

THE
"Plebs" Magazine

Vol. III.

May, 1911.

No. 4.

Copyright Entered at Stationer's Hall.

EDITORIAL

THOSE of our comrades who have been actively engaged in promoting the cause of working-class education, will doubtless have found in the course of their propaganda a number of difficulties, having a very general existence in the minds of men, in the way of clearly recognizing the validity of the

The Dispelling of Difficulties. principles and policy for which we stand as an educational movement. Our attitude must be not one of marvelling at these difficulties but of removing them. It is by this latter way alone that our movement can progress. The more educational the propaganda of the movement the more widely will its object be realized. We propose on this occasion to consider some of those general difficulties that stand in the way of a conviction of the soundness of our principles.

In pointing out the particular or special character of the education which it is our mission to promote, in differentiating it from other forms of education, we are frequently confronted with the difficulty

Education and its Concrete Forms.

of some of our fellow-workers to appreciate this difference. "Education is education. There is only one education. What we want is to educate, educate, educate, and then we, as workers, will come into our own." It seems to be forgotten that the term education is a general one—an abstraction. Generalizations are units. But how do we arrive at these units? Through our faculty of enlightenment coming in contact with a number of concrete and particular forms of education and abstracting from them what is common to them all. That which the various forms have in common we sum up under the general term education.

But like things differ. A theological college, a technical college, and a military college *agree* in being institutions where individuals are trained. But they all *differ* in so far as one is theological, one is technical and the other military, in the form and object of the training, Ruskin College is as much an educational institution as the Central Labour College. That does not exclude their very radical differences. True, Ruskin College claims to be a Labour College. It is well known, however, that the manufacturer of shoddy does not advertise his wares *as shoddy*, but as the real genuine articles. Those who examine the goods are not deceived. The applied touchstone which reveals the difference between the two institutions is that economic antagonism, inevitable in capitalist society, between those who sell their labour-power for wages and those who appropriate the bulk of labour-power's product in the form of rent, interest, and profit. *It is because of that antagonism that there is a Labour Movement. It is because of that antagonism that the Labour Movement needs a Labour College. It is because Ruskin College does not recognize that antagonism that it is not a Labour College.*

By the same standard is that form of education, styled University education, pronounced of no service to the Labour Movement. The University as a means of education belongs to those who own the mines, the factories, the shipyards, and the transportation lines. Their possession of the former is based upon their possession of the latter. To make the means of education the property of society demands first of all the social possession of the socially-produced means of production. Until then the University will have nothing to offer the working-class movement, for the simple reason that this movement seeks to eradicate what those for whom the University stands wishes and strives to preserve. But is there not a movement on foot emanating from the University atmosphere seeking earnestly, and, it may be repentingly, to help the working class by offering to it a University education? Whatever its sins in the past, shall we not absolve the sinner in this its penitential hour? Most certainly if its penitence is *bona fide*. Let us see if its confession rings true to our touchstone.

The demand that the Universities shall serve all classes derives much additional significance from changes which are taking place in the constitution of English society and in the distribution of political power. The most conspicuous symptoms of such changes to which we refer have been the growth of Labour Representation in the House of Commons and on municipal bodies, the great increase in the membership of political associations which claim to express the ideals of at least a considerable section of the working classes, the increasing interest taken by trade unions, which, till recent years were purely industrial organizations, in political action, and the growing demand for a widening in the sphere of social

organization. As to the advantages and disadvantages of these developments we, of course, express no opinion: But their effect has certainly been both to foster a ferment of ideas in classes where formerly it did not exist, and to make it imperative that they should obtain the knowledge necessary to enable them to show foresight in their choice of political means. We are of opinion that, as a result of these changes, all educational authorities, and Universities above all others, are confronted with problems to which they are bound to give continuous and serious attention. Oxford, in particular, which stands for the contact of ideas with the whole of life, has a special interest in the new situation which has been created.*

Unfortunately for the sinner, and fortunately for us, it has confessed something more than its past sins. *It has confessed that it seeks forgiveness only to sin again the more freely. It asks pardon for the sins of omission in order that it may practise the sins of commission.* Having failed to stem the onflowing tide of the Labour Movement from the outside by isolating itself from the movement, it now seeks to dam it up from the inside by establishing contact with the movement. And this change of attitude is by no means peculiar to the educational field. It manifests itself on all fields where the antagonism between capital and wage-labour marks its furrow. Have not the capitalist parties on the political field become suddenly solicitous about the ills of the wage-earning class? Have they not, too, become penitent humanitarians, bubbling over with social-reformist sympathy? And why? Read the confession!

The growth of Labour Representation in the House of Commons and on municipal bodies, the great increase in the membership of political associations.

And if we turn to the industrial field we find our tearful and repentant captains of industry, who, not many moons ago, were breathing out fire and slaughter against those organizations called Trade Unions, denouncing them as wanton destroyers of our industrial prosperity, causing the timid bird (of prey) capital to fly the country with something more than feathers on its back—we find those one-time Sauls now Pauls, glorifying both leaders and led, and earnestly assuring both, of their great love for Trade Unionism. And why? To the confession!

The increasing interest taken by trade unions, which, till recent years were purely industrial organizations, in political action.

No matter on what field it is the same sin, the same confession, and the same sinner. And it is precisely the same object that is aimed at in each case: *to ruin by adoption what it cannot conquer by force.* And it is just on the educational field where there is the greatest danger, and the possibility of the most deception, the more

* Oxford Working Class Joint Committee's Report, ch. iv., page 47.

so the less the conception of education is analysed and reduced to its special and concrete forms. By the light of our standard, that whatever does not base itself on a recognition of the immanent antagonism of interests between capital and wage-labour cannot be regarded as an agent in the Labour Movement, cannot be considered as a Labour College, the place of Ruskin College in the educational field is made plain. And the growing connexion between it and the University of Oxford which the Press has recently been hailing with much satisfaction—extracts from which we published in our last issue—only confirms all that we have claimed with regard to it from the first day of our existence as a movement until now. There is only one Labour College, one institution that is working-class educational, and the growing support of the Labour Movement to that college is the best answer to the enemy whose sins we shall forgive on the day when he is an enemy no longer—when he has surrendered.



THE removal of this first difficulty makes the removal of the remaining difficulties relatively easy. They have only to be exposed in the light of the analysis of the first difficulty, when they fall away.

**“ Something
or
Nothing ”!**

The Workers' Educational Association, an institution that takes its place along with Ruskin College on the educational field, is seeking to establish tutorial classes in the industrial centres throughout the country. The Central Labour

College Classes, five of which are already in existence, stands in relation to the Workers' Educational Association in the Provinces, as the Central Labour College stands in relation to Ruskin College at Oxford. Time was when Ruskin College had its own provincial expression, until that institution had become so *en rapport* with the W.E.A. that the late Secretary, Mr. Bertram Wilson, now in charge of a Labour Exchange at Birmingham, advised all “would-be League members” of the affiliation of R.C. to the W.E.A., and recommended them to work through that body.* The present secretary of Ruskin College, Mr. Allsopp, has been good enough to confirm this fact, as we pointed out in our March editorial. Where ever the W.E.A. appear with an offer to open up these tutorial classes and wherever they are faced by the propagandists of the Central Labour College, it is put to the latter by some of those to whom both parties appeal, that on the principle that “something is better than nothing,” or half a loaf is better than no loaf, the offer of the W.E.A. should be accepted. Let us look at that principle. True, half a loaf is better than no loaf. False, something is better than nothing, if that something means *any* thing. The half loaf and the whole loaf differ only quantitatively. Both are loaves. Half a brick is not better than no loaf because bricks and loaves differ qualitatively. The half brick may be used for suicidal purposes, for

* See Appendix I. of “The Burning Question of Education.”

knocking your brains out, but it cannot be used for nutritive purposes. Beware of the W.E.A. half brick. "But the W.E.A. are offering the same thing as the Central Labour College, both are educational." With that we are back again at the first difficulty of failing to perceive, that while both agree in being training institutions, both radically differ in the qualitative principles of training, character and object of training. See, for example, the object of the W.E.A. as specified in the Oxford Working Class Joint Committee's Report, pages 83 and 51.

The education which Oxford can give, by broadening his knowledge and strengthening his judgment, would make him at once a more efficient servant of his own society and a more potent influence on the side of industrial peace (83).....that he may be a good citizen and play a reasonable part in the affairs of the world (51.)

Then compare such etherealistic vagary with the definite concrete object of the Central Labour College.

To train men and women for the industrial, political and social work of the organized Labour movement.

As we have already remarked, once the primary difficulty has been removed, once the analysis of what is comprehended by the term education has been made, this second and subsequent difficulties will disappear. A useful illustration may be given to help dispel this first difficulty in analysing another general term, for example, Unionism. How many different concrete forms of organization are comprehended under this term? Would we say that the Free Labourers Union is better than no union? Certainly not. And why? Because it is not founded on a recognition of the antagonism of interests between employers and employed, because it seeks not to eradicate that antagonism but to preserve it. And yet both are unions, both stand for unionism, just as both the W.E.A. and the Central Labour College stand for education. The W.E.A. are on the educational field what the Free Labourers Union are on the industrial field. *Both are half bricks not half loaves.* But there is still another aspect of this second difficulty to be considered. The proposal to accept a half loaf presupposes that there is not a whole loaf to be had. That is not so. What did those workers do when they recognized the impotency of the capitalist political parties to remove the causes of the oppression and suffering of their class? Did they reason, "Something is better than nothing," the Liberal half brick is better than no Labour loaf? Ah now! They proceeded to bake their own bread. *They formed their own independent political organization.* They set about helping themselves. On the educational field the same independence and self-sufficiency must be manifested. The loaves are already in the educational oven of the working class prepared for the purposes of nutrition. And they will be found to be more digestible in the organism of labour than bricks, however generously and imposingly the latter may be presented.

DIFFICULTY number three kicks back at the answer to difficulty number two. Nevertheless, the latter causes the kick to spend its force vainly. "How can the W.E.A. and Ruskin

**Democracy
and
Labour.**

College be regarded as capitalist or anti-labour bricks when both institutions are democratically controlled and when prominent Labour men are seated upon the boards of administration of these institutions?" We will dismantle what appears as a poser by putting forth a counter-poser. How could the Liberal Party be regarded as a capitalist party, at the time when the independent political party of Labour was developing, seeing that prominent Labour men were members of that party, and as such, sat in Parliament? If the presence of labour leaders like Mr. Richard Bell, and Mr. Thomas Burt, made the Liberal Party a Labour party, why was an independent Labour party inaugurated? The formation and development of the Labour Party is an answer to the question. Because some trade unions did not want an independent political party, because they agreed with the attitude of their trade-union leader as Liberal or Liberal-Labour M.P! Did that prove the founders of the Labour Party to be wrong, or did it cause them to cease the work of building up such a party? By no means. They proceeded to win over the unions to the new point of view, and having done so, the leaders of these unions had to cease acting as Liberal representatives. The presence of prominent Labour men in the Workers' Educational Association and Ruskin College, no more makes these institutions Labour, than the presence of prominent Labour men in the Liberal Party made that party Labour. *The independent educational movement represented by the Central Labour College occupies the same posture and acts in no other way than the upbuilders of the independent political movement.* We have already in the short period of our existence, convinced five organizations of the soundness of our principles. There will soon be twice five. And as for democracy—is not the Liberal Party democratic? But is not its democracy a condition for the promotion of its principles? Its democracy, however, does not make it a working-class organization, a Labour party. No more does the democracy of Ruskin College or the W.E.A. make them Labour organizations. Social democracy, it is true, is the high aim of the working-class movement. The realization of that aim involves the disappearance of all classes and class antagonisms. Only one class can carry out this work—the working class. And until it is carried out it can know of no democracy outside itself, no democracy that is not squarely planted on its needs, and in harmony with its purpose. An educational institution that is to serve the Labour movement in its historic mission must be something more than democratic: it must be a Labour college. Its democracy, if it is to be something more than a name, must have its roots in a definite object and in principles, which are not only openly

and avowedly working-class, but which also are actually in correspondence with the economic and social conditions of that class. Viewed in that light, the democracy of Ruskin College and the W.E.A. is as equivocal as the political economy which they teach. An institution may be democratic without being Labour. It cannot be Labour without being democratic. And certainly a non-partisan and neutral democratic Labour institution is unthinkable.

We will return to a consideration of further difficulties to the understanding of our movement next month.

Some May Days in History

IT was Oliver Wendell Holmes who made the profound observation that in order rightly to determine a man's attitude it is not only necessary to note where he stands at present. One must also see where he stood at such and such times in the past, and then, "striking the arc" of the person's motion, determine whether it be really progress or no, and whither it rightly tends.

To him who, in the fray of capitalism, finds the blows heavy, and thinks the issue doubtful, the application of the same method to the course of human progress across the centuries opens a spring at which he can drink deep of hope and courage for the future. Like the troubled sea, man's history has had its wave-crests and its hollows; but each crest has lapped a higher mark than its predecessors, and rarely has a hollow subsided so low as to be lower than the troughs which went before. "Striking our arc," then, across the seething crests of these world waves, we can trace unmistakably the character of our centuries-long march. It spells progress, and the Co-operative Commonwealth.

The First of May, 1215, was very near the summit of one of these wave crests. The then state of the working class of the land of England can well be surmised when it is known that even the barons, the mighty of the kingdom, were in terror of their lives and dwellings. King John, whom even a British writer like Dickens calls a miserable brute, and of whom it has been said that hell itself was fouler for his presence there, was then upon the throne. Greedy, licentious, cruel, and withal an arrant coward, his only objects in life seemed to be land, money, and sensual gratification. In the pursuit of these he waged wars upon foreign cities and his own, pulled out persons' teeth to make them pay ransom, and offered violence to the highest women of the realm. The Church of Rome, which he often fought, he was not above fawning to when he needed the Pope's blessings and assistance in his greedy plots. His enemies, when he caught them, he shut in dungeons and starved to death. His nephew, Arthur, whom he feared as a rival to the throne, he first sent to have blinded, and, that failing, he stabbed and drowned with his own

hand in the dead of night. Every law of the land he broke, pledges of reform he violated faster than he could make them, and England he reduced to the estate of a wilderness of cruelty. No man's person or goods were safe from seizure; justice was bought and sold in open court; rights were a forgotten word. Peasants, artisans, city bourgeois, barons — all groaned under the weight of John's iron rule.

However, the barons, John's vassals, in time had their fill of such a reign. Though for a space he wielded against them an unholy alliance with the Pope, they at last forced him to his knees. Seizing a favourable moment after one of his foreign defeats, they demanded that he ratify and henceforth obey the traditional law of the land. Not many days from the First of May, 1215, John saw that he stood alone in his kingdom. He capitulated, and summoned his belligerent barons to a conference.

A copy of it hangs yet in the Tower of London, that Magna Charta, or Great Charter of the English liberties, which was born of that conference, on the river isle of Runnymede, on June 15 of that year. True, this Great Charter contained nothing which had not been previously known and acknowledged in some form. True, before the year was out, John had violated it from A to Z. Yet here we have the first written constitution wrung from a king by his subjects, a germ which has expanded into the present British constitution and code of legal procedure, and which, carried over to America, has here played a great part in fixing the form of the American political republic, under which capitalism has so powerfully developed as now to leave the road wide open to Socialism.

After King John had been forced to sign the Magna Charta, he fell in a fit of impotent fury on his floor, biting the straw with which it was covered, and crying out in rage against the barons. But what would he have said could he have seen the state of affairs in England on the First of May, 1648, some 400 and odd years later? Then was to be beheld the spectacle of a king a close prisoner in his own dominions, and with a great popular army in the field sworn to bring him to account for the blood he had shed in his long career of misrule and incurable duplicity.

It was Charles I of the house of Stuart, who had made such a mess of the business of ruling. With the aid of his wife Henrietta, his Presbyterian Archbishop Laud, and his iron-handed Earl of Strafford, his whole reign was an attempt to restore the autocracy which 400 years before had been wrenched from the hand of John. For twelve years he had high-handedly run things to suit himself, persistently disregarding and trampling upon the law which required that he call together a Parliament. "Thorough" was his watchword, meaning thorough autocratic rule; but "Thorough" he never got, unless it be thorough defeat and disgrace.

So false and crooked was his course that even his best friends at times withdrew their support in shame. He set Scotland against England, and Ireland against both, in the hope of reducing all three to his power. Finally, in dire need of money, which he could get no other way, he was forced to call a Parliament. But this Parliament he hoodwinked and intrigued against. Cromwell, the head of the army Parliament raised for its own defence, he lied to and tricked. The people everywhere sat among the ruins of their homes, desolated by the civil war this lying prince maintained for his own criminal ends.

At last human flesh and blood could stand it no longer. Charles's troops were scattered, he himself was seized and made a prisoner. In this state we find him on May Day 250 odd years ago. A strong party of his friends in Parliament even yet sought to make peace with him. The army marched to London, purged the royalists out of Parliament, and that body then ordered his trial. The House of Lords refused to second this ordinance. The House of Commons replied that it was the elected representative of the people, and that what it decreed was law, whether the Lords deigned to like it or no. On January 10, 1649, the trial of Charles began. Nine days later Parliament signed his death warrant, and on the 30th he paid the penalty of his crimes with his head. On the ruins of his dynasty the Republic of England was reared.

Here, evidently, is a second wave-crest in human affairs; and note how much higher it has risen than the first. In the first, it was merely the barons against the king, for the exaction of certain rights. Here it is the people against the king for the maintenance of those rights, the declaration that the Parliament is the true governing body, the assertion of the right to execute a king for his manifest crimes against the nation, and, to cap it all, the establishment of a Republic.

Shortly after dawn of the First of May, 1777, a little sailing cruiser named the "Surprise" put out of the French port of Dunkirk. A century and a quarter had passed since Charles lost his head on the scaffold at Whitehall. The Republic of England was short-lived. Charles's son was restored to the throne, and things had dragged tediously on till now again there was the stir of freedom in the world. A new country on the other side of the Atlantic had grown up. Its rising bourgeoisie chafed under the oppression of British feudal rule, which was throttling their commerce. Their trade was restricted, their cities were burnt, their people slain, their population limited, their legislatures suspended, and their courts of justice turned into mockeries, till again the breaking point was reached, and under the name of the United States of America the new nation was up in arms for its independence.

Benjamin Franklin was one of the American commissioners to France, and he it was who fitted out the "Surprise," which on this First of May, 1777, practically began the American war upon the sea. In a week the "Surprise" was back in the French port with a British merchantman she had captured. For this violation of the French neutrality the "Surprise" was seized; but within ten months France had acknowledged the independence of America, and had sent a fleet to her aid.

Without the aid of this fleet, it is highly doubtful whether American independence would ever have been won. All through the war it lent its signal aid, and four years later, at the climax of the struggle, it was it which clinched success for the colonies. By the little-known victory of Cape Henry, a five days' engagement, in which, under the Count de Grasse, it drove off the combined English squadrons, this French fleet prevented succour from reaching Cornwallis at the critical time, and forced the surrender at Yorktown, which terminated the war. This First of May, then, may be taken to mark the upward turn of another high tide in the affairs of men—a high tide which established a Republic, unhampered by relics of feudalism, and, moreover, established it in a country of unparalleled wealth, where it could rush onward the development of industry, and pave the way for the Industrial Commonwealth.

Again the scene shifts. Twelve years elapse, and we are at the French Court at Versailles. What strange gathering is this we note on Friday, the First of May, 1789? Twelve hundred and fourteen individuals, from all over France, foregathering here at Versailles. "Members of the States General," is the word. What, a States General in France, where none has been known for 175 years? Aye, so it is. The Old Régime has dug its own grave. A growing aristocracy of wealth, touched in its tenderest spot by the heavy levies of taxes put upon it, angered by the king's power of *lettre de cachet* to throw it into prison without trial, enviously prudish over the regal debaucheries of the court, and banking on the muttering discontent of a population of 20,000,000 peasants and working men, who often had to eat grass like beasts, and failing even that, died of hunger—backed by all these forces the bourgeoisie of France has at last forced the hand of thick-headed Louis XVI into granting a Parliament. And here, on this First of May, it is assembling.

From this time on the French Revolution marches unshakably to its destiny. The States General is organized. The nobility and the clergy refusing to sit with the Third Estate, or bourgeoisie, the six hundred members of the latter decree themselves the National Assembly. The king's armed attempt to disperse them falls flat. The people of Paris tear down the Bastille, the hated symbol of autocracy.

"Why, this is a revolt!" exclaims King Louis when told of it.

"No, sire, it is a revolution!" replies the Duke of Liancourt.

A Revolution it is. A constitution is made for France. The king turns traitor and is deposed. The Republic is declared, and Louis goes to the guillotine for his treasons. The bourgeois of the Assembly fail to fulfil to the people their promises of equality, peace, and plenty. The people attempt to take up the revolution where the bourgeois leave it off, and are finally beaten down. The triumphant bourgeoisie, victorious over the crown on the one hand, and over the people on the other, is left to digest its prey "under the sabre of Napoleon and the Concordat of the Pope of Rome."

So ended the French Revolution. But Old Régime or New Republic, the people were little better off. The glowing hopes of a regeneration of France and the world, the expectations held by many for the socialization of the tools of production, were doomed to disappointment. But not to death; early in its life's history the human race was communistic. Economic possibilities and development were against that system then, and in the struggle with private property it lost out. Still, ever as the possibilities for a return to communism have grown from age to age, some have always looked forward to the era of peace and plenty which it would usher in. So it comes that on the First of May, 1871, we find the proletariat of Paris giving their blood and their lives for their communistic ideal.

Eight months before, the Third Empire had been ignominiously defeated in a war of its own picking. Paris alone might have withstood the invading Prussian army. But Paris, on the surrender of Napoleon III., had declared the Republic again, and for this was crippled by the French ruling class itself, for fear the workers would become too strong.

No less "patriotic" a crew than the French capitalists themselves called on the Prussian arms to capture their capital for them. This was done, and thereupon the capitalist statesmen of France, Louis Thiers at their head, began their insidious campaign to defeat the working class strength of the city, and reduce it to their terms. A midnight attempt to steal the cannon of Paris precipitated the Commune, March 18, 1871. On the First of May the army of the bourgeoisie, then pressing hard upon the city, captured two outposts, those at Clamart and Issy. On the 23rd the city gates were forced, and the Commune defeated. For days thereafter platoons of men, women and children were marched out and shot down by the hirelings of the money-bags and factory owners of Paris. Thus was the first attempt of the proletariat to govern itself smothered in its own blood.

To-day, thirty-eight years after that First of May on which we saw the Communards dying bravely in their outposts, we may be sure that noble blood has not been shed in vain. "Striking our arc" across these various social epochs, we see it points but one way.

Beginning with Magna Charta, down through the uprising against Charles, further developed by the American Revolution, strengthened by the French Revolution, advancing again with the Paris Commune, we trace the ever-rising pathway of the race.

The May Days of history have seen class after class arise against their oppressors, till to-day the bed-rock has been reached. Below the proletariat there is no other class. Not many more May Days shall elapse ere its victory, whose tramp we can now dimly hear, shall strike the last remaining shackles from the slave.

S. DE LEON.

Weekly People, New York.

Social and Biological Struggles

I.

IT has long been perceived that the "struggle for existence" is common to the human race and to the animal kingdom in general. Biologists are also aware that it extends to the vegetable kingdom and to all life. The sociologists, very few of whom are biologists in any proper sense, but most of whom have read the great leading works in biology, have themselves long been endeavouring to find the bond connecting the social with the biological struggle, and the essential characters by which the two forms of struggle are distinguished. It is not too much to say, and is what might be expected, that the greater part of all that the sociologists say on the subject is wide of the mark, and exhibits an almost complete failure on their part to understand the true nature of the biological struggle.

The socialists, for the most part, regard the social struggle as a practical extension of the biological struggle into the human field, and the work of Karl Marx is frequently characterized as having the same relation to society that Darwin's work has to the organic world. For a long time the modern doctrines relating to life were regarded as highly favourable to socialism, and they are still so regarded by many. Nevertheless it is a fact that they are looked upon by most biologists who think at all on the subject, and by biological philosophers in general, as completely opposed to socialism, and as sustaining the old "let-alone" political economy.

The sociologists in the main deem it their duty to deny that there is any necessary connexion between social and biological struggles. They are especially severe on all attempts to show that there is any redeeming virtue in social struggles, or that it is through them that

social evolution has taken place, in any such sense as it is claimed that organic evolution takes place, viz., through the struggle for existence and the survival of the fittest. Considerable ingenuity has been shown in pointing out that the cases are not parallel, and that social struggles result in the survival of the unfit.

The sociologists generally confound the so-called "struggle for existence" with Darwinism, and very few of them have any adequate idea of what Darwin's phrase "natural selection" means. It is true that Darwin used both phrases, and also that he recognized the influence of direct effort, i. e., use and disuse, in modifying structures, although the discovery of that great law is more properly attributable to Lamarck, and constitutes the essence of Lamarckism as distinguished from Darwinism. But the sociologists are unable to see the distinction, and have only a confused idea of the whole process which they imagine to constitute Darwinism.

With this vague notion in their minds certain of them have invented the phrase "social Darwinism," and have set it up as a sort of "man of straw" in order to show their agility in knocking it down. There is of course much difference in the ability with which different authors have treated the subject, and a few have evinced some conception of the true merits of the question.

II.

Darwinism has very generally been confounded with Malthusianism, and the fact that Darwin modestly admitted that he was led to the consideration of such subjects by reading Malthus on *The Principle of Population* has caused most of the sociological writers who graduated out of political economy into sociology, to identify the Malthusian law with Darwinism as a whole, and to imagine that when they have stated the former, which, as economists, they usually understand, they have stated Darwin's great biological principle, which they do not at all understand.

Darwin did not say nor mean to imply that the Malthusian principle embraced the whole of the biologic law. It is contained in the latter with certain qualifications, and naturally suggested the wider applications that Darwin made of it to the organic world; but it falls far short of embodying even the principle of natural selection.

M. Achille Loria, in a very interesting chapter entitled "Social Darwinism,"¹ confines himself to a statement of the principle that

¹ *Problèmes sociaux contemporains*, Paris, 1897. Sixième Leçon; *Le Darwinisme social*, pp. 113-35.

"the quantity of subsistence existing on the earth is not sufficient for the nourishment of all organized beings, so that they are compelled to secure it at the price of an incessant struggle," and he bases his discussion entirely on that principle, saying :

It is natural that the weak should be defeated in this struggle, because, not being able to obtain any nourishment, or at least not a sufficient quantity, they perish, while the strong survive and triumph, so that the species possessing the "fittest" qualities improve little by little and rise to more perfect conditions of existence.

M. Loria then shows that certain sociologists apply this theory to social phenomena :

Men, too, they say, have carried on for centuries a terrible struggle for life, which, in our days, manifests itself in the unbridled competition of which we are witnesses ; in this fierce struggle the victory is to the strong, and this constitutes the basis of evolution and progress. It is therefore wrong to deplore the bloody battles between men and the fierce competition which makes them trample upon one another in order to be first, since it is this competition which insures the triumph of the best, the most worthy ; it is wrong to try to make laws to mitigate this struggle, since it is a valuable factor in progressive development. . . . Hence the most complete quietism, the happy calm of the philosopher and the *dolce far niente* of the legislator constitute the lesson taught by the Darwinian theory, according to these modern theorists. ¹

Such is the theory which, according to M. Loria, is called social Darwinism, but in his view these social applications of Darwinism are wholly false. He does not say who has defended this doctrine, but it cannot be denied that something near akin to it is held by many biologists who attempt to carry biological principles into human affairs, and that it is practically the attitude of most scientific men and evolutionists in so far as they have expressed themselves on the subject. It is the doctrine that I have characterized as the "gospel of inaction," and to the refutation of which I have devoted much effort.

M. Loria easily shows that there is no such parallel, and his comparison of the industrially successful class in society to parasites is ingenious and not wholly incorrect. He could have made his argument much stronger if he had recognized that all predatory animals are essentially parasites, since they live on the nourishment stored up by animals that take it from the vegetable kingdom, and do not differ in this essential respect from parasites that attach themselves to the bodies of other animals.

¹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 117, 118.

But the "struggle," if it can be so designated, between parasites and their hosts, including that between carnivorous and herbivorous animals, is only a very small part of Darwinism. In fact it may be said to form no part of it, since it was well understood long before Darwin was born. And yet, curiously enough, the so-called "social Darwinism" scarcely ever gets farther than this. I have never seen any distinctively Darwinian principle appealed to in the discussions of "social Darwinism." It is therefore wholly inappropriate to characterize as social Darwinism the *laissez-faire* doctrine of political economists, even when it is attempted to support that doctrine by appeals to the laws of organic development. That the *laissez-faire* doctrine is false and not sustained by biological principles I freely admit and have abundantly shown, but the fallacy involved is to be found in an entirely different department of scientific investigation.

III.

There is another school of sociologists who, ignoring the economic struggle, confine themselves to the race struggle. These have still another form of supposed "social Darwinism" which they have conjured up in their own imagination, and against which they are battling as valiantly as Don Quixote battled with the windmills. With them social Darwinism is any attempt to maintain that human or social evolution has been influenced or furthered by the struggle of races, peoples, and nations. Their idea is that the only condition to progress is absolute peace, and that all disturbances of the peace of the world are retrogressive and even "pathological."

It is not my present intention to refute this doctrine. That has been done far more eloquently by history than it can ever be done by words, but I wish to protest in the strongest possible terms against the application of the term Darwinism to the race struggle. I know of no ethnologist, historian, or sociologist among those who see the real effect of the struggle of races, who has accepted this designation for that law. The general character of that struggle has always been known, and therefore it no more belongs to Darwin's teachings than does the law of parasitism. But the great discovery of precisely how the race struggle operates in the process of civilization, though clearly formulated by Gumplowicz¹ in 1875 in a pamphlet of whose existence Darwin could have known nothing, was not fully worked out until 1883,² one year after Darwin's death. That principle is

¹ Ludwig Gumplowicz, *Race und Staat. Eine Untersuchung über das Gesetz der Staatenbildung*, Wien, 1875.

² Ludwig Gumplowicz, *Der Rassenkampf. Sociologische Untersuchungen*. Innsbruck, 1883.

to be ranked with the principle of natural selection, and may be appropriately called its sociological homologue, because, although an entirely different principle, it agrees with the latter in constituting a strictly scientific explanation of a great natural process, never before understood. I call it the principle of *social synergy*. It certainly is not social Darwinism nor Darwinism in any form. It would be difficult to find even an adumbration of it in any of Darwin's works, or, for that matter, in the works of any author prior to 1875 or even to 1883. But Ratzenhofer in 1893,¹ and especially in 1898,² took it up and greatly expanded it. But he acknowledges that it was Gumpłowicz who succeeded in first establishing sociology as the science which forms the foundation of all political teachings.³

¹ Gustav Ratzenhofer, *Wesen und Zweck der Politik als Theil der Sociologie und Grundlage der Staatswissenschaft*, 3 vols. Leipzig, 1893.

² Gustav Ratzenhofer, *Die sociologische Erkenntnis: Positive Philosophie des sozialen Lebens*, Leipzig, 1898.

³ These are his own words, to which almost all his expounders neglect to call attention: "Nach vielen mehr oder weniger erfolgreichen Versuchen, das gesellschaftliche Leben wissenschaftlich zu erfassen, in welcher Hinsicht insbesondere Comte, Spencer, Tylor und Bastian bahnbrechend wirkten, scheint es Gumpłowicz gelungen, die Sociologie als Wissenschaft festzustellen, welche die Grundlage der Lehre über die Politik bildet."—*Wesen und Zweck der Politik*, Vol. I, Preface, p. v.

LESTER F. WARD.

From the *Annales de l'Institut International de Sociologie*,
Tome XI, pp. 111-126, Paris, 1907.

To be continued.

A Causerie

⊙ DSFISH and bodkins! We live, move, and have our being. We find the nine-and-half hours' day, however, is not conducive to the psychic phenomena desired by the over-scrupulous modern Editor. That was yester eve. Now we are living on twenty-four hours a day; an enforced interlude to which the Proletarian is heir; a not unwilling one either. The civic atmosphere of the Psychic Centre, together with the material necessities of life (faugh!) has revived us to the usual sense of our own importance, which is almost Shavian—we won't say Wellsian. That's atrocious. We acquired in our younger days, the pernicious habit of gaining some of our information from perusing periodicals, books, and other forms of written expression. The habit lingers. Recently the habit has become of a chronic character; so, for our own selfish ends (mark the influence of Twain), we'll endeavour to be communicative, to cure, or perhaps palliate, this noxious trait which has changed freer spirits into not exactly biological, but bibliological organisms, namely, book-worms.

We have read some books. Take heed, ye Palaestra Logica parasites! We said "some." Three of them have been issued by the Cambridge University Press. We have perused, although we have not purchased. In that particular we claim the company of the orthodox reviewer. Our other qualifications are meagre. We belong to "The Society for the Suppression of the Obvious." We have transgressed.

The edition is handy. "Heredity" is one of the subjects dealt with in these series by Mr. Doncaster, M.A. It is suggested that organic evolution is admitted by all schools of biology, but the cause and manner of that particular branch of evolution permits of a variety of opinions. The nature of Heredity and Variation, their relations, are discussed and emphasized.

Chapter III. is devoted to the causes of Variation. Here it is pointed out that influences acting for several generations may have a cumulative effect. If we may digress, we would suggest that cumulative preference shares be allotted to all when the Cosmos is refloated. We know our humour is vile. Can the Ethiopian, &c., &c.? Galton and Eugenics are touched upon, and in Chapter IV. a fairly good explanation of the Mendelian theory is put forward. The domain of disputed questions is next entered upon, followed by a brief historical summary of heredity, and concluding remarks are confined to the material basis of inheritance. Another little volume deals with "The Idea of God in Early Religions." F. B. Jevons is responsible for it. At the outset the distinction is shown between the Fetish, which was individual, and may have been anti-social, whilst the God was active in the interests of the community.

Portions are given to the study of Polydaemonism, Polytheism, Animism, Anthropomorphism, and the Godhead. The contributions to the Idea of God, from mythology, next engage the reader's attention. Mythology is said to rise under, and spring from, polytheism when the gods are named, and is not due to "disease of language," as Max Müller maintains. This is a very interesting section. "All myths are narratives," and "Mythology is the biography of the gods," the author says, epigrammatically, and also points out the reasons for the discarding of mythology. The Idea of God in worship involves a consideration of Vegetation Deities and Harvest Festivals. Discussion on contracts and covenants with the gods is supported by examples from the children of Israel and the Japanese, and is admirably dealt with. Spells and Prayers, their influence and

origin, are considered, and their distinct characteristics pointed out. If we remember rightly, in dealing with morality and religion, the author appears to suggest an immutable morality. We may be mistaken. "Morality is a duenna to be circumvented," we are told by Meredith. It may be the morality—the standards of morality

alter from time to time, in every age and clime. Yet, every man to his opinion, and we think the author infers the absolute truth. Apart from controversial matters, we think the book is well worth reading, and will be found to be very instructive as well as interesting to our readers who care for these matters.

Another contributor to this collection is John W. Judd, F.R.S., who gives us "The Coming of Evolution." The title is rather misleading, at least, we think so, because it deals almost exclusively with the evolutionary conception in biology, and consists largely of biographical notes. Early ideas of evolution are shown to have been influenced by the advent of sudden floods, volcanic eruptions, and other violent natural phenomena, which finally culminated in the catastrophic theory.

The catastrophic conception is Orthodoxy, and is supported by Arabian and Jewish Cosmogonies, for example, Biblical Creation and the Noachian Deluge. Then came Scrope and Lyell's independent investigations, springing as they did from the revolt against this wholesale destruction and creative idea. It is shown how Lyell, in the field of organic evolution finally "went the whole orang," and also an interesting insight into Lamarck's influence is given. Darwin also comes in for a considerable amount of attention. He is depicted as a convinced evolutionist in 1837, and it is shown how the reading of Malthus influenced his conception of natural selection.

An interesting glimpse of the home life of this remarkable man is given by the relation of an anecdote to the effect that the children were so accustomed to seeing him engaged in his biological work that one of their friends was once naively asked: "When does Mr. So-and-So do his 'barnacles?'" The Descent of Man is simply the principles embodied in the Origin of Species applied to Man. This is a very readable book, but unless one is interested in the biological side of evolution the interest will be likely to pall. The price of each volume is one shilling, but before increasing the expenditure on intellectual armaments fellow-Plebeians, look ye to your subscriptions or the PLEBS will be a "going concern" in very truth. To parody Tennyson, "The Plebeians have but to will it and we set our faces towards liquidation." There are other books but time and space and the editor press; in addition, Beaumont, our college chum and fellow-Sartorial, is with us, and for a few short hours we're going to forget dull care and become fervent devotees of Dionysus, in popular parlance, we're going to have a very enjoyable evening together. We may return to our books when we again receive the editorial call. Au Revoir.

MEREDITH F. TITTERINGTON.

The Masters' Builders

(With Apologies to Ibsen.)

THE following letter, which is a reprint from the *Times* of the 10th inst. will, we feel sure, be of great interest to our readers and co-workers. The letter has appeared in most of the leading papers throughout the country. It is but one more justification for the existence of the Central Labour College, one more testimony to the correctness of our vision and pre-vision at the inauguration of the Plebs League, and of the provision of a movement for independent working-class education.

It was a practice in ancient and even mediæval times either as a punishment or as a sacrifice, to wall in alive some human being. Grant Allen tells us that, in the case of the Copenhagen wall, they took an innocent little girl and sat her at a table with toys and eatables. Then, while she played and ate, twelve master builders closed a vault over her. Analogously, we have before our eyes in the case of Ruskin College, an attempt at *the walling-in of Labour*. There, too, is the table set with the diploma toys and other deviceful delicacies! And the masters' builders have come forward with their articles of craft and their assurances of "well and truly" upbuilding this Labour College: a Labour College in the sense that *Labour is safely imbedded in the masters' mortar!* Unless the working-class movement builds its own house with stones from the quarry of its own might and with tools from the workshop of its own experience and self-sufficiency,

"THEY LABOUR IN VAIN THAT BUILD IT."

W. W. C.

RUSKIN COLLEGE, OXFORD.

THE BUILDING FUND.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "TIMES."

SIR,—It has been decided to proceed at once with the new buildings of Ruskin College.

May we, therefore, bring before you for your kind consideration the claims of Ruskin College for wider support than it has yet received?

From personal acquaintance with the facts we can assure you that the working of the college under its present conditions is not unworthy of its ideals, and that its character as a place of serious education is being steadily maintained.

An appeal is now made for donations to the building fund. The present accommodation is quite inadequate and unsuitable for the purpose of a college, and it has now been decided to proceed at once with the erection of a handsome block of buildings containing two good lecture-rooms and good accommodation for 50 students. The sum of £4,100 has been subscribed (in large measure by a single munificent donor) towards this fund, but a sum of £8,000 is still needed.

Any subscriptions or donations may be sent to the secretary of Ruskin College (Mr. H. Allsopp); or to the Oxford Branch of the London County and Westminster Bank.

We are, yours very truly,

WILLIAM R. ANSON, M.P., Warden of All Souls College.
 CYRIL BAILEY, M.A., Fellow of Balliol College.
 SIDNEY BALL, M.A., Senior Tutor of St. John's College.
 ERNEST BARKER, M.A., Fellow of St. John's College.
 HERBERT W. BLUNT, M.A., Student of Christ Church.
 A. J. CARLYLE, M.A., D.Litt., Fellow of University College.
 J. ESTLIN CARPENTER, M.A., D.Litt., Principal of Manchester College.
 E. F. CARRITT, M.A., Fellow of University College.
 H. E. EGERTON, M.A., Beit Professor of Colonial History.
 F. Y. EDGEWORTH, M.A., Professor of Political Economy.
 H. A. L. FISHER, M.A., Fellow of New College.
 W. HAMILTON FYFE, M.A., Fellow of Merton College.
 W. M. GELDART, M.A., B.C.L., Vinerian Professor of English Law.
 HENRY GOUDY, M.A., Regius Professor of Civil Law.
 A. J. HERBERTSON, M.A., Professor of Geography.

KENNETH LEYS, M.A., Fellow of University College.
 A. D. LINDSAY, M.A., Fellow of Balliol College.
 W. MARKBY, K.C.I.E., D.C.L., J.P., Fellow of Balliol College.
 R. R. MARETT, M.A., Fellow of Exeter College.
 WILLIAM MCDUGALL, M.A., Wilde Reader of Mental Philosophy.
 GILBERT MURRAY, M.A., Regius Professor of Greek.
 L. R. PHELPS, M.A., Fellow of Oriel College.
 L. L. PRICE, M.A., Fellow of Oriel College.
 C. GRANT ROBERTSON, M.A., Fellow of All Souls College.
 W. D. ROSS, M.A., Fellow of Oriel College.
 ARTHUR L. SMITH, M.A., Fellow of Balliol College.
 HENRY STURT, M.A., Fellow of Queen's College.
 R. J. E. TIDDY, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College.
 H. H. TURNER, M.A., D.Sc., Savilian Professor of Astronomy.
 PAUL VINOGRADOFF, M.A., Professor of Jurisprudence.

Sectarianism and Dogmatism *

THE International was organized for the purpose of putting the actual fighting organizations of the working class in the place of the socialist and semi-socialist sects. The original statutes and the inaugural address show this at the first glance. On the other hand, the Internationalists could not have maintained themselves, had it not been for the fact that the historical development had already smashed the sectarian cliques. The evolution of socialist sectarianism and that of the real labour movement always move in opposite directions. So long as the sects are historically justified, the working class is still unfit for an independent historical movement. As soon as it reaches this point of maturity, all sects are essentially reactionary. However, the International repeats in its history what history in general shows everywhere. The obsolete seeks to rehabilitate itself and maintain itself within the newly-established form.

And the history of the International was a continual struggle of its General Council against the attempts of sects and amateurs, who tried to maintain themselves against the real labour movement

* (Extract from a letter written by Marx in London, November 23rd, 1871, and addressed to his friend Bolte, a member of the Central Committee of the "International" in the United States.)

within the International. This struggle was carried on at its congress, but still more in the private negotiations of the General Council with the individual sections.

Since in Paris the proudhonists (mutualists) had help to found the Association, they naturally were at the helm in Paris during the first years. In opposition to them collectivist, positivist, and other groups naturally arose later.

In Germany there was the Lassalle clique. I have myself carried on a correspondence with the ill-famed Schweitzer for two years and irrefutably demonstrated to him, that Lassalle's organization is a mere sectarian organization and as such opposed to the organization of the real labour movement desired by the International. He had his reasons for not understanding.

At the close of 1868 the Russian Bakounin entered the International for the purpose of forming within it a second International, with himself as its chief, under the name of "*Alliance de la Démocratique Socialiste*." Although he was a man without any theoretical training, he pretended to represent in this separate body the scientific propaganda of the International and to make this the special avocation of this second International within the International.

His programme was a superficial mixture of things grabbed up right and left, such as the equality of classes, the abolition of the right of inheritance as a point of departure of the social movement (Saint Simonian nonsense), atheism dictated to its members as a dogma, &c., and his main dogma was Proudhonian, namely, abstention from political activity.

This primer for children found some support (and still has a certain hold) in Italy and Spain, where the conditions for a real labour movement have but little developed, and among a few conceited, ambitious, shallow doctrinaires in Romanic Switzerland and Belgium.

This doctrine (a hash borrowed from Proudhon, Saint Simon and others) was, and is of secondary importance to Bakounin, and primarily a means for his own personal aggrandizement. Theoretically a zero, he is in his elements as an intriguer.

For years the General Council had to battle against this conspiracy (which was supported to a certain degree by the French Proudhonists, particularly in Southern France). At last it struck the long prepared blow by the resolutions 1., 2 and 3, IX, and XVI, and XVII, at its London conference.*

* Resolutions 1., 2 and 3, forbid all names of sects and decide that the individual sections shall be known exclusively as sections of the International in the various localities; resolution IX, declares that the political activity of the working class is necessary and that this political activity is inseparable from its economic movement; resolution XVI, declares the question of the "*Alliance de la Démocratique Socialiste*" settled by the announcement of its dissolution on the part of its secretary; resolution XVII, permits to the Jurassic sections in Switzerland to adopt the name "*Fédération Juraésienne*," but censures its publication "*Progress*" and "*Solidarité*."

It is a matter of course that the General Council will not lend its support to the same thing in America which it opposes in Europe. The resolution 1., 2 and 3, and IX, offer to the New York Committee the legal weapons, by which they may make an end to all sectarianism and amateur groups, and eventually expel them.

The political movement of the working class has for its natural and ultimate aim the conquest of the political power for it, and this requires, of course, that a previous organization of the working class, arising out of its economic struggles, should have reached a certain degree of maturity.

On the other hand, every movement, in which the working class meets the ruling classes as a class and seeks to overcome them by pressure from without, is a political movement. For instance, the attempt to force from individual capitalists a reduction of the labour time, in some individual factory or in some line of occupation, is a purely economic movement; but a movement trying to obtain an eight-hour law, or something similar, is a political movement. And in this way a political movement grows everywhere out of the various economic movements of the working class, that is, a movement of the class to enforce its demands in some general form, which, in some form shall have a general social power.

Wherever the working class is not far enough advanced in its organization to undertake an effective campaign against the collective power, that is, the political power of the ruling classes, it should be trained towards the policies of the ruling classes which is hostile to us. Otherwise the working class will remain a plaything in the hands of the ruling classes. This has been demonstrated by the September Revolution in France and is proved to a certain degree by the game, which is still played with success in England by Gladstone and his helpers.

International Socialist Review.

KARL MARX.

Rochdale and District Labour College Classes Conferences

THE first conference under the above auspices was held in Rochdale on April 15th, at which reports of the class work preformed in the various centres, were submitted by the secretaries, together with the lecturers' general report.

The contraction of the class area was considered. A report was given by a delegate from classes held in Oldham under the auspices of the local Socialist Society, and arising out of this report, the possibilities of forming a C.L.C. class at Oldham was discussed.

A second conference was held in Rochdale on May 13th, at which delegates were present from Bury, Bacup, Rochdale, Shaw, Oldham and Radcliffe. It was agreed that we proceed towards the formation of a class in each of these towns.

It was further agreed that we form a district committee to consist of two representatives from the class committee of each town, this district committee, when formed, to elect its own President and Secretary.

It is hoped that a St. Helens District and a Preston District may be formed for next winter's work on similar lines to the above. This, in addition to setting up two new areas in Lancashire, would greatly reduce the travelling expenses involved in the formerly wide area.—
ED.

Central Labour College Extension Movement CLASS REPORTS

ROCHDALE

The second term, which extended from October to April, came to a close at Easter. The total number of students attending the three classes was fifty-two. Subjects were: Industrial History, Economics, and Logic. A few public lectures have been given under our auspices. These on the whole were moderately successful, and assisted towards meeting the expenses involved in the class work.

The financial turnover of the classes amounted to £58 10s. A large portion of this amount was absorbed in travelling expenses. It is hoped to effect an economy in this direction next term by the contraction of the class area and the formation of new areas.

The students are holding a class throughout the summer on Industrial History. The class is to be conducted by a different student each week. The textbooks to be taken are those that have been in use during the winter course.

LEWIS TAYLOR and HAROLD KERSHAW, *Joint Secretaries.*

BACUP

Our class on Industrial History had a very successful first session from an educational point of view, but suffered somewhat from paucity of students. Every prospect of a much larger class next winter providing we get a more suitable class night.

T. ROBINSON, *Secretary.*

PRESTON

The above class was held on Sunday mornings under I.L.P. branch auspices. Subject taken: Industrial History. Forty-four students enrolled, average attendance, thirty-five. In addition to class

lectures, five special public lectures were delivered in the Branch Rooms on Sunday evenings, and on another occasion Mr. Craik addressed a large audience in one of the local theatres.

The Branch at its half-yearly meeting passed a special vote of thanks and appreciation for the good work of Comrade Craik and the Classes.

JNO. PORTER, *Secretary*.

ST. HELENS

The educational movement of the working-class has at last found definite expression in St. Helens. A class, twenty-six in number has just concluded a five months course on Industrial History. "And surely it were needed much" in this centre of Glassopolis. The refreshing influence of the fount of knowledge will do much to dispel the drowsiness that has been present in the local Labour world. Twenty-six men and women with the history of their class imprinted on their memory will surely do much for the workers' emancipation. The forms of family association, the development of the ancient civilizations out of barbarism, the industrial and political history of Britain, and last, but not least, the evolution of life with the various interpretations of that evolution were all lucidly expounded by the lecturer, Will W. Craik, of the A.S.R.S., and Central Labour College, Oxford.

The best possible recommendation is perhaps that sorely tried encomium of the popular advertisement, "It supplies a long felt want." The C.L.C. classes do all this and more.

Other branches of the movement will be well advised to inaugurate classes as early as possible, "You have nothing to lose but ignorance you have Knowledge and power to gain."

E. ARCHBOLD, *Secretary*.

BURY

The Class held here during the past six months has been a great success. We have had an intellectual treat. The twenty-three students who formed the class have had their conception of history revolutionized. A very deep interest has been maintained throughout. No words of mine can adequately express our appreciation of the work done. We are confident of increasing the number of students for next winter's work.

We have sent over the fifty shillings to the Central Labour College to assist them in their great struggle and some of the students have promised to subscribe a small sum monthly during the summer for the same purpose.

FRANK BUNDOCK, *Secretary*.