class divisions and struggles amongst the freed population. The Patricians and the rich Plebians, entrenched by economic power, held control of government and social life, whilst the poor men, the Plebians, starving and suffering, again and again pitted their strength against the patricians and the rich plebians. "Two Pages from Roman History," by Daniel De Leon, portrays graphically the causes and the effects of the class antagonisms of Roman days.
Turn over the pages of history where you will, and you will find every age, every epoch, the battle-ground of conflicting economic interests. Let it be feudal days, and there you find the kingly aristocrats entrenched in privilege; the lords and the barons living on tribute exacted from the serf and peasant; and the Church extending its holy dominion by levies on the superstitious people and by the accumulation of Church property.

The Church in the middle ages owned one-third of the land of Europe. By virtue of this it was the main prop of feudalism. No wonder the rising capitalists turned Protestant and fought the Catholic Church. It and the rest of the landed aristocracy were the barriers to the rising class of commercial city merchants—the bourgeoisie.

The wars of the Crusades fostered by the Roman Church were cute economic-political moves of the Holy Fathers. Whilst the ever-wrangling princes of Europe and their discontented subjects were allured to Palestine by visions of spoil and plunder, the princes of the Church extended their lands and secured a firmer hold of the good things of life. Visions of heavenly paradise were good enough to appease the hungry mob, but the fat and comfortable bishops and priests were well content with Omar Khayyam’s philosophy:

“Ah! take the cash in hand and waive the rest.
Oh! the brave music of a distant drum!”

Pope Julius II., who said to his favourite cardinal, “Brother, this fable of Jesus Christ pays well, does it not?” might have been indiscreet, but certainly he was no ancestor of Henry Dubb.

Every historical picture tells the same story. The French wars were quarrels between the settled Norman barons, who objected to paying levy to the English Crown. The innumerable petty struggles of the middle ages were squabbles between the plundering and marauding knights and barons.

The maritime struggles of Spain and England and Holland were quarrels centring round material things. The buccaneering exploits of Drake and Frobisher were but piratical raids on the treasure ships of Spain. The new commercial policy of colonial expansion that came into being was a result of the development of the English wool trade.

To recount all would be to fill volumes, and he who works and reads is recommended to study

“Six Centuries of Work and Wages,” by Thorold Rogers.
“Economic Interpretation of History,” by Thorold Rogers.
“Commerce in Europe,” by Gibbins.

And a host of others recommended by the writers of these books.

With proof piled up, extensive and full, the existence of the class struggle cannot be denied. In all ages it has been a conflict for social dominance. Stripped of its veneer of romantic idealism it is seen to be, on the one hand, naked and as ugly as existence
itself, a brutal struggle for wealth and the right to extort wealth, and, on the other hand, a despairing or inflamed resistance of an exploited class.

In our own times, to-day, the bitter struggle of the classes goes on as it ever did since man left the communistic jungle life behind. The bone of contention lies in the social dominance of the capitalist class, the domination that gives the capitalist class the power to exploit Labour, to wring surplus value from the toil-worn hands of the proletariat.

The class struggle manifests itself in strikes and lock-outs. The workers unconsciously admit the class struggle by forming unions purely of wage-workers, and in attempting by strikes and agitation to secure more of the products of their toil—in the shape of increased wages and a shorter working day.

The capitalist class also admit the class struggle by locking the workers out, by starving them into submission to capital's demands, and by bludgeoning, shooting, and imprisoning any workers who rebel against capitalistic conditions.

The class struggle is reflected in political life, in class legislation, and in the use by the capitalist of the power of government with a view to keeping the workers in subjection.

The modern wage-earning class came into being with the industrial revolution. The establishment of capitalism transformed an incoherent mass of peasants into a wage-earning class.

The beginning of working-class unity occurred when a number of wage-earners realised they had interests in common and formed local protective associations or unions. In the early days this unionism was based on craft and was local. It was also purely engrossed with the immediate events of the class struggle, such as fights for wages, for better conditions, etc. It never questioned the right of the capitalist to extort surplus value; it never questioned why there were classes in society.

But capitalism has not stood still. It has developed new methods of production. It has brought into being the vast workshops where production is social, the tasks are sub-divided, and the elimination of particular skill or craft is going on.

Corresponding with the new conditions, a demand for organisation able to meet the new circumstances has sprung up. Craft or trade unionism has become effete and ineffective. To fight industrialised capital Industrial Unionism is needed.

Not only that, but the social advantages brought into being by the development of the capitalist system contrast strangely with the economic disadvantages that the worker lives under.

Capitalism educates him to make an efficient minder of intricate machines, but that education enables the best and brightest minds in the working class to perceive the trend of social events. The thinking worker sees that his class produce tremendous wealth but yet live in poverty. He sees that wealth is no longer produced by any individual, but jointly by the useful workers of society. He sees the capitalist class appropriate the product
of Labour. He sees, further, that the capitalist system has become a huge machine, out of control of man, feverishly turning out products, not because products are needed, but Profits, Everlasting Profits, are needed. He realises what all this means—foreign wars, civil strife, financial crises, bankruptcies, hard times, feverish toil, starvation, with smashed and broken manhood crushed under the wheels of the relentless machine that man has built but not learnt to control.

A knowledge of these things leads to thought and action. The advanced worker sees through it all, and stepping clear of all the entanglements of capitalist politics, religion, ideas that long have claimed him, becomes a class-conscious revolutionary worker with heart and soul aflame with the light of new things. He organises industrially and carries the flaming torch of Socialist knowledge into the ranks of his fellows.

Thus with capitalist development the real meaning of the class struggle is seen. It is a struggle waged by the working class to complete a period of social revolution. To give those who create the good things of life a chance to enjoy them.

Socialism is not class hatred, nor do we preach class war. We simply recognise facts, and, realising that the one small class which hinders the development of the whole mass of the people, will not give up social control without a struggle, we prepare to wage that struggle until humanity is free. Socialism will end class struggles and class hatreds.

The lessons of the class struggle for the worker are four:—

(1) The workers must organise at the point of production in order to fight capital successfully, and in order to lay the foundations of future industrial control—the co-operative ownership of the tools.

(2) The workers must secure control of the political weapon. They must wrest from the hands of capital, control of that engine of oppression, the Government, which dominates by control of education, and by armed force—the navy, army, and police.

(3) Militancy.—There can be no compromise between capital and Labour. The workers are only strong when they stand alone. The capitalists, being in control and established, have all to gain by compromise. The workers only hope is to destroy that control. The workers' interests are directly opposed to those of the capitalists. It follows, therefore, that the workers give their whole position away when they compromise with capitalism, for they thus compromise for the continuance of that which is the cause of their exploitation.

(4) Solidarity.—The working-class movement must not be sectarian in the sense of divorcement from the general activities of the working class. The advanced sections cannot throw away principle in order to appease or become popular with the ignorant elements, but, on the other hand, the revolutionaries must never allow their advanced principles to set up a barrier between them and the rest of their fellows. The revolutionary who becomes
angry with his fellow-worker still in the mesh of capitalist thought, or sets up hostility to all and every one who differs with him, at once becomes a dead drag upon revolutionary progress.

The duty of the Revolutionary Socialist is to keep the flag of revolutionary principle nailed to the mast, and rally there under the working-class forces. To fight in the everyday battle of the workshop, to march with those who will march with him. To give a lead and be an inspiration to the struggling forces of the working class. The place of Revolutionary Socialism is in the van of the working-class movement. It is the standard-bearer of the class struggle. The rallying urge and the unwavering pointer to the only thing that can emancipate the workers—Socialism: The Hope of the World.

ADDENDA.

THE ESSENCE OF MARXISM.

Without tools and knowledge of the making of tools men were the slaves of nature.

When the tool arose, the tool-less men became the slaves of those who owned the tools.

The progress of the tool has made possible increased production of food, improved clothing and shelter, and a general surplus of the good things of life.

With changes in the tool (methods of production, etc,) have occurred changes in ideas, in morals, in religious outlook, in forms of government and social institution. Proof lies in the fact that every economic change in the past has produced corresponding change in the ideas, government, etc.

Private ownership of the tools whereby all live has resulted in class divisions and consequently class struggles.

So long as production is inadequate to afford plenty for all, so long are class divisions of masters and slaves inevitable.

The trend of social evolution is towards increasing production, and decreasing the labour required for production.

Under capitalism this tendency reaches its highest form. Production reaches the point when more than enough for all is produced.

The private ownership of the tools now prevents the development made possible by the increased social production. Evolution awaits the conscious action of the workers when they will take control of the things they socially produce.

The conscious movement springing out of the conditions of capitalist production is the movement of revolutionary Socialism.

It is founded on economic and sociological laws. The things produced under capitalist production are solely the products of social labour.
As commodities or wares they come into the market and on the average exchange at their value.

This economic law of exchange value demonstrates the fact that social labour, and that alone, determines value.

The wares that the worker produces represent the value of the social labour put into their production.

The wages that the worker receives represent, on the average, the value of his labour-power—the commodity sold by him in order to live.

The difference between the value of the product of social labour and the value received by the workers for the sale of the labour-power that produced the product is surplus value, or the profits of the capitalist class.

The existence of surplus value leads to the increased exploitation of Labour, and the intensification of industry, until we reach that sociological stage when only social ownership as well as social production can further evolution and social progress.

The opportunity of Socialism, then, has arrived!
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"Feurbach”—Engels, .. .. .. .. 1/6
"Theoretical System of Karl Marx”—Boudin, .. .. 3/6
"Student’s Marx”—Aveling, .. .. .. .. 2/6
"The State: Its Origin and Function”—W. Paul, .. 2/6

BIOGRAPHICAL.

"Memoirs of Marx”—Liebknecht, .. .. .. .. 1/6
"Life of Marx”—Spargo, .. .. .. .. 8/6
THE PLEBS LEAGUE.

Secretary-Treasurer:
Mrs. W. HORRABIN, 176 SPRINGVALE ROAD, SHEFFIELD.

Executive Committee:
FRANK. S. JACKSON. J. T. WALTON NEWBOLD.
B. S. MACKAY. C. T. PENDREY.
GEO. MASON. C. TERRY. TOM QUELCH.

OBJECT.

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

METHODS.

The formation of local branches and classes for the study of social science, in connection with the Central Labour College (now the Labour College), such classes to be maintained and controlled, wherever possible, by Trades Unions, Trades Councils, or other working-class organizations; and the linking-up of these branches into Districts (or Divisions) with a District (or Divisional) Committee appointed by the branches.

The issuing of a monthly magazine, mainly devoted to the discussion of Labour questions, theoretical and practical.

The assistance in every way of the development of the Central Labour College (now the Labour College), or of any other working-class educational institution, and their maintenance of a definitely working-class educational policy.

MEMBERSHIP.

Open to all who endorse the object of the League.
Each Member shall pay 1/- a year to the Central Fund towards general expenses, publications, etc.
All expenses incurred by District organizations shall be met by an additional payment from members within that area.

MANAGEMENT.

An Executive, together with a Secretary-Treasurer and Magazine Editor, elected at the Annual Meet.

THE PLEBS MAGAZINE.

The Magazine is published monthly, price 2d. (2½d. post paid).
Subscriptions (payable in advance): six months 1/3, yearly 2/6.