

THE  
"Plebs" Magazine

Vol. III.

March, 1911.

No. 2.

Copyright Entered at Stationer's Hall.

EDITORIAL

THE RUSKIN COLLEGE Secretary's reply to Professor Ramsey Muir, of Liverpool University, through the columns of the *Liverpool Post*, and which we reprinted in the February issue, confirms literally what we have continually

**Two Aspects  
of the  
Same Movement.**

pointed out in the course of our propaganda, viz., that the Workers' Educational Association and Ruskin College, "are not, and cannot be, hostile; they are aspects of the same great movement." Such candidness is decidedly fresh and unusual, coming as it does, from Ruskin College. But the connexion between Ruskin College and the W. E. A. has never been concealed for those who have looked beneath the surface of things. This heterodox burst of frankness has been called forth by the feverish anxiety of the hounds, fearful lest the hare should escape them. So they needs must assure each other that they are both out for being "in at the death." We, therefore, welcome this assurance for the reason that it will save us space and time in any further discussion as to the identity of their aspirations. "They are aspects of the same great movement." We might, however, here point out that since the appearance of the Central Labour College in the field of education, the apostles of the W. E. A. have been saying the same thing as Mr. Henry Allsopp, with reference to the C. L. C.; that they too "are aspects of the same great movement." One is all and all is one. We have never been, and will not be, a party to such false monism. If the W. E. A. have found it easier and more convenient to identify us with themselves than reply to our criticisms, it has by no means stopped the flow of our criticism. We, at least, will not complicate the problem even though it mean the descent upon our heads of the wrath of the most high god, impartiality. The problem now reduces itself to this: the identity of Ruskin College and the Worker's Educational Association being given to prove that the educational

policy and principle for which they stand are not in accord with the circumstances and needs of the working class. What are those circumstances and needs? Poverty, starvation, and misery is the common lot of the working class. Under the present wages-system, the situation of the wage-earning mass so far from growing better has gone from bad to worse. This is a proposition that can be doubted only by those who derive their political economy from books, and who treat of the matter purely intellectually and to whom the practice is foreign. The economic lecturers of the W. E. A., Ruskin College, are typical of those who treat of the matter in this fashion. Professor Marshall, whose political economy is the staple intellectual diet of the W. E. A., Ruskin College students, teaches that *the falling rate of profit is an indication of the rise in wages which is characteristic of the present*. That is a typical example of the reasoning practised in University circles where any vital conception of the real economic process is absent. The result of such teaching is not clarification but confusion. It is quite the custom

**The  
Problem Put.**

to compare the life of the working class at two different periods in order to prove that the worker is better off in the later period than in the earlier. The relation of wages to wants at different periods does not trouble people who reason in this way, and the result is that conclusions of the most ridiculous and false character are reached and served up as wisdom and "common-sensible economics." A simple fact which the practice demonstrates is that while in former times the wages of the man sufficed to procure the needs of the family, to-day it is necessary for the wife and child to supplement the wages of the husband in order to enable them all to live no better relatively than before. And so far from the falling rate of profit indicating a decrease in exploitation it means that the producers are being exploited increasingly. Here again the practice of the proletariat is superior to the economic theoretician of the University. Right well does he who is fortunate enough to secure a buyer for his labour power know that he has to work harder to-day than ever he did before. The speeding up of machinery and the intensification of labour with which the Marshal's don't seem to have cultivated even a nodding acquaintance is quite familiar to the labourer. All this is not to deny that there has been a progress in social evolution but to put that progress in its proper place and to show that, so far, it has been partial and one-sided, and that it must inevitably be so in a society where the producer is exploited *i.e.* where the labourer buys the permission to work for his own support only by paying for it in surplus or gratuitous labour. We are quite prepared to acquiesce in the inevitability of this exploitation in the past. In this sense the proletarian method of investigation is the really "impartial" method. We study the past, not to condemn it, but to understand it, and in the light of such understanding to enable us to grasp the development and direction of society in the present. On the other hand, the bourgeoisie method

is to condemn the past in order to set off the present with an Eden-like glow and glitter. Slavery in Ancient Rome is, for the apologists of the present system a vice, the outcome of ignorance. Capitalism in twentieth century England is a virtue, an emanation of eternal reason. We repeat that exploitation and suffering was inevitable until now, inevitable as long as the labour of the masses was not fertile enough to satisfy all human and social needs. So long as there was not enough for all, so long as the productive powers were deficient, poverty was inevitable and to that extent intelligible. But the scene is changed, these deficiencies have disappeared, but poverty yet remains, and its existence to that extent is a contradiction. There are no human or social needs that to-day cannot be produced over and over again. Labour has become so fertile, the means of sustenance so easily produced that—that what? That less and less labour is required, that more and more labourers are unemployed, that more and more poverty abounds. Labour power has become so productive that the labourer is deprived of his employment, a phenomenon unknown to previous systems of society. Why should misery be caused by an abundance of goods, by a superfluity of wealth? Because of the form of production viz. for sale, because of the dual position of the producer in that he is both a seller of his labour power and a buyer of the product. From this merchandise status of labour which is an indispensable pre-requisite of production for sale flows all the ills to which the working class is heir.



THE prime and immediate need of the working class is, therefore, the abolition of the merchandise status of labour. All other needs stand unrealizable before this one, except the need to intelligently organize for the great event. And for this great task we can look for no help outside of the ranks of the oppressed. It is no doubt true that some individuals rise above their class interests, but they are "the exceptions which prove the inductive rule." Many will come, many have come, in the name of the revolution seeking to blind it. They will succeed only as long as we ourselves are blind to the nature of our circumstances and needs. And to understand these circumstances, to recognize the road on which we must travel to the realization of our needs, we require no University training or education at the hands of those who have been so trained. But that is precisely what the Workers' Educational Association and Ruskin College say we need. And that is precisely the reason why they are both incapable of serving the working classes in its march towards the goal. Professor Ramsey Muir, zealous advocate of the W. E. A., complains that Ruskin College have not got University teachers. Mr. Allsopp hastens to assure him that his complaint is unfounded, that "the Members of

**Do we need  
a  
University  
Education?**

the permanent staff of Ruskin College are all University men with the "highest qualifications," and "three of them are University teachers."



We have here again another important admission on a matter over which there has hitherto been a considerable amount of wriggling. Not only are Ruskin College and the Workers' Educational Association admitted to be "two aspects of the same movement," but there is now the further admission that both stand for a system of education carried on by "University teachers," by men who have received a University training—"men with the highest qualifications." Thus, academic thought is put forward as the criterion of education for the working class and academic men as the impetus of this education. Certainly this sort of education is highly qualified—to confuse, to humbug, to mislead. There is no man more incapable of understanding the proletariat and of promoting the proletarian movement than the average University teacher. The very nature of his training, the character of the institution in which he is trained unfits him for becoming an ally of the wage-earning class. Here and there are one or two honourable exceptions, and these are generally cases where the individual has long ceased to move in the active life of the University. But in the main it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a University teacher to understand the working class. The latter appears as crude and barbaric in the cultured eye, a force that must be tamed by the wondrous and disciplining mind of the intellectual. This contempt of the "intellectual" for the labouring class is very old—as old as class oppression. Time was in which it was openly shown. It is only when the intellectual himself becomes a saleable ware, treated like other merchandise, and especially when there are more of these wares upon the market than are required, that the contempt for those who work with their hands is veiled over. On the other hand, the growth of the working-class movement, the growing evidence of its determination to make a clean sweep of the present social order opens up a new prospect to this "new middle class" to which the University professors and teachers belong. A certain section of them seek the good graces of the keepers of the purse by openly proclaiming the eternal character of Capitalism. In this way they seek to fortify their position as the intellectual retainers of the ruling class. They are, from the point of view of the working class, the least dangerous. They belong to the same species as the Anti-Socialist crusader in political life. On the other hand, there are those, and they are a growing number, who see in the advancing files of the working class a better prospect, not only in that it secures a new market for their intellectual ware, but also the possibility of directing the working-class movement into a channel in which they shall function as an intellectual priest-

hood. The more they succeed in monopolizing this market, the more those who have not the "highest qualifications" are excluded from the educational field of the working class, the better the prospects of the aspiring intellectual aristocracy.

In order to secure this monopoly they have of necessity to advertise freely, to boom their goods as the real democratic article, to affix the sign of labour above the shop door. The working class will only fall a prey to these academic vendors if it allows itself to be deceived by the sign and the phrase. For, out of the shop itself, nothing can come but shoddy. Out of W. E. A. and Ruskin College education nothing can come but a new form of usurpation. If they were all that they claim themselves to be they would not be flying the flag of neutrality and non-partisanship. If they were really out for the emancipation of the working class, for the abolition of that system of exploitation which is the basis of class oppression, then they would openly and avowedly proclaim that as the object of their policy, and their education would be so framed to secure that end. Instead, however, their teaching is wholly apologetic, and instead of helping to remove the cause of our present social evils, is calculated only to prolong the agony by leading to mere tinkering with effects. Weakness always takes refuge in the wonderful, and helplessness in howling. The time has gone by "when the cackling of the geese can save the capital." Most certainly we want democracy, but we cannot secure the reality until all forms of economic oppression are banished from society. Democracy for us is not a mere name, a meaningless abstraction, but a concrete and substantial condition to be secured in a concrete and substantial way. Democracy for the present can only exist within the working class. Similarly democratic education can only be a working class affair. On that recognition is the Central Labour College based.

*How far does it assist the working class to stand upon its feet and not only demand, but secure, all that it is entitled to? That is its only and highest qualification.* Beside that all other so-called qualifications—M.A.'s, B.A.'s and diplomas included are cheap and tawdry.

W. W. C.

## The Increase of the Proletariat

**I**T is not only through the extension of large production that the capitalist system causes the condition of the proletariat to become more and more that of the whole population. It brings this about also through the circumstances that the condition of the wage-workers engaged in large production strikes the keynote for the condition of wage-workers in all its branches. The conditions under which the latter work and live are revolutionized; the advantages which they may have had over those employed in capitalist industry are turned into so many disadvantages under the influence of the

latter. To illustrate : In those localities where mechanics still work for, and board and lodge with, the master mechanic, the poor board and lodging which the wage-worker employed in a capitalistic industry can afford become a pretext for the master mechanic to reduce both the board and the comforts of lodging which his workmen enjoy.

There is another, and very extensive, domain on which the capitalist system of large production exercises its influence of turning the population into proletarians—the domain of commerce. The large stores have begun to bear, and are now bearing, heavily upon the small ones. The number of small stores does not, therefore, necessarily diminish. On the contrary, it increases. The small store is the last refuge of the bankrupt small producer. Were the small stores actually crowded out, the ground would be wholly taken from under the feet of the small traders ; they would then be forthwith thrust below the class of the proletariat into the slums ; they would be turned into beggars, vagabonds, and candidates for the penitentiary. Such in fact is, to a great extent, the evolution of the small trader.

But it is not in the reduction of the number of small stores, it is in the debasement of their character. The small trader deals in ever worse and cheaper goods ; the tribe of the haberdasher grows ; and the streets and roads are overrun with pedlars, itinerant vendors, and hucksters of all manner of worthless articles ; of spoiled fruit, decayed vegetables, &c., sold under false pretences with all sorts of fraudulent devices, such as deceptive measures and weights. Thus the livelihood of the independent small trader becomes ever more precarious, more proletarian-like, while, steadily and at the same time, in the large stores, the number of employees goes up—genuine proletarians, without prospect of ever becoming independent. Woman and child labour, with their accompaniment of prostitution ; excessive work ; lack of work ; starvation wages—all the symptoms of large production appear also in increasing quantity in the domain of commerce. Steadily the condition of the employees in this department approaches that of the proletarians in the department of production. The only difference perceptible between the two is that the former preserve the appearances of a better living, which require sacrifices unknown to the industrial proletarians.

There is still a third category of proletarianism that has gone far on the road of its complete development : the educated proletarians. Education has become a special trade under our present system. The measure of knowledge has increased greatly, and grows daily. Capitalist society and the capitalist State are ever more in need of men of knowledge and ability to conduct their business, in order to bring the forces of nature under their power, be it for purposes of production or of destruction, or to enable them to expend in luxurious living their increasing profits. Now, then, it is not only

the hardworking small farmer, mechanic, or the proletarians in general, who have no time to devote themselves to science and art; the merchant, the manufacturer, the banker, the stock-jobber, the landlord class—all of these are in the same fix. Their whole time is taken up either with their work, or with their "business" and pleasures, as the case may be. In modern society, it is not, as it used to be under previous social orders, the exploiters themselves, or, at least, a class of them, who nurse the arts and sciences. The present exploiters, our ruling class, leave these pursuits to a special class, whom they keep in hire. Under this system, education becomes a merchandise.

A hundred years ago or so, this commodity was rare. There were few schools; study was accompanied with considerable expense. So long as small production could support the worker he stuck to it; only special gifts of nature or circumstances would cause the sons of these to dedicate themselves to the arts and sciences. Incredible, or unlikely, as it may look at first blush, even in so new a country as the United States, the demand for physicians, teachers, artists, &c., was, for quite a long number of years, supplied almost entirely by this limited class and its descendants.

So long as this condition of things lasted, the merchandise education commanded a high price. Its possession procured, at least to those who applied it to practical ends, lawyers, for instance, physicians, professors, &c., quite comfortable livings; not infrequently it also brought fame and honour. The artist, the poet, the philosopher, were, in monarchical countries, the companions of royalty; in our republic they were persons of unquestioned distinction. The aristocracy of intellect felt itself superior to the aristocracy of birth or of money. The only care of such was the development of their intellect. Hence it happened that people of culture could be, and often were, idealists. This circumstance explains the appearance, in the forties, of that galaxy of men and women who took up in this country the idealist philosophy of Fourier, resulting in the communistic tidal wave that swept over the land at that time. These aristocrats of education and culture stood above the other classes and their material asperations and antagonisms. Education meant power, happiness, and worthiness. The conclusion seemed inevitable, that, in order to make all men happy and worthy, in order to banish all class antagonisms, all poverty, all wickedness and meanness out of the world, nothing else was needed than to spread education and culture.

Since those days the development of higher education has made immense progress. The number of institutions of learning increased wonderfully, and, in a still larger degree, the number of pupils. In the meantime, the bottom was knocked out of small production. The small property-holder knows to-day no other way of keeping his sons from sinking into the proletartat, but by sending them to college;

and he does this if his means will at all allow. But, furthermore, he must consider the future, not of his sons only, but of his daughters also. The rapid development in the division of labour is steadily encroaching upon the household; it is converting one household duty after another into a special industry, and steadily diminishing household work. Weaving, sewing to a great extent, knitting, baking, and many other occupations, that at one time filled up the round of household duties, have been either wholly or substantially withdrawn from the sphere of house-keeping. More than fifty years ago, the "store close," of which Artemus Ward loved to make frequent mention, began in this country, to compete with and supplant the homespun; and similarly, many another home-made staple was extinguished, and its production absorbed by specialized industries. As a result of all this, matrimony, where the wife is to be housekeeper only, is becoming more and more a matter of luxury

But it so happens that the small property holder and producer is, at the same time sinking steadily, and steadily becoming poorer; ever more and more he loses the means to indulge in luxuries. In consequence of this, the number of spinsters grows apace, and ever larger is the number of those families in which mother and daughter must work for a living. Accordingly, woman labour does not only increase in the domains of both large and small production and commerce, it also spreads in other directions, in government offices, on the telegraph, telephone, railways, banks, in office clerkships—bookkeeping, typewriting, stenography—and in the sphere of the arts and sciences. However loudly prejudices and personal interests may rebel against it, woman labour presses itself forward more and more upon the various professional pursuits. It is not vanity, nor importunity, nor pride, but the force of the economic development that drives women to labour in these as well as in other departments of human activity. In those countries and those localities of the United States where the men have succeeded in excluding the competition of women from those branches of intellectual pursuits which are still organized upon the old guild principle, the latter press with all the greater force upon those pursuits that are not so organized, like writing, painting, music, &c.

The result of this whole development is that the number of educated people has increased enormously. Nevertheless, the beneficent results which the idealists expected from an increase of education has not followed. So long as education is a merchandise, its extension is tantamount to an increase in the quantity of that merchandise, consequently, to the falling of its price, and the decline of the condition of those who possess it. The number of educated people have grown to such an extent that it more than suffices for the wants of the capitalists and of the capitalist State. The labour market of educated labour is to-day overstocked as that of manual labour. To-day it is no longer the manual workers alone



who have their reserve army of unemployed, and are afflicted with lack of work; the educated workers also have their reserve army of idleness, and among them also lack of work has taken up its permanent quarters. Those who strain for public office experience the difficulty of obtaining it by reason of the crowd; those others who seek employment elsewhere experience the extremes of idleness and excessive work the same as the manual workers, and just the same as these they are the victims of wage-slavery.

To-day, whichever way the proletarian may turn, he finds awaiting him the same proletarian conditions of life and toil. Those conditions pervade society more and more; in all countries the bulk of the population has sunk to the level of the proletariat; to the individual proletarian all prospects has vanished of ever being able, by his own efforts, to pull himself out of the quagmire into which the present system of production has pushed him. The forecast of James Madison, made sixty-five years ago, that, owing to our competitive social system, the bulk of our people would ere long have lost, not only all property, but even the hope of the prospect of acquiring any, has been verified to the letter.

The individual proletarian can accomplish his own redemption only with the redemption of his whole class. That consummation cannot, however, be reached without the collective ownership by the people of their instruments of production, namely, by the Socialist Republic.—*Weekly People*, New York.

## Evolution of Social Structures

(Continued).

**W**ITH the establishment of the state, or even before, there begins a differentiation of social tissues. The analogy with organic tissues is here particularly clear and useful in helping us to understand the process. All well-informed persons are now familiar with the fact that the tissues of all developed animals consist of an ectoderm, or outer layer, an endoderm, or inner layer, and a mesoderm, or intermediate layer, and that out of one or the other of these fundamental tissues all the organs of the body are formed. Now, the evolution of the metasocial body is exactly parallel to this. The conquering race, or superior class or caste, represents the social ectoderm; the conquered race, or inferior class or caste, represents the social endoderm. The social mesoderm is not so simple, but it is not less real. It is one of the most important consequences of race-amalgamation.

Within the social body, under the régime of law and the state, there is intense activity. Compelled by mutually restraining forces to remain in one place and not fly off on various tangents, the vigorous elements of the new complex society display a correspond-

ing intensity in their inner life. Only a small part of the superior race can hold high places under the state, and the great majority of them are obliged to support themselves by their own efforts. Neither are all the members of the subject race held in bondage; a large percentage remain free, and must of course maintain themselves by some form of useful activity. These two classes are too nearly alike in their social standing to continue long socially and economically independent. It must be remembered that both races have descended from the same original stock, although they do not know it. There is therefore no essential difference in their general character. The superiority by which one was able to conquer the other may have been due to a variety of more or less accidental causes. It does not render them superior in other respects. The individuals of both races will differ greatly in character and ability, and members of the subject race will often excel those of the dominant race in certain respects. They are all struggling together for subsistence, and it is inevitable that their interests will often be the same. Race-prejudice will thus gradually give way, and in the general industrial strife there is a greater and greater commingling and co-operation. There thus arises a large industrial class made up of these two elements, and this class may be appropriately called the "social mesoderm." This industrial, commercial, or business class is the real life of the society. The ruling class becomes more and more dependent upon it for the supply of the resources of the state, and gradually the members of this class acquire more or less influence and power.

As time goes on, the situation is accepted by all, and race-prejudices give way. The interaction of all classes increases, and a general process of assimilation sets in, tending toward a complete blending of all classes into a single homogeneous group. Inter-marriage among the members of the two races grows more and more frequent, until ultimately nearly or quite all the members of the society have the blood of both races in their veins. The final outcome of it all is the production of a people. The people thus evolved out of heterogeneous elements is different from either of the races producing it. It is a new creation, the social synthesis or the race struggle, and is as homogeneous in its constitution as was either of its original components.

Only one more step in this process of evolution of social structures is possible on the simple plane on which we have been tracing it, and that is the making of a nation. The new people that has been developed now begin to acquire an attachment, not only for one another as members of the society, but also for the place of their birth and activity. They realize that they are a people and that they have a country, and there arises a love of both which crystallizes into the sentiment that we call patriotism. All are now ready to defend their country against outside powers, and all are

filled with what we know as the national sentiment. In a word, out of the prolonged struggle of two primarily antagonistic and hostile races there has at last emerged a single cemented and homogeneous nation.

We thus have as the natural and necessary result of the conquest and subjugation of one primitive group by another no less than fourteen more or less distinct social structures or human institutions. These are in the order in which they are developed : (1) the system of caste ; (2) the institution of slavery ; (3) labour in the economic sense ; (4) the industrial system ; (5) landed property ; (6) the priesthood ; (7) a leisure class ; (8) government by law ; (9) the state ; (10) political liberty ; (11) property ; (12) a business class ; (13) a people ; (14) a nation.

The first two of these social structures are not now regarded as useful, but they were useful when formed and, indeed, the essential conditions to all the subsequent ones. The priesthood and the leisure class are now no longer necessary to a high civilization, but they still exist, and under proper limitations they have an important function. All institutions undergo great modifications and some are completely transformed with time.

The case considered is that of the union of two primitive groups which occupied at the outset the same social position, and that the lowest known. It may be called a case of simple social assimilation. That there have been many such cases there is no doubt, but no such could be observed by enlightened man, for the simple reason that no such primitive groups exist, or have existed since there have been enlightened men. This may sound strange when we constantly hear of existing hordes and clans. But I make bold to affirm that none of the hordes or clans now existing are at all primitive. Nay, I go farther and maintain that all hordes and clans, all tribes, and all races are equally old. The lowest race on the earth is as old as the most enlightened nation. There is no escape from this except in the old exploded theological doctrine of special creation. The theory of polygenism is a form of that doctrine applied to human races. To admit it involves the surrender of the whole doctrine of evolution. If man has evolved from a lower prehuman stage, he emerged as man at a given time, and all human races have descended from one truly primitive type. All human races are therefore equally old. The differences among them are not at all due to the time it has required to reach their present state, because all have had the same time in which to do this. The differences are wholly due to the different conditions under which they have been placed and in conformity with which they have developed.

There has, of course, been a great variety of influences at work in determining the direction and degree of development of the races of men, but there is one element that has had more to do with this than any other, or perhaps than all others combined ; that is the

element with which we have been dealing, viz., the element of social assimilation. When we realize that all human races are equally old, we can readily see that all cases of simple assimilation, such as the one sketched, must have occurred far back in the early history of man. The period of social differentiation may have been very long. It may have occupied half of the two hundred thousand years that are commonly assigned to man on the earth. But whatever its length, that period is long past, and the period of social integration has been at least as long. All the cases of simple assimilation had run their course ages before there were any records of any kind, and human history acquaints us only with types of a far higher order.

In other words, the only cases of which we have any actual knowledge are cases of compound social assimilation. Compound assimilation results when peoples or nations that have already been formed in the manner described out of lower social elements again amalgamate on a higher plane and repeat the process. When one perfectly integrated nation conquers and subjugates another, the same steps have to be taken as in the case of simple groups. The struggle is as much more intense as it is higher in the scale of social structure. But the new structures developed through it, although they have the same names and the same general character, become, when formed, more powerful and capable of accomplishing much more. The new society is of a higher grade and a more potent factor in the world. The new state, the new people, the new nation, are on a higher plane, and a long step is taken toward civilization.

But all the nations of which history tells us anything have undergone much more still than two social assimilations. Most of them have undergone many, and represent highly complex structures. With every fresh assimilation they rise in the scale of civilization. What they acquire is greater and greater social efficiency, and the principal differences between races, peoples, and nations are differences in the degree of social efficiency. Not only are the same social structures acquired in the first assimilation greatly increased and strengthened, but a large number of other, more or less derivative, but highly socializing, structures are added. The system of law, which was at first only a sort of police regulation, becomes a great system of jurisprudence. Government, which at first had but one branch, viz., the executive, acquires a judicial and finally a legislative branch. The state becomes a vast systematized organization. Industry, which at the beginning consisted wholly of slave labour under a master, and latter included the simplest forms of trade, develops into a system of economic production, exchange, transportation, and general circulation. Property, which primarily meant only oxen, spears, bows and arrows, and primitive agricultural implements, now takes varied forms, the most important being those symbols of property which go by the name of money. Under the

protection of the state, wealth becomes possible to a large number who possess the thrift to acquire it, and this takes the form of capital, which is the condition to all industrial progress and national wealth.

The existence of wealth—i.e., of a large number of wealthy citizens—creates another kind of leisure class, and many, freed from the trammels of toil, turn their attention to various higher pursuits. Art and literature arise, and civilizing and refining influences begin. Voluntary organizations of many kinds, all having different objects, are formed. Besides innumerable business combinations and corporations, there spring up associations for mutual aid, for intellectual improvement, for social intercourse, for amusement and pleasure, and also eventually for charitable and benovolent purposes. Educational systems are established, and the study of human history, of art and letters, and finally of nature, is undertaken. The era of science at last opens, invention, and discovery are stimulated, and the conquest of nature and the mastery of the world begin.

Every one of these civilizing agencies is a social structure, and all of them are the products of the one universal process. They represent the products of that intensive activity which results from the primary clash and conflict of the social forces in the fierce grapple of hostile hordes and clans, and the far fiercer battles of developed nations bent on each other's conquest and subjugation. To see all this one has only to read the history of any of the great nations of the world that are leading the civilization of to-day. Everyone is familiar with the history of England, for example. No less than four typical social assimilations have taken place on English soil since the earliest recorded annals of that country began. Think of the animosities and hostilities, the bitter race-hatred, the desperate struggles, the prolonged wars, that characterize the history of England. What has become of all these warring elements? There is no country in the world where patriotism is higher than in England, and it is shared alike by Saxon and Celt, by Scot and Briton. Who now are the Normans that constituted the last conquering race? And do the Saxons, when they can be distinguished, any longer feel the chains that once manacled them? The equilibration is complete, and all class distinctions, at least those arising out of the race question, have totally disappeared. On the other hand, consider the achievements of England. Contemplate the wonderful social efficiency of that many times amalgamated people. The sociologist cannot shut his eyes to the fact that the social efficiency is mainly due to the repeated amalgamations and to the intensity of the resultant social struggles, developing, molding, and strengthening social structures.

France or Germany would show the same general truth, and those who are equally familiar with their history will find no difficulty in

paralleling every step in the process of national development in all these countries. Austria seems to present an exception, but the only difference is that Austria is now in the midst of a new social assimilation. The equilibration is not yet complete. The Magyar and the Slav are still in the stage of resistance. It is said that, on account of the differences of language, they can never be assimilated. But in England there was the same diversity of language, and the languages of the Romans, of the Normans, of the Saxons, and of the Welsh and Scots had all to undergo a process of mutual concession, of giving and taking, and of ultimate blending, to form the new resultant language. It is not probable that just such a result will be attained in Austria, and no one is probably wise enough to foresee the end; but it seems probable that the time will come at last when all these race-elements will be fully conciliated and a great new race, people, and nation will emerge. The world regards the struggle sympathetically and unanimously echoes the sentiment: *Tu felix Austria nube.*

We know less of the great Asiatic peoples, and still less of the African; but, so far as their history is known it is shown to have been one of perpetual war. This means the repeated conquest and subjugation of one race or nation by another, and a long series of social assimilations, all similar to those described. That these countries have not attained the same stage of culture as have those of Europe is due to causes too subtle and obscure to be discussed here, even if I were competent to discuss them; but one truth seems to be growing more and more clear, viz., that the difference is due much less to the native abilities of these peoples than to the external conditions to which they have been subjected. Fifty years ago Japan and China were habitually classed together, and they were regarded as inferior races incapable of any such civilization as that of the western world. No one so classes them now, and it is all because Japan resolutely set about adopting western methods. Should China ever do so, the result would be the same, and it is impossible to calculate what this might be.

But it is not necessary that the two races brought into conflict be of the same degree or order of assimilation. It is equally possible that they be of very different degrees in this respect. Of course, in such cases it is easy to see which will be the conquering race. The race having the greatest social efficiency will easily subdue the other, and the process of assimilation will be somewhat different. The new racial product will differ much less from the conquering race. That race will be prepotent and will virtually absorb the inferior race. If the difference is very great, as where a highly civilized race invades the territory occupied by a race of savages, the latter seems soon to disappear almost altogether, like the North American Indians, and to exert scarcely any influence upon the superior race. It is so in Australasia and in South Africa. But where there

remains a great numerical disproportion of the native race, this latter being somewhat advanced in civilization, as in British India, other complications arise and new problems confront the student. In Mexico, and to a greater or less extent throughout Central and South America, there has been extensive blending of conquering and conquered races, giving rise to still other conditions, and correspondingly varying the character of the resultant social structures.

This is not the place to dilate upon the remote effects of this vast process of universal social integration, but I cannot leave the subject without repeating what I have said before: that if we could but peer far enough into the great future, we should see this planet of ours ultimately peopled with a single homogeneous and completely assimilated race of men—the human race—in the composition of which could be detected all the great commanding qualities of every one of its racial components. And I will also add that to the subsequent duration of this final race on the earth there are no assignable limits.

But we are considering social structure and not social integration, although these are intimately bound up together. We have seen how social structures are formed. The spontaneous products of a great cosmical law, they could not be other than thoroughly organized, firm, compact, and durable mechanisms, comparable to organic structures—tissues, organs, organisms. This is the most important lesson taught by the science of sociology. If all the world could learn it, the greater part of all political and social failures would be prevented. It would dispel at one blow all the false notions so widely current relative to the alteration, abolition, or overthrow of any human institution. As human institutions are the products of evolution, they cannot be destroyed, and the only way they can be modified is through this same process of evolution. Universal acquaintance with the causes, the laws, and the natural history of social structures, and with their consequent durability, permanence, and indestructibility, would produce a complete change in all the prevailing ideas of reform, and the superficial reformers, however well-meaning, would forthwith abandon their chimerical schemes, and set about studying the science of society with a view to the adoption of legitimate means for the direction of the course of social evolution toward the real and possible modification and perfecting of social structures. For structures are easily modified by appropriate methods. They are of themselves always undergoing changes. It is in this that social progress wholly consists. But the integrity of the structures must not be disturbed. They must remain intact and be permitted, or even caused, to change in the desired direction, and to be ultimately transformed into the ideal human institutions that a progressive age demands. A condition of social statics may thus be converted into one of social dynamics. All social structures

taken together constitute the social order. The problem is to inaugurate a condition of social progress. This cannot be done by disturbing the social order. Order is the condition to progress, and progress consists in setting up dynamic activities in the social structures themselves. A structure represents a state of equilibrium, but it is never a perfect equilibrium, and the conversion of this partial equilibrium into a moving equilibrium, provided it moves in the right direction, is social progress.

Washington, D. C.

LESTER F. WARD.

## The Door Knob

"WELL, good-bye, everybody; hope you will all have a good time," he said, as he left the dining-room and made for the door.

"Good luck! Let's know how you get along," came from a dozen voices and just filtered through the door as he closed it. He gripped his valise, walked hurriedly through the lecture-room, and stood half regretfully in the porch.

"Hullo, are you off?" piped a metallic voice.

He looked round. "I'm going home," he said. "Who is it?"

"It's me!"

"Where are you?" he asked.

"I'm here; here, on the door."

He looked, and saw a chubby face shining in the door knob.

"Be you going home, really?" the cherub asked.

"Yes," he said; "I may see you again though." "Do you know anything of the theory of probabilities, because it's about as remote as that?"

The Brass Genie screwed his face and looked likely to burst into tears, or perhaps it was only the moisture in the atmosphere. Anyhow he looked anything but bright.

The Door-knob became reminiscent.

"It's a bit since I came here; a lot of us came together," quite a brilliant company from some big industrial town.

"My early recollections are somewhat vague because my environment consisted largely of other knobs and sawdust, but I left that long ago. Of course, you must remember, relatively speaking, I'm older than you. Well, one morning I was dazzled by a brilliant light and I heard a voice saying, 'Yes, those will do,' and I felt myself snugly ensconced in a soft, warm palpitating hand. Only for a moment, then I was back amongst the sawdust and I remember no more until a hard, strong hand gripped me firmly and placed me



here. For the first few years I was fairly comfortable. I used to continually reflect the faces of a charming elderly couple. The feel of their hands was so gentle and kind. I used to see a pretty dark girl passing to and fro and she always came and visited me at least once a week. I always felt better for it. I could see and feel better. Then I missed her and another came, and then she left, and that occurred several times. Then I heard the benevolent gentleman say something about the servant problem. Anyhow, this was evidently my hey-day: soft hands, kid-gloves, beaming faces, brilliant equipages. The change came. There appeared to be a lot of bustling and hurrying. Rough coarse men came in and out carrying huge loads. I remember it well because I came into sharp contact with something and I could never see correctly after that. They, the men, called it "a bulge," and I'm sure I shall carry it to the end of my days. Then for a long time there was silence and I had to bear unceasingly the pitiless weather, a most malignant and unreliable wretch. Some eighteen months ago I felt the old thrill. Somebody's hand had touched me. Soon after I heard a lot of chattering and boisterous laughter, the exuberance of young men, I could not reflect properly but I heard a lot. Ah! I did laugh at the funny things they said. Then a big strong hand rubbed me briskly and I began to reflect a face. What a face! quite different from all the others, not so nice, yet quite as kindly and intelligent. Then a bell tinkled and he ran away but he had left something in my bulge that gave me a bias. This was explained to me later when I was told that he believed in the Class War and that you can't be impartial."

After that I got a chum—the letter-box. Oh! the confabs we had, the discussions we made and the news we got—invitations out to tea and dinners, tickets for political and anti-vivisection meetings, love-letters, home-letters, and picture postcards, papers, books, and such a lot of bills, not like the other people's, but only for shillings and so on. They weren't a snobbish lot, although at times they treated me badly, sending the door to with a terrific bang and shaking the very brass in my body. I was always pushed out in the cold at eleven o'clock at night by the Evening Delegate. One of them was kind and let me stay in one night, but I heard from the Dining Table that he had been severely punished with a Labour Fine. In the morning I used to look for my boys. They used to scamper to the door for the papers. Sometimes in the evenings I used to see more people and they had what is called an Evolution Lecture, or perhaps the jovial elderly man would give a literary lecture instead, and sometimes I heard noises of revelry and then the place would be quiet for a time.

"You will excuse me interrupting you, but you see my train goes in a few minutes, I hope you'll forgive me for forgetting you and I'm indebted to you for reminding me of 'The Blue Bird.'"

"Whats that?" his Brightness asked.

"Oh its a sort of a mystical fairy play, where a lot of you inanimate things talk and tell of your feelings and such things just like you've been doing now."

"How jolly! but I don't like that word inanimate. What does it mean?"

"Dead! Lifeless! Motionless!" he replied.

"But I'm not!" the cherub answered hotly.

"Well you are relatively, why, there are even people who think that we are inanimates, that we've got no feelings, emotions, or aspirations; in other words that we are socially inanimate, although that may be true partly, yet *their* social activity is based on *our* plodding industry; just like you, we are being constantly turned round in the same groove."

"Oh! but I don't quite follow you," the Door-knob said.

"Never mind, stay where you are and think it out, goodbye! I'm off to catch my train and change my *Weltanschauung*" he said, clearing the entrance steps at a bound.

"Wh-a-a-t!" yelled the knob.

In a few minutes the air was pierced by a shrill whistle, and he never came back.

MEREDITH F. TITTERINGTON.

## The Paris Commune

THE Commune was formed of the municipal councillors, chosen by universal suffrage in various wards of the town responsible and revocable at short terms. The majority of its members were naturally working men, or acknowledged representatives of the working class. The Commune was to be a working, not a parliamentary, body, executive and legislative at the same time. Instead of continuing to be the agent of the central Government, the police was at once stripped of its political attributes and turned into the responsible and at all times revocable agent of the Commune. So were the officials of all other branches of the administration. From the members of the Commune downwards, the public service had to be done at *workmen's wages*. The vested interests and the representation allowances of the high dignitaries of State disappeared along with the high dignitaries themselves. Public functions ceased to be the private property of the tools of the central Government. Not only municipal administration, but the whole initiative hitherto exercised by the State, was laid into the hands of the Commune.

Having once got rid of the standing army and the police, the physical force elements of the old Government, the Commune was anxious to break the spiritual force of repression, the "parson-power," by the disestablishment and disendowment of all churches as proprietary bodies. The priests were sent back to the recesses of private life, there to feed upon the alms of the faithful in imitation of their predecessors, the Apostles. The whole of the educational institutions were opened to the people gratuitously, and at the same time cleared of all interference of Church and State. Thus, not only was education made accessible to all, but science itself freed from the fetters which class prejudice and governmental force had imposed upon it.

The judicial functionaries were to be divested of that sham independence which had but served to mask their abject subserviency to all succeeding governments to which, in turn, they had taken, and broken, the oaths of allegiance. Like the rest of public servants, magistrates and judges were to be elective, responsible, and revocable.

The Paris Commune was, of course, to serve as a model to all the great industrial centres of France. The communal régime once established in Paris and the secondary centres, the old centralized Government would in the provinces, too, have to give way to the self-government of the producers. In a rough sketch of national organization with the Commune had no time to develop, it is clearly stated that the Commune was to be the political form of even the smallest country hamlet, and that in the rural districts the standing army was to be replaced by a national militia, with an extremely short term of service. The rural communes of each district were to administer their common affairs by an assembly of delegates in the central town, and these district assemblies were again to send deputies to the National Delegation in Paris, each delegate to be at any time revocable and bound by the *mandat impératif* (formal instructions) of his constituents. The few but important functions which still would remain for a central government were not to be suppressed, as has been intentionally misstated, but were to be discharged by communal, and therefore strictly responsible, agents. The unity of the nation was not to be broken; but, on the contrary, to be organized by the Communal Constitution, and to become a reality by the destruction of the State power which claimed to be the embodiment of that unity independent of, and superior to, the nation itself, from which it was but a parasitic excrescence. While the merely repressive organs of the old governmental power were to be amputated, its legitimate functions were

to be wrested from an authority usurping pre-eminence over society itself, and restored to the responsible agents of society. Instead of deciding once in three or six years which member of the ruling class was to represent the people in Parliament, universal suffrage was to serve the people, constituted in Communes, as individual suffrage serves every other employer in the search for the workmen and managers in his business. And it is well known that companies, like individuals, in matters of real business generally know how to put the right man in the right place, and, if they for once make a mistake, to redress it promptly. On the other hand, nothing could be more foreign to the spirit of the Commune than to supersede universal suffrage by hierarchic investiture.

It is generally the fate of completely new historical creations to be mistaken for the counterpart of older and even defunct forms of social life, to which they may bear a certain likeness. Thus, this new Commune, which breaks the modern State power, has been mistaken for a reproduction of the medieval communes, which first preceded, and afterwards became the substratum of, that very State power. The Communal Constitution has been mistaken for an attempt to break up into a federation of small States, as dreamt of by Montesquieu and the Girondins, that unity of great nations which, if originally brought about by political force, has now become a powerful coefficient of social production. The antagonisms of the Commune against the State power has been mistaken for an exaggerated form of the ancient struggle against over-centralization. Peculiar historical circumstances may have prevented the classical development, as in France, of the bourgeoisie form of government, and may have allowed, as in England, to complete the great central State organs by corrupt vestries, jobbing councillors, and ferocious poor-law guardians in the towns, and virtually hereditary magistrates in the counties. The Communal Constitution would have restored to the social body all the forces hitherto absorbed by the State parasite feeding upon, and clogging the free movement of, society. By this one act it would have initiated the regeneration of France. The provincial French middle class saw in the Commune an attempt to restore the sway their order had held over the county under Louis Philippe, and which, under Louis Napoleon, was supplanted by the pretended rule of the country over the towns. In reality, the Communal Constitution brought the rural producers under the intellectual lead of the central towns of their districts, and there secured to them, in the working men, the natural trustees of their interests. The very existence of the Commune involved, as a matter of course, local municipal liberty, but no longer as a check upon the now superseded State power. It could only enter into the

head of a Bismarck—who, when not engaged on his intrigues of blood and iron, always likes to resume his old trade, so befitting his mental calibre, of contributor to *Kladderadatch* (the *Berlin Punch*)—it could only enter in such a head, to ascribe to the Paris Commune aspirations after that caricature of the old French municipal organization of 1791, the Prussian municipal constitution, which degrades the town governments to mere secondary wheels in the police machinery in the Prussian State. The Commune made that catchword of bourgeois revolutions, cheap government, a reality, by destroying the two greatest sources of expenditure—the standing army and State functionarism. Its very existence pre-supposed the non-existence of monarchy, which, in Europe at least, is the normal incumbrance and indispensable cloak of class-rule. It supplied the Republic with the basis of really democratic institutions. But neither cheap government nor the "true Republic" was its ultimate aim; they were its mere concomitants.

The multiplicity of interpretations to which the Commune has been subjected, and the multiplicity of interests which construed it in their favour, show that it was a thoroughly expansive political form, while all previous forms of government had been emphatically repressive. Its true secret was this. It was essentially a working-class government, the product of the struggle of the producing against the appropriating class, the political form at last discovered under which to work out the economic emancipation of labour.

Except on this last condition, the Communal Constitution would have been an impossibility and a delusion. The political rule of the producer cannot co-exist with the perpetuation of his social slavery. The Commune was, therefore, to serve as a lever for uprooting the economic foundations upon which rests the existence of classes, and therefore of class rule. With labour emancipated, every man becomes a working man, and productive labour ceases to be a class attribute.

It is a strange fact. In spite of all the tall talk and all the immense literature, for the last sixty years, about emancipation of labour, no sooner do the working men anywhere take the subject into their own hands with a will, than uprises at once all the apologetic phraseology of the mouthpieces of present society with its two poles of Capital and Wage-slavery (the landlord now is but the sleeping partner of the capitalist), as if capitalist society was still in its purest state of virgin innocence, with its antagonisms still undeveloped, with its delusions still unexploded, with its prostitute realities not yet laid bare. The Commune, they exclaim, intends to abolish property, the basis of all civilization! Yes, gentlemen,

the Commune intended to abolish that class-property which makes the labour of the many the wealth of the few. It aimed at the expropriation of the expropriators. It wanted to make individual property a truth by transforming the means of production, land and capital, now chiefly the means of enslaving and exploiting labour, into mere instruments of free and associated labour. But this is Communism, "impossible" Communism! Why, those members of the ruling classes who are intelligent enough to perceive the impossibility of continuing the present system—and they are many—have become the obtrusive and full-mouthed apostles of co-operative production. If co-operative production is not to remain a sham and a snare; if it is to supercede the capitalist system; if united co-operative societies are to regulate national production upon a common plan, thus taking it under their own control, and putting an end to the constant anarchy and periodical convulsions which are the fatality of capitalist production—what else, gentlemen, would it be but Communism, "possible" Communism?

The working class did not expect miracles from the Commune. They have no ready-made utopias to introduce by decree of the people. They know that in order to work out their emancipation, and along with it that higher form to which present society is irresistibly tending, by its own economic agencies, they will have to pass through long struggles, through a series of historic processes, transforming circumstances and men. They have no ideals to realize, but to set free the elements of the new society with which old collapsing bourgeois society itself is pregnant. In the full consciousness of their historic mission, and with the heroic resolve to act up to it, the working class can afford to smile at the coarse invective of the gentlemen's gentlemen with the pen and ink-horn, and at the didactic patronage of well-wishing bourgeois-doctrinaires, pouring forth their ignorant platitudes and sectarian crotchets in the oracular tone of scientific infallibility.

When the Paris Commune took the management of the revolution in its own hands; when plain working men for the first time dared to infringe upon the governmental privilege of their "natural superiors," and, under circumstances of unexampled difficulty, performed their work modestly, conscientiously, and efficiently—performed it at salaries the highest of which barely amounted to one-fifth of what, according to high scientific authority, is the minimum required for a secretary to a certain Metropolitan School-board—the old world writhed in convulsions of rage at the sight of the Red Flag, the symbol of the Republic of Labour, floating over the Hôtel de Ville.

KARL MARX.

## Open Letter to Ben Tillet

March, 1911.

DEAR BEN,

The recent announcement of your acceptance of a seat on Ruskin College Council has caused a considerable amount of surprise to many of your friends, particularly those of us who are interested in the Central Labour College. When the famous—or infamous—strike broke out at Ruskin College, in 1909, you were good enough to send the rebellious students a letter of encouragement, and, at the same time, to express yourself on the various points at issue between them (the students), and the enemies of their class-interests as represented by the Council of Ruskin College (see letter enclosed). What has led you into the camp of the enemy at this later stage of the movement? You surely will not attempt to persuade us that Ruskin College has altered itself in anything but form! That the wolf remains under the sheep's clothing is quite apparent from Mr. Allsopp's letter, quoted in last month's "Pleb's" Magazine. In this precious missive, Mr. Allsopp claims affinity between Ruskin College, the W. E. A., and University teaching, and all the evidence seems to justify the claim. How are you going to separate yourself from the stigma of assisting the reactionaries in these circumstances? Ruskin College stands for the unholy gospel—from the workers' point of view—of "identity of interests" between employer and employed—how, otherwise, can they claim to give impartial teaching in social science? How comes it that you find common interests with such a body as the Club and Institute Union, which is made up of Liberal, Tory, and other working-men's clubs, on matters that affect the future of the working-class movement? Do you know that at the conference called by Ruskin College in Oxford, October, 1909, at which meeting the present constitution of the latter body was adopted, the proposal to include the Labour Party among the national bodies nominating two representatives on Ruskin College Council was defeated by 29 votes to 4? Do you know the reason advanced for this? *It would make the College too partisan!*

You have before now criticised the Labour Party as not being advanced enough. Is it possible you are now of the opinion that if they were represented on the Council of Ruskin College they would advocate an educational policy of *too* advanced a character? It is true you had nothing to do with their (the Labour Party's) rejection, but you have now associated yourself with the rejection, and the reasons advanced for same by joining the Council. How can you escape the inference?

Dear Ben, the above are just a few points on which we should be pleased to have a reply from you.—Yours,

DEAR —

I had thought of writing you upon a different matter than that of the discharge of our good friend Dennis.

Although I suspected the designs of the crowd, who have insidiously worked themselves into government, I hardly expected such a "coup" so early in the development of the College.

It is to be like all other Institutions brought into being for workers—the bourgeoisie worm themselves in like cuckoos and then leave their own brood and type to be reared at the expense of others. I know the Unions will protest against the scandal, you can rest assured some of us who were in at the inauguration will want to be satisfied that the Institution is not being prostituted by the scallawag crowd. I sincerely trust the past scholars will rally to the best teacher they could have had, and if he has the pluck again to start in life, I wish, from the bottom of my heart, that he would start another college, and I am sure there would be those who would rally to him. We ought not to see these Institutions taken from the proper work, even their (the cuckoo's) charity is the worst of thieving, for they only give services that they might enter into the scheme to rob the intellects of the bright young fellows and warp them to the capitalists, to use against their own class—the poor. I hope your "Plebs" Magazine will be able to do some good in the matter of protest against the robbers of the Institution who want to degrade Ruskin College to the low brutish level of class dominance. I do not know your powers, but hope there is enough spunk left in the old scholar, as there ought to be with the students in residence at the College now—to fight.

The economic truths, the biological facts of our present civilization, ought to be taught in all the nakedness of their ugliness, and it is only intellectuals, with the courage and the human love of Dennis Hird, who are able to grasp thoroughly the essentials and to teach them to young fellows, who may have to go into the working world again with a message of truth and love, as well as justice.

It is the policy of the W.E.A., and will have to be fought all over the country. I think the best course is to prepare a statement of the position. The next course ought to be one devising some scheme to work another college on the lines of Socialism and the straight out-teaching of the "Class War," awakening a class-consciousness among those who will go to the College for instruction.

I would be prepared to take a part on a Committee having for its object the founding of another Institution, as I believe many others would be anxious to have a college teaching, working-class rights, powers and possibilities.

With all best regards to those who are prepared to make a fight of it, for the property as well as the rights of the toilers,

I remain, yours sincerely, BEN TILLET.