

upon the commercial factor in this great struggle, and the wars between England and Holland. Instead we read that Cromwell continued the policy of Elizabeth and Spain was the national enemy once more. In the account of the Restoration we have religion and autocracy the moving factors and incidents of court gossip, but of the stupendous advance in science, not a word. Charles II gave continuance to and christened the Royal Society of Scientific Research, and magnets; air pumps; blood circulation; plants; animals; all began to unfold their mysterious ways to man. Boyle, Wilkins, Woodward, Ray and company surely have a place in a story of mankind which has so much to say of Charles II, whose energy seemed to have been devoted to creating aristocracies for his bastards. Newton had laid mankind under heavy obligations ere this merry monarch was recalled from exile, in fact we think the fateful apple had already rudely disturbed his sleep; anyway, 1665 is the year in which he had the theory of gravity fully developed, though not proven.

But these sidesteps into the material factors are extending unduly the length of our review. We pass further European development to "the great figure of Washington standing guard over the cause of the colonists." The American Revolution account is wholly orthodox and Jefferson is duly credited with the Declaration of Independence, without any reference to Thomas Paine. The American Revolution also, we are told, brought about the French Revolution, to which we must now proceed (p. 338): We receive a warning; a book, a play, or a movie of the French Revolution always presents the rabble as the cause. Nothing of the kind. The mob is used by middle class professionals: "The fundamental ideas which caused the revolution were invented by a few brilliant minds." Quite easy; get a few brilliant minds to invent some ideas, pick up a hungry rabble and go to it. Such is history! But following this warning we read of much misery and economic paralysis which appears to have some bearing on the revolution. The good King Louis is treated very gently, and, "quietly and with much dignity" suffered himself to be taken to the scaffold. He had never understood what all the shooting and fuss had been about. And he had been too proud to ask questions. Dear me! What is this lump in our throat; and whence this river in our eyes! We feel constrained to lay violent hands on the first Frenchman we may meet.

We cannot recommend Mr. Van Loon from this time onward, and would vote for the destruction of the remainder. We pass over the jibes at the revolutionists, which may or may not be justified. But no justification can be advanced for the statement: "The Age of Reason (which Thomas Paine had written so eloquently during the American Revolution) . . . etc." Paine's "Age of Reason" was written while awaiting death in a Paris jail during the French Revolution, in 1794, and eloquent is the last word which may describe that earnest document.

We turn from the school book history of the succeeding pages (our objections would exceed in bulk the hundred-odd pages that remain), to the comments on the working class and their struggle. Page 425 we read: "In England, Robert Owen, the owner of many cotton mills, established a so-called 'socialist Community' which was a success. But when he died the prosperity of New Lanark came to an end." In the first place, New Lanark was in Scotland, and Owen had severed his industrial connections with it and all his other factories long before he died, being ruined principally by the New Harmony colony in the States. New Lanark was purely a business venture.

Now follows Karl Marx, "He had heard of Owen and Blanc and began to interest himself in questions of labor and wages and unemployment." He had heard of Blanc all right, and Blanc had heard of him. As the Communist Manifesto was written in January 1848 and the social workshops of the French government (not Blanc) were not instituted until after the February Revolution of 1848 they could hardly have been the cause of Marx turning to labor.

Then we read that his "liberal" views made him very unpopular with the police authorities of Germany. "Marx believed that all history was a long struggle between those who 'have' and those who don't have." We don't know why the "have" and "don't have" are in quotation marks, but we can assure Mr. Van Loon that Marx never believed anything of the kind. Again: "The introduction and general use of machinery had created a new class in society, that of the capitalists who used their surplus wealth to buy the tools which were then used by the laborers to produce still more wealth, which was again used to build more factories and so on, until the end of time. Meanwhile, according to Marx, the third estate (the bourgeoisie) was growing richer and richer, and the fourth estate (the proletariat) was growing poorer and poorer, and he predicted that in the end one man would possess all the wealth of the world while the others would be his employees and dependent on his good will." (page 426) Of all the attempts to briefly summarize Marx by a responsible writer, this is the most pitifully inadequate that we have seen. Entirely wrong in substance and principle, it arouses grave doubts as to the author's right to speak on other subjects.

But the same spirit prevails throughout the entire book. The Paris Commune is not even mentioned, the 1848 revolutions but vaguely intimated, and for the revolts of feudal and ancient history conducted by the working class they are mentioned with a sneer, when mentioned at all, which is seldom. Now this is common to almost every history, and will continue so for some time; the book under review is not singular in this respect. There are many errors, but Mr. Van Loon protests and warns his readers against being taken for an infallible guide. Many of these errors can be traced to a somewhat incomprehensible partiality to the great man and to good birth,—for instance, on page 430 he says in the latter part of the 17th century "the Marquis de Laplace was working on a new theory of creation . . . etc." Laplace did not become a Marquis until after the Restoration of the Bourbons in the beginning of the 18th century. The noble Marquis did not become an astronomer and mathematician; on the contrary, the poor scientist became a Marquis.

Aside from this, there is merit in having told the Story of Mankind in less than 500 pages in such a manner that it cannot fail to interest; it will certainly tend to create a new concept of man's development. Therein lies the value of the book, and it is considerable. We are of the opinion that some courageous publisher could realize the cent. per cent. item, and also satisfy the utmost demands of fact, if some historian with the necessary training, leisure and substance were to apply himself to the task of writing history in the light of Marx.

J. D. HARRINGTON

ECONOMICS FOR WORKERS

(Continued from page 5)

Some people might think that if the value of a commodity is determined by the labor spent on it, the more idle and unskilful the laborer, the more valuable would his commodity be, because more time would be required in its production. The labor, however, that forms the substance of value, is homogeneous human labor." On p. 46 Marx emphasizes socially necessary labor time. "The labor-time socially necessary is that required to produce an article under the normal conditions of production and with the average degree of skill and intensity prevalent at the time." "The introduction of power looms into England probably reduced by one-half the labor required to weave a given quantity of yarn into cloth. The handloom weavers, as a matter of fact, continued to require the same time as before; but for all that, the product of one hour of their labor represented after the change only half an hour's social labor, and consequently fell to one half its former value." We see then that, that which determines the magnitude of value of any article is the

amount of labor time socially necessary for its production.

In a foot note Marx draws attention to an unknown writer who wrote in the year 1738 or 1740. "The value of them (the necessaries of life) when they are exchanged the one for the other, is regulated by the quantity of labor necessarily required and commonly taken in producing them."

One book on Banking starts out with this: "A distinction must be made between value and price. The value of an article is its exchange relationship to another article."

The writer, although starting clear on value and price, soon gets all mixed up. Marx states it thus: "Exchange value is the relationship between two or more commodities, based upon the amount of socially necessary labor time embodied in their production." Again, "Exchange value alters according to the amount of socially necessary labor time embodied in the commodity."

If we eliminate their use values, commodities have a common property left, the socially necessary labor time embodied in their production.

The value an article has in consumption is its use value, but use value has no relationship to exchange value, e.g., a carpenter's hammer has probably more use value than any other tool he uses, but no one would suggest it has the greatest exchange value amongst his tools. Use value, although a necessary factor embodied in a commodity, has no relationship to its exchange value. A thing can have a use value and have no exchange value, as Marx points out regarding air, water and virgin soil. Again a thing can be useful and the product of labor without being a commodity.

Whoever produces for his own wants creates use values but not commodities. In order to produce commodities he must produce use values for others. If the thing is useless, the labor contained in it is also useless, and therefore creates no values. Marx illustrates how labor can be waste labor. "If the market cannot stomach all the linen that the weaver has produced, even although every piece of it contains no more labor time than is socially necessary, in spite of this we have had superfluous labor-time of the community expended in the form of weaving having the same effect as if every individual weaver had expended more labor-time on this particular product than was socially necessary."

The proof of the labor theory of value is seen in every book on industrial efficiency, illustrating costing departments and scientific management, with cards giving accurate time records to do certain jobs and with spaces for noting the workers' efficiency and productive capacity, to be entered with motion studies by moving pictures to eliminate waste movements of the workers, and reducing hours where fatigue has hampered output.

The "Efficiency Magazine," Oct. 1917: "If cows can be developed so as to give three times as much milk, is it not possible to train employees so that the output will be multiplied three times?" This during the war and since has been brought about with greater division of labor and specialized automatic machines.

The following words, from an advertisement by a Coventry firm in England in their magazine: "Today's problem is how to turn out the work with less time," show still further proof.

The struggle for the world's markets is a struggle to cheapen commodities between competitors, by lessening the socially necessary labor time in their production, and also to realize a surplus value, which we will discuss in a future lesson.

Keep in view that exchange value is the socially necessary labor embodied in the production of commodities.

Next lesson is: Money. . . . We will then be able to take up the subject price more intelligently