

1: EconoSpeak: Labour Defended Against the Claims of "Human Capital"

Labour Defended Against the Claims of Capital Throughout this country at present there exists a serious contest between capital and labour. The journeymen of almost every trade have combined to obtain higher wages, and their employers have appealed to the legislature for protection.

Labour Defended against the Claims of Capital Labour Defended against the Claims of Capital Or the Unproductiveness of Capital proved with Reference to the Present Combinations amongst Journeymen NOTE IN all the debates on the law passed during the late session of Parliament, on account of the combinations of workmen, much stress is laid on the necessity of protecting capital. What capital performs is therefore a question of considerable importance, which the author was, on this account, induced to examine. As a result of this examination, it is his opinion that all the benefits attributed to capital arise from co-existing and skilled labour. He feels himself, on this account, called on to deny that capital has any just claim to the large share of the national produce now bestowed on it. This large share he has endeavored to show is the cause of the poverty of the labourer; and he ventures to assert that the condition of the labourer can never be permanently improved till he can refute the theory, and is determined to oppose the practice of giving nearly everything to capital. Labour Defended Against the Claims of Capital Throughout this country at present there exists a serious contest between capital and labour. The journeymen of almost every trade have combined to obtain higher wages, and their employers have appealed to the legislature for protection. The contest is not only one of physical endurance, or who can stand out longest, but of argument and reason. It is possible for the workmen to force their masters into compliance, but they must convince the public of the justice of their demands. The press has, at present, a great influence over public questions; and by far the greater and more influential part of it is engaged on the side of the capitalist. Through it, however, and through public opinion, must the journeymen find their way to the legislature. They may possibly terrify their masters, but they can only obtain the support of any influential persons by an appeal to reason. To suggest some arguments in favour of labour against capital, is my chief motive for publishing the present pamphlet. The labourers are very unfortunate, I conceive, in being surrounded by nations in a worse political condition than we are, and in some of which labour is still worse paid than here. Labourers are still more unfortunate in being descended from bondsmen and serfs. Personal slavery or villanage formerly existed in Britain, and all the living labourers still suffer from the bondage of their ancestors. Our claims are consequently never tried by the principles of justice. The law-giver and the capitalist always compare our wages with the wages of other labourers; and without adverting to what we produce, which seems the only criterion by which we ought to be paid, we are instantly condemned as insolent and ungrateful if we ask for more than was enjoyed by the slave of former times, and is now enjoyed by the half-starved slave of other countries. By our increased skill and knowledge, labour is now probably ten times more productive than it was two hundred years ago; and we are, forsooth, to be contended with the same rewards which the bondsmen then received. All the advantages of our improvements go to the capitalist and the landlord. When, denied any share in our increased produce, we combine to obtain it, we are instantly threatened with summary punishment. New laws are fulminated against us, and if these are found insufficient we are threatened with laws still more severe. Combination is of itself no crime; on the contrary, it is the principle on which societies are held together. When the Government supposes its existence threatened, or the country in danger, it calls on us all to combine for its protection. No other combination seems unjust or mischievous, in the view of Government, but our combinations to obtain a proper reward for our labour. It is a heinous crime in the eyes of a legislature, composed exclusively of capitalists and landlords, and representing no other interests than their own, for us to try, by any means, to obtain for ourselves and for the comfortable subsistence of our families, a larger share of our own produce than these our masters choose to allow us. All the moral evils that ever plagued a society have been anticipated by the ministers from our persevering in our claims. To put down combinations they have departed from principles held sacred for upwards of two hundred years. They have made also a law handing us over to the magistrates like vagabonds and thieves, and we are to be condemned almost unheard, and without the privilege and

formality of a public trial. All that we are compelled to suffer, all that we have had inflicted on us, has been done for the advantage of capital. If its operations be not left free, if they are to be controlled by bodies of workmen, it will leave this for some more favoured country. Under the influence of such notions, no laws for the protection of capital are thought too severe, and few or no persons, except the labourers, see either impropriety or injustice in the fashionable mode of despising his claims, and laughing at his distresses. In fact the legislature, the public at large, and especially our employers, decide on our claims solely by a reference to the former condition of the labourer, or to his condition in other countries. We are told to be contented, because we are not quite so badly off as the ragged Irish peasants who are suffering under a more grievous system even than the one which afflicts us. By them also we are destined to suffer; for they are imported here in crowds, and beat down the wages of our labour. We can have no hope, therefore, either of convincing the public or of calling the blush of shame into the cheek of those who are opulent by our toils, and who deride the poverty and sufferings they cause, by referring to the customs of any other society, either in times past or present. To obtain better treatment the labourers must appeal from practice to principle. We must put out of view how labour has been paid in times past, and how it is now paid in other countries, and we must show how it ought to be paid. This, I admit, is a difficult task, but the former condition of the labourer in this country, and his condition at present in other countries, leaving us no criterion to which we can or ought to appeal, we must endeavour to perform it. The claims of capital, are, I am aware, sanctioned by almost universal custom; and as long as the labourer did not feel himself aggrieved by them, it was of no use opposing them with arguments. But now, when the practice excites resistance, we are bound, if possible, to overthrow the theory on which it is founded and justified. It is accordingly against this theory that my arguments will be directed. When we have settled the question, however, as to the claims of capital or labour, we shall have proceeded only one step towards ascertaining what ought now to be the wages of labour. The other parts of the inquiry will, I trust, be entered into by some of my fellow-labourers, and I shall content myself at present with examining the claims of the capitalists, as supported by the theories of political economy. I admit that the subject is somewhat abstruse, but there is a necessity for the labourers to comprehend and be able to refute the received notions of the nature and utility of capital. The theory on which profits are claimed, and which holds up capital, and accumulation of capital to our administration as the mainspring of human improvement, is that which I say the labourers must, in their own interest, examine, and must, before they can have any hope of a permanent improvement in their own conditions, be able to refute. They, indeed, are so satisfied that by their exertions all the wealth of society is produced that no doubt on the subject has ever entered their minds. This is not, however, the case with other people, and whenever the labourers claim larger wages, or combine to do themselves justice, they hear, both from the legislature and the Press, little or nothing about the necessity of rewarding labour, but much about the necessity of protecting capital. They must therefore be able to show the hollowness of the theory on which the claims of capital, and on which all the oppressive laws made for its protection are founded. This will, I hope, be a motive with them for endeavouring to comprehend the following observations, as it is my excuse for directing them, not so much to show what labour ought, as to what capital ought not to have. It is to them, therefore, that all which is derived from the surface of the earth, or from its bowels, by the united application of immediate labour, and of capital, or accumulated labour, must primarily belong. The other classes of society have no revenue except what they derive either voluntarily or by compulsion from these three classes. It is the greater produce of all the land which is more fertile than the least fertile land cultivated. To produce this surplus would not break the back, and to give it up would not break the heart of the labourer. The labourers do only receive, and ever have only received, as much as will subsist them, the landlords receive the surplus produce of the more fertile soils, and all the rest of the whole produce of labour in this and in every country goes to the capitalist under the name of profit for the use of his capital. Capital which thus engrosses the whole produce of a country, except the bare subsistence of the labourer, and the surplus produce of fertile land, is, "the produce of labour," "is commodities," "is the food the labourer eats, and the machines he uses": Capital, the reader will suppose, must have some wonderful properties, when the labourer pays so exorbitantly for it. In fact, its claims are founded on its wonderful properties, and to them, therefore, I mean especially to direct his attention. Several good and

great men, whom we must all respect and esteem, seeing that capital did obtain all the large share I have mentioned, and being more willing, apparently, to defend and to explain the present order of society than to ascertain whether it could be improved, have endeavoured to point out the method in which capital aids production. From their writings I shall extract some passages explanatory of its effects. I must, however, beg not to be understood as doing this invidiously. The only motive I have for selecting these authors, as the representatives of the political economists, is, that they are by far the more efficient and eloquent supporters of the doctrine I do not assent to. And it is only by their conjoined and powerful operation that wealth can be largely produced and universally diffused. These are provided for him by the capitalist. For making this provision the capitalist of course expects a reward. In other parts of his book it is not the capitalist who provides, but the capital which works. He speaks of capital as an instrument of production co-operating with labour, as an active agent combining with labour to produce commodities, and thus he satisfies himself, and endeavours to prove to the reader that capital is entitled to all that large share of the produce it actually receives. He also attributes to capital power of accumulation. This power or tendency to accumulate, he adds, is not so great as the tendency of population to augment -- and on the difference between these two tendencies he and other authors have erected a theory of society which places poor Mother Nature in no favourable light. Without troubling myself to quote more passages from these authors, or to transcribe the opinion of other writers, I shall proceed to examine the effects of capital; and I shall begin with circulating capital. A weaver, for example, could not apply himself entirely to his peculiar business, unless there was beforehand stored up somewhere, either in his own possession, or in that of some other person, a stock sufficient for his maintenance, and for supplying him with the materials and implements required to carry on his work, till he has not only completed, but sold his web. This accumulation must evidently be previous to his applying himself for so long a time to a peculiar business. He has time to learn an art, and his labour is rendered more productive when directed by skill. Being assured of immediate subsistence, he can ascertain which, with his peculiar knowledge and acquirements, and with reference to the wants of society, is the best method of labouring, and he can labour in this manner. Unless there were this assurance there could be no continuous thought, an invention, and no knowledge but that which would be necessary for the supply of our immediate animal wants. The weaver, I admit, could not complete his web, nor would the shipwright begin to build his ship, unless he knew that while he was engaged in this labour he should be able to procure food. A merchant certainly could not set out for South America or the East Indies unless he were confident that during the period of his absence he and his family could find subsistence, and that he would be able at the end of his voyage to pay all the expenses he had incurred. It is this assurance, this knowledge, this confidence of obtaining subsistence and reward, which enables and induces men to undertake long and complicated operations, and the question is, do men derive this assurance from a stock of goods already provided saved from the produce of previous labour and ready to pay them, or from any other source? The labourer, the real maker of any commodity, derives this assurance from a knowledge he has that the person who set him to work will pay him, and that with the money he will be able to buy what he requires. He is not in possession of any stock of commodities. Has the person who employs and pays him such a stock? Only a very few capitalists possess any of those commodities which the labourers they employ consume. He possesses money, he possesses credit with other capitalists, he possesses, under the sanction of the law, a power over the labour of the slave-descended labourer, but he does not possess food or clothing. He pays the labourer his money wages, and the expectation which other labourers have of receiving part of these wages or other wages, induces them in the meantime to prepare the clothing and food the labourer constantly requires. Not to deal, however, in general terms and abstractions, doing which seems to have led other writers astray, let us descend to particulars. A great cotton manufacturer, we suppose, for example, a Sir Robert Peel, or any other of those leviathans who are so anxious to retain their power over us, and who, as legislators, either in their own persons or in the persons of their sons, make the laws which both calumniate and oppress us, employs a thousand persons, whom he pays weekly: Does he even know whether the food and clothing they receive are prepared and created? In fact, are the food and clothing which his labourers will consume prepared beforehand, or are other labourers busily employed in preparing food and clothing while his labourers are making cotton yarn?

Let us first examine the question as to food. One portion of the food of the people is BREAD, which is never prepared till within a few hours of the time when it is eaten. The corn of which the bread is made must, of course, have been grown, or one part of the whole operation, and that the longest part -- that between saving the seed and harvesting the ripe grain, which is necessary to the complete preparation of the food, has been performed; but the corn has afterward to be thrashed, ground, sifted, brought to market and made into bread. For the cotton-spinner to be able to attend only to his peculiar species of industry, it is indispensable that other men should be constantly engaged in completing this complicated process, every part of it being as necessary as the part performed by the agriculturist. The produce of several of the labourers particularly of the baker, cannot be stored up. In no case can the material of bread, whether it exist as corn or flour, be preserved without continual labour. The employer of the working cotton-spinner can have no bread stored up, for there is none prepared; the labouring cotton-spinner himself knows nothing of any stock of corn being in existence from which his bread can be made; he knows that he has always been able to get bread when he had wherewithal to buy it, and further he does not require to know. But even if he did know of such a stock, he would probably give up cotton-spinning and take to preparing food, if he did not also know that while he is making cotton other labourers will till the ground, and prepare him food, which he will be able to procure by making cotton. If it be said that the cattle to supply it are already there -- why, the answer is, they require constant attention and constant labour, and their food, through the greater part of the year, is of daily growth. The fields in which they pasture require the hand of man; and, though some herds be drilled into the habits of obedience more perfect and certainly more pleasing to see than the obedience of soldiers, yet even they require perpetual attention, and their milk must be drawn from them twice a day. The meat, also, which the labourer eats is not ready, even for cooking, till it is on the shambles, and it cannot be stored up, for it begins instantly to deteriorate after it is brought to market.

2: Sandwichman – Labour Defended Against the Claims of "Human Capital" ~ Mike Norman Economics

Labour defended against the claims of capital: or, the unproductiveness of capital proved with reference to the present combinations against journeymen.

I have consumed my entire original capital in the form of revenue, that is, I have received an equivalent for it, which I have consumed. The new capital consists solely of the appropriated labour of other people. In considering surplus-value as such, the original form of the product, hence of the surplus product, is of no consequence. It becomes important when considering the actual process of reproduction, partly in order to understand its forms, and partly in order to grasp the influence of luxury production, etc. Here is another example of how use-value as such acquires economic significance. But the possessors of the surplus produce, or capital, will neither maintain the population the following year in idleness, nor allow the produce to perish; they will employ them upon something not directly and immediately productive, for instance, in the erection of machinery, etc. Their power to produce is not necessarily equal to our power to produce. But the pamphlet stresses that it is not only national labour, but also national surplus labour which is embodied in the outcome of foreign trade. If surplus labour or surplus-value were represented only in the national surplus product, then the increase of value for the sake of value and therefore the exaction of surplus labour would be restricted by the limited, narrow circle of use-values in which the value of the [national] labour would be represented. But it is only foreign trade, the development of the market to a world market, which causes money to develop into world money and abstract labour into social labour. Abstract wealth, value, money, hence abstract labour, develop in the measure that concrete labour becomes a totality of different modes of labour embracing the world market. Capitalist production rests on the value or the transformation of the labour embodied in the product into social labour. But this is only [possible] on the basis of foreign trade and of the world market. This is at once the pre-condition and the result of capitalist production. It does not, consequently, make the claim that its conception of surplus-value as surplus labour carries with it a general criticism of the entire system of economic categories, nor can this be expected of it. The author stands rather on Ricardian ground and is only consistent in stating one of the consequences inherent in the system itself and he advances it in the interests of the working class against capital. For the rest, the author remains a captive of the economic categories as he finds them. Just as in the case of Ricardo the confusion of surplus-value with profit leads to undesirable contradictions, so in his case the fact that he christens surplus-value the interest of capital. To be sure, he is in advance of Ricardo in that he first of all reduces all surplus-value to surplus labour, and when he calls surplus-value interest of capital, he at the same time emphasises that by this he understands the general form of surplus labour in contrast to its special forms—rent, interest of money and industrial profit. He thus distinguishes the general form of surplus labour or surplus-value from their particular forms, something which neither Ricardo nor Adam Smith [does], at least not consciously or consistently. But on the other hand, he applies the name of one of these particular forms—“interest”—to the general form. And this suffices to make him relapse into economic slang. This passage reminds one of Carey. But with him it is not the labourer who uses capital, but capital which uses the labourer. However, what he really means is that in the exchange of capital for labour the appropriation of alien labour should be reduced or that the worker should appropriate more of his own labour and capital less. Reduction of surplus labour can mean two things: Less work should be performed over and above the time which is necessary to reproduce the labour-power, that is, to create an equivalent for wages; or, less of the total quantity of labour should assume the form of surplus labour, that is, the form of time worked gratis for the capitalist; therefore less of the product in which labour manifests itself should take the form of surplus product; in other words, the worker should receive more of his own product and less of it should go to the capitalist. The author is not quite clear about this himself, as can be seen from the following passage which is really the last word in this matter as far as the pamphlet is concerned: Since what is understood by interest here is profit, rent, interest—in short, all the forms of surplus-value—and since, according to the author himself, capital is nothing but the produce of labour, i. The product is not transformed into capital. No surplus product and no surplus labour exist. Only then is a nation really rich. This

can mean however: There is no product and no labour over and above the product and the labour required for the reproduction of the workers. Or, they [the workers] themselves appropriate this surplus either of the product or of the labour. This can now mean: The economists themselves justify the slave-labour of the wage-labourers by saying that it creates leisure, free time for others, for another section of society—and thereby also for the society of wage-labourers. Or it can also mean: The workers now work six hours more than the time now required for their own reproduction. If capital ceases to exist, then the workers will work for six hours only and the idlers will have to work the same amount of time. The material wealth of all would thus be depressed to the level of the workers. But all would have disposable time, that is, free time for their development. The author himself is obviously not clear about this. Nevertheless, there remains the fine statement: A nation is really rich when six hours instead of twelve hours are worked. This means, in other words, that the greatest possible abundance of material wealth is created in the shortest possible labour-time. There is always the wish that the smallest possible portion of society should be doomed to the slavery of labour, to forced labour. This is the utmost that can be accomplished from the capitalist standpoint. The author puts an end to this. Labour-time, even if exchange-value is eliminated, always remains the creative substance of wealth and the measure of the cost of its production. It is self-evident that if labour-time is reduced to a normal length and, furthermore, labour is no longer performed for someone else, but for myself, and, at the same time, the social contradictions between master and men, etc. A most remarkable work. The author of *The Source and Remedy of the National Difficulties* discussed above understands surplus-value in its original form, i. Consequently his attention is mainly centred on the extent of labour-time. In particular, the conception of surplus labour or [surplus-] value in its absolute form; the extension of labour-time beyond that required for the reproduction of the labourer himself, not the reduction of necessary labour as a result of the development of the productive power of labour. The reduction of this necessary labour is the principal aspect examined by Ricardo, but in the way it is carried out in capitalist production, namely, as a means for extending the amount of labour-time accruing to capital. Ravenstone seems to assume the working-day as given. Hence, what he is particularly interested in—just as was also the author of the pamphlet previously discussed, so that the theoretical questions only crop up incidentally—is relative surplus-value or the surplus product which accrues to capital as a result of the development of the productive power of labour. As is usual with those who adopt this standpoint, surplus labour is conceived here more in the form of surplus product, whereas in the previous [pamphlet], surplus product is conceived more in the form of surplus labour. The opposition evoked by the Ricardian theory—on the basis of its own assumptions—has the following characteristic feature. To the same extent as political economy developed—and this development finds its most trenchant expression in Ricardo, as far as fundamental principles are concerned—it presented labour as the sole element of value and the only creator of use-values, and the development of the productive forces as the only real means for increasing wealth; the greatest possible development of the productive power of labour as the economic basis of society. This is, in fact, the foundation of capitalist production. In this contradiction, political economy merely expressed the essence of capitalist production or, if you like, of wage-labour, of labour alienated from itself, which stands confronted by the wealth it has created as alien wealth, by its own productive power as the productive power of its product, by its enrichment as its own impoverishment and by its social power as the power of society. But this definite, specific, historical form of social labour which is exemplified in capitalist production is proclaimed by these economists as the general, eternal form, as a natural phenomenon, and these relations of production as the absolutely not historically necessary, natural and reasonable relations of social labour. Their thoughts being entirely confined within the bounds of capitalist production, they assert that the contradictory form in which social labour manifests itself there, is just as necessary as labour itself freed from this contradiction. Since in the self-same breath they proclaim on the one hand, labour as such for them, labour is synonymous with wage-labour and on the other, capital as such—that is the poverty of the workers and the wealth of the idlers—to be the sole source of wealth, they are perpetually involved in absolute contradictions without being in the slightest degree aware of them. Sismondi was epoch-making in political economy because he had an inkling of this contradiction. Labour is the sole source of exchange-value and the only active creator of use-value. This is what you say. On the other hand, you say that capital is everything, and the

worker is nothing or a mere production cost of capital. You have refuted yourselves. Capital is nothing but defrauding of the worker. This, in fact, is the ultimate meaning of all the writings which defend the interests of the proletariat from the Ricardian standpoint basing themselves on his assumptions. Just as little as he [Ricardo] understands the identity of capital and labour in his own system, do they understand the contradiction they describe. That is why the most important among them—Hodgskin, for example—accept all the economic pre-conditions of capitalist production as eternal forms and only desire to eliminate capital, which is both the basis and necessary consequence [of these preconditions]. By productive industry Ravenstone understands industry which produces necessaries. Unproductive industry, the industry of consumption, is a consequence of the development of capital, or property. Ravenstone appears ascetic like the author of the pamphlet discussed above. Without capital, without property, the necessaries of the workers would be produced in abundance, but there would be no luxury industry. Or it can also be said that Ravenstone, like the author of the pamphlet discussed above, understands or at least in fact admits the historical necessity of capital; since capital, according to the author of the pamphlet, produces surplus labour over and above the labour strictly necessary for the maintenance [of the worker] and at the same time leads to the creation of machinery what he calls fixed capital and gives rise to foreign trade, the world market, in order to utilise the surplus product filched from the workers partly to increase productive power, partly to give this surplus product the most diverse forms of use-value far removed from those required by necessity. Ravenstone and the pamphleteer do not say this in justification of capital, but simply seize on it as a point of attack because all this is done in opposition to [the interest of] the workers and not for them. But in fact they thus admit that this is a result of capitalist production, which is therefore a historical form of social development, even though it stands in contradiction to that part of the population which constitutes the basis of that whole development, In this respect they share the narrow-mindedness of the economists although from a diametrically opposite position for they confuse the contradictory form of this development with its content. The latter wish to perpetuate the contradiction on account of its results. The former are determined to sacrifice the fruits which have developed within the antagonistic form, in order to get rid of the contradiction. This distinguishes their opposition to [bourgeois] political economy from that of contemporary people like Owen; likewise from that of Sismondi, who harks back to antiquated forms of the contradiction in order to be rid of it in its acute form. But every increase of skill adds to the proportion which can be reserved for rent. Where the labour of nine is required for the maintenance of ten, only one-tenth of the gross produce can be given to rent. An original piece of work. Its real subject is the modern system of national debt, as its title indicates. Amongst other things he says: With reference to the Present Combinations amongst Journeymen. Thomas Hodgskin, Popular Political Economy. The anonymous first work is also by Hodgskin. Whereas the pamphlets mentioned previously and a series of similar ones have disappeared without trace, these writings, especially the first one, made a considerable stir and are still regarded as belonging to the most important works of English political economy see John Lalor, Money and Morals, London, We shall consider each of these works in turn. Ricardo does not assert that capital is productive of value. It only adds its own value to the product, and its own value depends on the labour-time required for its reproduction. It only has value as accumulated labour or rather , materialised labour and it only adds this—its value—to the product in which it is embodied. It is true that he is inconsistent when discussing the general rate of profit.

3: Thomas Hodgskin - Wikipedia

Labour defended against the claims of capital, or, The unproductiveness of capital proved with reference to the present combinations of journeymen by: Hodgskin, Thomas,

4: Labour Defended Against the Claims of Capital, by Thomas Hodgskin | The Online Books Page

Labour Defended Against the Claims of Capital has 3 ratings and 0 reviews: Published January 1st by A. M. Kelley, pages, Hardcover.

5: The Avalon Project : Labour Defended against the Claims of Capital

Loading Labour defended against the claims of capital; or, The unproductiveness of capital proved with reference to the present combinations amongst www.enganchecubano.com an introd. by G. D. H. Cole.

6: Clive Lewis claims New Labour failed to tax the rich enough | Politics | The Guardian

In Labour Defended Against the Claims of Capital, Hodgskin stated explicitly that the purpose of his essay was to refute the arguments of John Ramsay McCulloch and James Mill to show that: "the effects attributed [by them] to a stock of commodities, under the name of circulating capital, are caused by co-existing labour." In a prefatory note.

7: Economic Manuscripts: Theories of Surplus-Value, Chapter 21

McCulloch, J.R. () A Treatise on the Circumstances which Determine the Rate of Wages and the Condition of the Labour ing Classes Including an Inquiry into the influence of Com binations, 2nd ed. , New York: www.enganchecubano.com,

8: Labour Defended Against the Claims of Capital : Thomas Hodgskin :

The title of "Labour Defended" was a jibe at James Mill's earlier "Commerce Defended" and signalled his opposition to the latter taking sides with the capitalists against their employees.

Jewish self-hatred NICENE AND POST-NICENE FATHERS: Second Series, Volume VIII Basil Spying for the Revolution Training for store service The popularization of social science. The Many-Sided Franklin Hurricane Watch (Lets Read and Find Out) Interdisciplinary Studies on Ancient Stone; Asmosi Appendix: 1. The may-fly: a study in transformation. 2. Health, a conquest. 3. Evening in spring: a medit To punish the hostiles Bibliography of higher education in Canada : supplement = Cheap Trick Greatest Hits The treasure of the seas Nature Fantasy Designs Chemical oxidations with microorganisms Homeland (Forgotten Realms: The Dark Elf Trilogy, Book 1) A Black physicians story Gunmans Reckoning Films of Cary Grant. The economy from Liberalism to Fascism Marcello De Cecco Games of the hangman Number of occurrences Engineering graphics essentials 4th edition solutions Heidi (Deluxe Watermill Classics) J.J. Straight Talking Urban policy in the European Union Trans Fatty Acids 2004 suzuki xl7 owners manual PC Music The Easy Guide Trust me by Jane Doak The traitor queen This book isnt fat its fabulous The Internet and campaign 2004 Bibliography of Glengarry County Mass Spectrometry: Volume 193 Dora Stock, portrait painter of the Koerner circle in Dresden (1785-1815) How a criminal case works through the courts The Moodys and Coffins and Everyone Dark Sweat, White Gold The Miami metropolitan experiment.