

THE  
"Plebs" Magazine

---

---

Vol. III.

February, 1911.

No. 1.

Copyright Entered at Stationer's Hall.

---

---

## EDITORIAL

---

**I**t is now just a little over two years ago since we began to point out in these pages the existence of a class struggle in the field of education. It only seems yesterday that we wrote the first editorial. Even at that moment we saw as **Towards clearer seeing.** "through a glass darkly," and but a little time previous we saw not even darkly. We were hard to convince and slow to discern the real danger that was developing in what seemed a delightful and cosy corner of the world. Like Queen Gertrude in Shakespeare's tragedy we would reply to the interrogation of those we thought mad, "Do you see nothing there?"

Nothing at all : yet, all that is I see.

Nor did you nothing hear?

No, nothing but ourselves.

Ourselves! Our "*good selves*" as the secretarial Polonius at Ruskin used to put it. Yes, we spent too much time in introspection. We looked too long and listened too lovingly to ourselves while other selves were idealistically experimenting *in facie Romuli*. It was the impatience and indecent haste of the experimenters that opened our eyes to the external reality. Many a time, we make no doubt, have they regretted that they did not apply their much paraded and well-worn dictum, *Evolution is a slow and painful process*. Many times have we given thanks to the gods that it was painful even though quick. We soon set ourselves to the task of locating the source of the pain. That discovered, organization for its removal followed. It was a simple remedy that was prescribed in December, 1908:

"To bring about a definite and more satisfactory connexion between Ruskin College and the Labour Movement."

We were soon to find out that it was too simple, that the disease was a legally constituted part of the Ruskin organism which, according to the guardians of that organism, could not and should not be removed. True "temperance" had once been prescribed for it diluted with small doses of "rhetoric," but that was an *authorized* prescription, and it was not the fault of the directing authority that the directions were not followed. Not only was the simple remedy rejected but those who proposed it were to be informed that "the Deed of Incorporation of the college clearly requires neutrality upon all matters of political controversy." If the remedy could not be applied the disease could, however, be aggravated. And the Ruskin authorities soon showed how this could be carried out. The climax was reached on the 26th of March, 1909. It served but to make us see more clearly, to recognize that what was underlying the actions of those in authority were not merely personal or local causes but arose out of that economic struggle in society which Ruskin tuition sought continually to obscure. The remedy of 1908 was truly too simple. Mr. Buxton's "old garment" could not be metamorphosed into a new one. And it was clear that out of that shop where the professors of patchwork preside no new garment could come. Out of this clearer seeing arose the Central Labour College.



THE authorities of Ruskin College made the fatal mistake of treating lightly the attitude of the students towards them. Those gentlemen of culture were so much in love with themselves and their ideas, so enamoured with the powers of their personality that they thought no obstacle could long remain to impede their progress. Conceit is a distinctly professional emotion. Especially was the self-styled second Bradlaugh blinded by his exalted ego. The possibility of a strike following their disposal of Mr. Hird never occurred to them. And

**Re-plastering  
or  
Re-organization.**

when the proposal to establish a new college was announced they openly joked about what seemed to them a piece of pure impossiblism. But when they found that the proposition was no metaphysical one, when they realized that the Central Labour College was beginning to look dangerously like coming into being, then they set about initiating a series of tactics which demonstrated that middle-class culture is by no means free from ethical dualism. Failing to prevent the occupancy of the premises in Bradmore Road, failing to prejudice Prof. Lester Ward against taking part in the first "Plebs" Meet, and still later failing to retain their hold upon the majority of the formerly supporting Trade Unions they began to "feel that the time was ripe" for making Ruskin College a Labour College. Middle-class culture is also wonderfully imaginative. The authorities at Ruskin by some subtle, self-sacrificing process discovered that they had been feeling

this ripeness "coming on" for some years. And what about that eternal verity the constitution? Well, the discovery had been made that with thoroughly trained operators and well selected assistants the constitution might be operated upon. One of those present at the operating table on October 30th, 1909, must have been overlooked by the vigilance group, for he appeared to have been unfavourably impressed with the proceedings as well as with the attitude of the presiding surgeon, Prof. Lees Smith. In a letter which he wrote to the *Oxford Chronicle*, on Nov. 20th, he summed up what had taken place by saying "Evidently the 'sand-papering' process is to go on and the 'Oxfordizing' process is to continue."

After the constitution had recuperated in that asylum of the workers, the Board of Trade, it reappeared before the working class with democracy written all over it. That it was only an appearance of democracy, only a re-plastering of the frontage, we pointed out at some length in our Editorial of October last. Good news travels fast, and the press of the country, who are also servants in the same cause as the professors, afforded a modest space to announcing the reorganization of Ruskin College. The results of the trumpeting have apparently not come up to expectations, for within the last few weeks the press have again been busy heralding the changes that have taken place in Ruskin College, together with its prospects and possibilities. This time whole columns are devoted to the subject, accompanied by editorials, which indicate that "orders" have been given by those who hold the keys of the newspaper world.



The *Liverpool Post* of the 27th January, devotes a column to a communication from "Our Labour Correspondent"! with regard to what is characterized as "the most dramatic scheme of democratic education ever planned," and which is to be laid before the annual general meeting of Ruskin College on February 25th. The scheme,

**A Dramatic Scheme.**

we are informed, has in view the giving to the future Labour Members of Parliament and Trade Union leaders throughout the empire *the systematic knowledge acquired by a Varsity training*. The italics are ours. "Evidently the 'sand-papering' process is to go on and the 'Oxfordizing' process is to continue." It was certainly a flash of "Democratic" genius that led to the institution of an advisory bureau on the Ruskin executive! And thus early has it begun to justify its existence. Those gentlemen who *advise* have apparently decided to add geographical breadth to educational breadth. Apart from the question as to whether they seriously believe in the possibility of their encompassing the empire to make proselytes, or shall we rather say intellectual eunuchs, it is

evident that they see in the parading of their "Dramatic" scheme considerable drawing powers. No doubt many will be caught by such chaff. No doubt Ruskin College will continue to diplomatize and debilitate a number of working men. But not for long. Brief will be its benevolent assimilation of future leaders of the working class. All its lures and devices, its stage thunder and melodramatic posing cannot save it from the fate which it so justly deserves. The working class are waking, and that spells extinction for all that cannot stand its gaze. Everyday the spirit of revolt deepens, the old ruts are forsaken and new paths are being hewn. And to all this the real agents at Ruskin College are by no means blind. On the contrary, it is the very sight of this that drives them to devise with feverish haste schemes by which they may saddle themselves on to the working-class movement and hold it in with the bureaucratic rein. For, however much they may prate about democracy, the middle-class culture despises it. Their patronage can only paralyze not promote the historic mission of the proletariat. They are like all the "friends of labour" in history, rhetorical but reactionary; altruists in public, egoists in secret; fraternal before gaining power, paternal when they have gained it. And, filled with the spirit of professional wisdom and clothed in academic parchment, they come forward as the called and chosen to gather the Demos of the Empire together—"only to sit at their feet"—to acquire and *be acquired*. And it is these dear humane professors who are so scornful and indignant about the Central Labour College being a forcing-house of propagandism. Well, that is certainly an improvement on a faking-house of fiction. "A systematic knowledge acquired by 'Varsity training" is as much use to the labour movement as the tools of a burglar would be to an honest man. For the latter to use them would involve ceasing to be honest. Similarly with university education. It is useful only to those who enter the service of a class that live upon the legalized burglary of the working class. We can quite appreciate the editorial remarks of the *Liverpool Post* on the subject of this great scheme, wherein is pointed out that this is a matter of "exceptional interest, not to the working class only, but to all sections of the community." Just so! The servant knoweth his master's taste.



THE text of the original plan of a proposed appeal to Trades' Unionists, Co-operators, and Members of the Working Men's Clubs and Institutes is quoted in full by the *Liverpool Post*. Therein appears a list of the staff and their qualifications. Dr. Gilbert Slater is, for the tenth time, referred to as having been a Labour Mayor of Woolwich. It was apparently thought necessary to add in parenthesis that Woolwich is "a thoroughly working-class com-

munity"! Surely the qualifying adjective "Labour" was sufficient to dispel all doubts from "democratic" minds. Mr. Henry Allsopp, B.A. has also most satisfactory qualifications—"First-class honours in modern history," besides "having had a life-long acquaintance with working-class problems and difficulties." Mr. Allsopp would, if he had been consulted, probably have suggested working men instead of "working-class." As a result of his life-long acquaintance," we understand that he has discovered that there is no such thing as a class, and as for a class struggle we know that his soul positively revolts against such crude notions. It might have been mentioned also in his favour that he has a strong antipathy against American publications, which should do much to strengthen the proposed Empire Amalgam. But list, ye ex-students of Ruskin College, for it is you alone that can appreciate the following—italics, Mr. Printer, italics—" *The College has the services of one of the cleverest experts in economics that Oxford has ever produced, Mr. H. S. Furniss, M.A., who holds the Oxford Diploma in Economics, and is thoroughly in sympathy with democratic aspirations.*" We can add nothing to this. We can only say, alas! Poor Oxford! It is hard on thee, grievously hard on thee! But it is all for the Empire. And surely a little dramatic licence is permissible for the dear Empire's sake. Go, and sin no more!

W. W. C.

## Working Class Education!!!

In pursuance of the topic mentioned in the Editorial the following articles have appeared.

The proposal outlined exclusively in the *Daily Post and Mercury* columns yesterday to increase the usefulness of Ruskin Hall, Oxford, by establishing trade union scholarships has attracted a large amount of attention in labour circles, both in Liverpool and London, as the work of the college is both known and appreciated there. The only difficulty about the matter seems to be the state of affairs brought about by the Osborne judgment, which makes trade unions very chary of contributing to outside agencies of any kind, as they have found by experience that the law can be put into motion by a single member, and bills of costs be run up.

### MR. RAMSAY MACDONALD.

A representative of the *Daily Post and Mercury* called upon Mr. Ramsay Macdonald, M.P., at his house, and obtained his views on the matter. "As this is the first information on the matter I have received," said Mr. Ramsay Macdonald, "I cannot say whether it is correct or not. I should like to point out that your informant states

that the proposal will be brought before the Imperial Labour Conference which, he says, is to be held in London during the Coronation festivities. As a matter of fact, no such gathering has yet been arranged, and it is therefore premature to say that any specific proposals will be brought before it."

As to the general proposal for contributions from all the unions, Mr. Macdonald went on: "I think this will require a great deal of consideration, especially under existing circumstances. The Osborne judgment not only prevents trade unions themselves from levying for any object outside their own work, but it also prevents them making any contribution whatever, and the experience of the union, so far as law costs are concerned, has been so bad that they will hesitate before doing anything of the kind in the future, however much they might approve of the object of the body seeking support.

"The Ruskin College," continued Mr. Macdonald, "has for some time been receiving students, whose fees and keep have been paid by their trade unions, but under the present state of the law it would be unwise to make any levy, or indeed to make any contributions at all to outside agencies. Nevertheless, we are all of us anxious to see Ruskin College continue its work, for it has the possibilities of much good in it. My only difficulty in discussing it is that I am sometimes afraid that the kind of education given is not that which is best adapted to benefit the students, especially those who have to go back to their work.

"The curriculum is too much moulded on Oxford lines and methods, and it does not always train the man's intelligence and capacity for work upon industrial and democratic lines. I should like to see the college solve the problem of a proper curriculum before it is put in possession of so much money that it can go on working without having to settle this problem.

"The great trouble with us workmen is as soon as we get out of the workshop or factory or (in my case) the field, to get the sort of breadth of mind as will enable us to solve problems as they present themselves to us. You cannot get that breadth of mind through reading text-books on economics. It can only come from experience, and from contact with influences that broaden the mind generally. The sort of curriculum I should advocate would be wide reading of science, natural science, such as geology or physiography. This would do these men far more good than dry economics or lectures on factory legislation. They have specialised in that already, and their lack of education consists in the fact that they have specialised.

"The first influence that ought to be brought to bear is the liberalising influence, and not an influence which merely sharpens the knowledge they have already got. If I had control of Ruskin

Hall, instead of providing lectures on economics I should choose the sort of subjects which would liberalise the mind and broaden the outlook of the students before allowing them to touch books on sociology and such like subjects. At the same time I should like it to be understood that I say this in no carping spirit. I wish the college every success, and all I am concerned in is that it should find out the best method for carrying on its work."

—*Liverpool Post*, January 28th, 1911.

Professor Ramsey Muir of Liverpool University, a W.E.A. Lecturer sent a long letter of criticism of the Ruskin College Scheme, the main points of which will be seen from the letter also sent by Mr. Allsopp to the *Post* and printed below.

SIR,—Will you kindly allow me, as secretary of Ruskin College, a few lines in which to reply to Professor Ramsay Muir's criticisms of our great scheme and of Ruskin College. Mr. Muir is anxious lest our work should conflict with the W. E. A. tutorial classes. To my mind there is no fear of that. What is much more likely is that the W. E. A. itself will shortly endow a few scholarships at Ruskin College for specially selected and specially suitable students. Would Professor Muir object to that? The W. E. A. and Ruskin College are not, and cannot be hostile; they are aspects of the same great movement. How can our "penny per year per member" affect the resources of the W. E. A., which asks only for one shilling per year from each member of a tutorial class? But further on Mr. Muir gives a picture of Ruskin College which cannot fail to mislead. He says (1) "In Ruskin College they live by themselves in a separate building." My reply is that, of course, they do; and there they gain what every college gains—a corporate spirit, a sense of comradeship, of loyalty, which is keener, closer, intenser than any weekly class can attain. On this count Ruskin College has a vast advantage. (2) "They have their own separate teachers, who are not university teachers." This is very misleading, because it is true and untrue. The members of the permanent staff of Ruskin College are all university men, with the highest qualifications; but, strange to say, three of them are university teachers. Dr. Gilbert Slater, M.A., is on the staff of extension lectures of the University of London, and has also given a series of lectures at Manchester College, Oxford, on "Local Government." The Vice-Principal has a big experience of W. E. A. work, and was actually on the Oxford list of W. E. A. lecturers. The economic tutor is a member of the Oxford University Committee for the Diploma in Economics and Political Science. What is even more significant, students of Ruskin College are able, if they wish, to attend most of the lectures in the University of Oxford on almost every conceivable subject. In addition, once

a week some university "don" lectures at Ruskin College on one of his pet topics. Can any W. E. A. class claim to have such "a conflict of ideas as such comminglings bring about"? On this line of argument Ruskin College wins hands down.

The fact really is that Ruskin College can give all that a W. E. A. can give, and very much more besides. Instead of evening classes for students tired by work in the factory or the office, it gives young men the opportunity to devote themselves wholly to study for a year or two. Instead of a weekly spirit of comradeship, it gives a much deeper one for a year or two. It gives the use of its own good little library and the privilege, very highly prized, of using the world-famed Bodleian Library. It has its debating club, its sports club; all the advantages of a college over a class.

The greatest advantage of all is, perhaps, that though it is not, and never can be, a part of the University of Oxford, yet it is in beautiful old Oxford, far removed from the din and stress of wage-earning. Yet it is a college of working men, most of whom are thoroughly determined to return to the bench or the desk to aid their fellow-workers to the utmost. They are men from all branches of industry; of all shades of political and religious opinion. In other words, Ruskin College is almost an ideal little community of earnest students. The word "almost" could be removed if only our buildings and our funds were made adequate.

In conclusion, may I beg your readers not to judge Ruskin College by what it was two years ago. We are very different now; better, more efficient. In any case, our new council of Labour representatives, properly elected, can be trusted to right whatever is wrong. Therefore, I venture to press on all trade unionists and co-operators the desirability of either founding scholarships outright or of opening a "Ruskin College Fund" in their societies,

Yours, &c.,

HENRY ALLSOPP, *Secretary.*

—*Liverpool Post, February 4th, 1911.*

---

The instruments of reformation are employment and reward—not punishment.—*Ruskin.*

There's always lots of other folks you kin be sorry for 'stid of yourself.—*Mrs. Wiggs.*

You need not pack up any worries. You can get them anywhere as you go along. *E. S. Phelps.*



Reprinted from *The American Journal of Sociology*, vol. x, No. 5, Mar., 1905.

## Evolution of Social Structures<sup>1</sup>

**I**T is not my intention to attempt any general treatment of social structures. That subject would be altogether too large for a single paper. But, aside from that, there is no need of any such treatment. Probably nine-tenths of all the work done in sociology thus far is of that kind. It consists chiefly in the description of social structures or in discussions of different aspects which they present. But thus far I have met with no work dealing with the evolution of social structures. By this I mean that sociologists have been content to take up the social structures which they find actually in existence, and to consider and examine them, often going into the minutest details and exhaustively describing everything in any way relating to them as finished products; but no one has as yet attempted to explain what social structure is, or how these various products have been formed.

As a general proposition, social structures may be said to be human institutions, using both terms in the broadest sense. In all grades and kinds of society there are human institutions, and, indeed, society may be said to consist of them. If we examine any one of them, we find that it possesses a certain permanence and stability. It is not a vague, intangible thing that will vanish at a touch, but something fixed and durable. This is because it possesses a structure. A structure is something that has been constructed, and a study of social structure is the study of a process and not a product. Our task, therefore, is not to examine the various products of social construction, but to inquire into the methods of social construction.

Our language, like our ideas, is more or less anthropomorphic. Man constructs, and the products are called structures. He takes the materials that nature provides, and with them he builds whatever he needs—houses, vehicles, boats, cities. Each of these products is a structure, but it is an artificial structure. The human method of constructing is an artificial method. This consists in first forming in the mind an ideal of the finished product, and then arranging the materials in such wise that they will realize that product. The end is seen from the beginning. It is a final or teleological method. Nature also constructs, but the method of nature is just the opposite of that of man. There is no foresight, and the materials are added in small increments until the structure is completed. The method of nature is a differential or genetic method. All natural structures are of this class, and social structures are natural structures.

<sup>1</sup> A paper read at the International Congress of Arts and Science, Department of Sociology, St. Louis, September, 1904.

But natural structures are not so simple as might appear from this statement. They do not consist in the mere mechanical apposition of the raw materials brought into material contact. This would produce only a mass, a heap, a mixture; it would not produce a structure. A structure implies a certain orderly arrangement and harmonious adjustment of the materials, an adaption of the parts and their subordination to the whole. How does blind nature accomplish this? It does it according to a universal principle, and it would be impossible to convey any clear conception of the process of social structure without first setting forth, at least briefly, the character of this principle.

It is not only in human society that natural or genetic structures are formed. The organic world affords perhaps the most striking examples of the process, and all organisms not only consist of such structures, but are themselves organic structures. Every other department of nature furnishes examples, but there is one other in which the process is so simple that it is easily grasped by the average mind. This is that of astronomy. Each one of the heavenly bodies is a natural structure formed by the raw materials and blind forces of nature, and yet the heavenly bodies are highly symmetrical and perfectly ordered structures. The solar system and all other star systems are also such structures, in which there is a perfect adjustment of parts and subordination of the parts to the whole.

This last example will serve a good purpose in explaining the principle, because we are already familiar with the facts of centrifugal and centripetal forces which constitute the principle by which the systems are maintained. This is, in fact, the principle that underlies all genetic structures; but in other departments there are many other elements to be considered which complicate the process. The principle may then be stated in its most general form as *the interaction of antagonistic forces*. In astronomy these are reduced to two classes, the centrifugal and centripetal; but in other departments there are many antagonistic forces, which need not directly oppose one another, but which modify and restrain one another in a great variety of ways. Any one of these forces considered by itself alone is in the nature of a centrifugal force. In astronomy it is well known that if the centrifugal forces were to operate alone, the systems would be immediately destroyed. This would be equally true of any other system and of all natural structures. Any force considered in and by itself is destructive, and no single force could by any possibility construct a system. All systems and all structures are the result of the interaction of a plurality of forces checking and restraining one another. A single unopposed force can produce only motion of translation. A plurality of interacting forces holds the materials acted upon within a limited area, and while no matter or force can be destroyed, the paths are shortened and

converted from straight lines into curves and circles, and the bodies impinged are made to revolve rapidly in limited circuits and vortices, and to arrange themselves into orderly systems with intense internal activities. This is the fundamental condition of all organization, and natural systems or genetic structures are organized mechanisms. If we apply it to the bodies or substances which make up the physical world, we see that the intensive internal activities which they thus acquire constitute what we call their properties, and the differences in the properties that different substances possess are simply the different activities displayed by their molecular components due to the differences in their organization. This doubtless applies to chemical elements as well as to inorganic or organic compounds, and many chemists regard even an atom as a system somewhat analogous to a solar system.

In the organic world the process of organization, due to successive recompounding of the highest organic compounds, undergoes a higher degree of organization, and protoplasm is evolved, which is capable of carrying the process on upward, and of producing the progressively higher and higher forms of life. The lowest of these forms consist of what are called unicellular organisms, which have the power of multiplication or increase of numbers, but are incapable of any higher development. They are called "protozoans," and represents the initial stage in organic development. The next step consists in the organic union of two or more, usually many, of these unicellular organisms into a multicellular organism. Such organisms are called "metazoans," and with this stage begins the most important class of organic structures, viz., tissues. All the organic forms with which any but the microscopist is familiar belong to this metazoic stage and present a great variety of tissues, with which everybody is more or less familiar.

I will not go farther with these illustrations from the inorganic and organic world; but it was essential, as will soon appear, to go thus far. Social structures are identical, in these fundamental aspects, with both inorganic and organic structures. They are the products of the interaction of antagonistic forces. They also pass from a primordial stage of great simplicity into a secondary, more complex stage, and these two stages are closely analogous to the protozoic and metazoic stages of biology. I call them the "protosocial" and "metasocial" stages, respectively.

If we set out with the simple propagating couple, we soon have the primitive family group consisting of the parents and children. The children are of both sexes, and they grow to maturity, pair off in one way or another, and produce families of the second order. These do the same, resulting in families of the third order, and so on. After a few generations the group assumes considerable size, and

constitutes first a horde, and finally a clan. The clan at length becomes overgrown and splits up into several or many clans, separating more or less territorially, but usually adopting the rule of exogamy, and living on comparatively peaceful terms at no great distance from one another. Their mode of reproduction is exactly analogous to the process of reproduction by division in the Protozoa, and this is what I characterize as the protosocial stage in race-development.

But the multiplication of clans through continuous reproduction in a geometrical progression, coupled with the limits prescribed by the food-supply, results in the wider and wider separation of the clans, until at length certain clans or hordes will have become so far removed from the primary centre of dispersion as to lose all connexion with it. At the low stage of mental development necessary to such a race of beings scarcely as much as a tradition would ultimately remain of the existence of a primordial group from which all had descended. One clan would keep budding off from another, and moving out farther and farther along lines of least resistance, until a great area of the earth's surface would at last become thus sparsely inhabited by a multitude of clans, each knowing only the few that are located nearest to it. As the dispersion takes place in all directions from the original centre, or as nearly so as the configuration of the country and the nature of the food-supply will permit, those migrating in opposite directions become, after a sufficient lapse of time, so widely separated from one another as to constitute wholly distinct peoples. They all have languages, but in time the local variations that they naturally undergo render them to all intents and purposes different languages, at least so much so that if individuals of these long-separated groups should chance to meet, they could not understand one another. It would be the same with their customs, beliefs, and religion. They would have become in all essential respects different races.

We will suppose that in the end a whole continent is thus peopled with these alien hordes and clans, which would now have become innumerable. The process by which this is brought about is what I have called "social differentiation." But it cannot always last. A new process supervenes, and the stage of social differentiation is succeeded by a stage of social integration. The protosocial stage closes, and the metasocial stage comes on. In the protosocial stage the social structure is the simplest possible. The horde or clan is composed altogether of similar elements. The multiplication of such groups can be nothing but a repetition of similar groups, and there can be no change or variation, and therefore no progress or structural advance. Throughout the protosocial, as throughout the protozoic stage there is no structural development, no evolution. The differentiation consists simply in the multiplication of practically identical clans. Just as organic evolution began with the meta-

social stage, so social evolution began with the metasocial stage. So, too, as the metazoic stage was brought about through the union of several or many unicellular organisms into a multicellular organism, so the metasocial stage was brought about by the union of two or more simple hordes or clans into a compound group of amalgamated hordes or clans. In the organic world the result was the formation of tissues, the multiplication of organs, and the integration of the parts thus united into complete organisms. In the social world the result was the formation of what may be properly called social tissues, the multiplication of social organs, and the integration of all the elements thus combined into peoples, states, and nations. The study of social structure properly begins here; but social structure would be wholly unintelligible without a clear idea of both the principle and the materials of social structure. The principle is the interaction of antagonistic forces, and the materials are the primitive hordes and clans brought into existence by the process of social differentiation. We have now to descend from generalities and inquire into the specific character of social integration. A great area has become inhabited by innumerable human groups, but there is no organic connexion between them. Each group lays claim to a certain area of territory, but they begin to encroach upon one another. Two groups thus brought into proximity may be, and usually are, utterly unknown to each other. The mutual encroachment is certain to produce hostility. War is the result, and one of the two groups is almost certain to prove the superior warrior and to conquer the other. The first step in the whole process is the conquest of one race by another. This is the beginning of the struggle of races of which we have all heard so much. Most persons regard this struggle as the greatest of all human misfortunes; but the sociologist studies the effect of race-struggle and finds in it the basis of his science. The first effect is the subjugation of one race by another. The second effect is the establishment of a system of caste, the conquering race assuming the rôle of a superior or noble caste, and the conquered race being relegated to the position of an inferior or ignoble caste. The greater part of the conquered race is enslaved, and the institution of slavery begins here. The slaves are compelled to work, and labour in the economic sense begins here. The enslavement of the producers and the compelling them to work was the only way in which mankind could have been taught to labour, and therefore the whole industrial system of society begins here.

The conquerors parcel out the lands to the leading military chieftains, and the institution of private ownership of land has its origin at this stage. Success in war is attributed to the favour of the gods, and those who pretend to be in communication with the gods are the most favoured of men. They are installed in high places and made the recipients of large emoluments. From the condition of

sorcerers, soothsayers, and medicine-men they are raised to that of a powerful priesthood. Henceforth they constitute a leisure class, and this is the origin of that most important human institution. Mutual race-hatred results in perpetual uprisings, requiring constant suppression by the military power. This is costly, dangerous, and precarious, and wisdom soon dictates a form of systematic treatment for offenders. Personal regulation gradually gives way to general rules, and these ultimately take the form of laws. Government by law gradually succeeds government by arbitrary military commands. The effect of this is nothing less than the origin of the State. The State is the most important of all human institutions. There is no institution about which so much has been written, and even in our day volumes are yearly appearing vainly endeavouring to explain the origin and nature of the State. They all completely miss the mark, and flounder in a sea of vague and worthless speculation. The State is a spontaneous genetic product, resulting, like all other social structures, from the interaction of antagonistic forces, checking and restraining one another and evolving a great social structure destined to become the condition to all social progress. Under the State there are recognized both rights and duties. So long as the law is not violated there is liberty of action, and the foundations of human freedom are laid.

Another great institution takes its rise at this stage, viz., that of property. With the establishment of the State, with its recognition of rights under the law, it becomes possible, as never before, to enjoy undisturbed any object that has been rightfully acquired. Such an object then becomes property, and belongs to its owner even if not in his immediate possession. He need no longer fear that, unless it is constantly watched and forcibly defended, it will be wrested from him by others who have no other claim than that of superior strength. The immense sociological importance of this cannot be too strongly emphasized. For a man's possessions need no longer be confined to what he can himself consume or enjoy; they may greatly exceed his wants, or consist of objects for which he has no need, but which are needed by others who have other things that he does want and for which he can exchange them. He can manufacture a single product many thousand times in excess of his needs, and exchange it for a great variety of other objects similarly produced in excess by others. We thus see that the institution of private property was the foundation at once of all trade and business and also of the division of labour. But property was not possible until the State was established, whose most important function was at the outset and still remains the protection of the citizen in his proprietary rights.

*(To be continued.)*

LESTER F. WARD.

## What the Bodleian !

I'VE just been reading Mark Twain. The Gospel according to St. Mark, the apostle of animation, is to be found in *What is Man?* A friend of mine once said Copernicus was a clever chap because he didn't publish his idea of the Solar System during his life. Cute Copernicus! Mark has just done exactly the same thing. During his life he has kept us splitting our sides and bursting the buttons off our shirt-necks with rollicking laughter, and all the time the artful mirth-provoker has been wondering, pondering, and sizing us up. Merry Mark! He knew a thing or two. He had no Solar System theory to bring forward nor even the plans for an Economic Eden; neither did he want to break in upon the world's laughter and tell "the listening earth" that the Universe was not exactly "his box of toys" but rather a cosmic penny-in-the-slot machine.

For many years the cry has been "echoing down the corridors of time," "If a man asks thee to go a mile, go with him twain." Twain went. He had to live and be at the beck and call of "His interior Master." His book is but the autobiography of the humourist catechizing the Cosmos. Dear old Mark! You were mighty clever not to tell us before you left us. Some of your less fortunate brethren told, but then, they ceased to be humourists. Verb. Sap. "Laugh, and the world laughs with you, snore and you sleep alone." That hardly smacks of Shaw or Chesterton, nor has it the gleam of Swift's rapier wit. Would that I had more convolutions and this year's model of the *corpus callosum*! Introspective analysis only serves to emphasize that error attributed to Tennyson:

Evolution ever striving after some ideal good,  
And Reversion ever dragging Evolution in the mud.

Hegelianism is refuted. "Nothing is, everything is becoming."—I'm stuck. That certainly is not 'becoming' in the middle of one's article. The scenic effects are supplied by a stern justice, inexorable as the Sphinx's and as steadfast as the laws of the Medes and Persians. "1500 words," lisps Cleopatra of the Blue Pencil:

Words, words, just idle words!  
Oh for the summer, Devon and curds!

That's an original convulsive spasm. "Obvious," says the Shavian. The poetic pulse beats but sluggish. It's no good trying to think during the Xmas season when you're floating on the flood tide of festivity. All one can do is to make New Year Resolutions, go see one's relatives, and visit the Pantomime. Ah! The Pantomime! No. I'm not going to write a story of *The Little Girl and the Fairy*, *John's Awakening*, or *How Santa Claus Crossed the Bar*. To me the Panto. is as invigorating as the breath from my own Yorkshire dales and moors. Don't you remember the times we've had at the Panto.? It always develops 'New Year muscular activity' and reminds me of Elia. One always finds a charming manifestation of

aesthetic taste in the plastering of the curtain with advertisements. "Smith's Sausages" are cheek and jowl with "Black and Blue" and "The 1911 Roadster," whilst "Brown, your Tailor" is dwarfed by a "Nodol Smile." The colours are loud, positively blatant. The perspective is frightful. You're gradually lulling yourself into a belief that you're suffering from astigmatism when your sense is provoked by the smell of oranges, and your ears evolutionarily entranced by the cracking of nuts. Soon the droning and tuning of the violins begin. The footlights blaze, the curtain rises and you get a draught of air impregnated with creosote grease-paint and astrackan collars. Robinson Crusoe! Your mind switches off to Marx, vol. i. page 48. Then somebody hands you a chocolate, or a programme flutters from the gallery and you come back to stern realities and matters of the moment. All our time-honoured friends are there, the Demon, the Dame, the Fairy, and the Funny Man. That touched the B natural. Back I am again at Mark. He knew Life, to some, was a panto., and as they grew older they grew out of it, but still fostered the make-believe for the sake of the nephews and nieces. Mark wants the book of words to be read after the play, "the passing show," when it may be known that Mr. Temperament had something to do with the plot, whilst Miss Optimist played the Fairy to Mr. Heredity's Demon and Mrs. Grundy was the Dame. It's all so interesting and delightful. But the dress, the glitter of the tinsel and the shimmering of the spangles. That can't be forgotten.

Symbolism! Symbolism!

If you want to be in the swim be symbolical. Talk symbolism. Think symbolism. Let every ordinary object be a symbol. Shades of Mummy Cats! Suggestion comes from outside, infinitesimal fractions, vulgar or monarchically mathematical. *There's* an end of "inside knowledge." The Sphinx is still staring stonily, in fact, pyramidically.

Pantos. are products of parsimony, creative syntheses. The thesis and antithesis, presence and absence of dress, produce an evolutionary echo. Dress! Dress! and run the risk of society slander cases, absence from the charmed circle, or for ever hold your peace. That is the modern dictum.

That mechanical martinet, the mind, suggests a course of lectures *From Tattoo to rather Too-too*, with special reference to the "Hobble" and the "Pasha" skirt. The method of treatment forces itself forward. Tattooing is classified as necessitating correct physical and historical perspective, but closely allied with prehistoric picture communication and love letters written on bricks. The Divided Skirt Division is thought to have been productive of a greater independency in woman, and the occasion of the evolution of matrimonial epithets with regard to "breeches," whilst the Reform Dress and Anti-corsetarian Age certainly points to a casting-off



of the iron fetters of convention. The introduction of hats precedes an epoch of mental restraint if worn by man, and indicates an advance in man's control over Nature if worn by woman. Walking sticks show the change into a partially upright animal or *vice versa*. The Caneozoic Age, distinguished by the long cane and pink bow, shows an intellectual dependency. Few great men have worn 3-inch collars: *à posteriori* it implies rigidity of outlook. The following is suggested as a working hypothesis.

A woman's dress generally indicates her relations to her lover. The state of a man's cravat shows the attitude of his liver. Sluggish livers, viewed ambiguously, require work or laughter. Mark was a court physician. He was a jester at the Court of Risible Rex. Mark and the Mue of Laughter were bosom friends. She's fickle' but she won't pine, nor yet even be "sicklied o'er with the pale cast of thought," because he's left her for ever. He's played his part, Vale.

MEREDITH F. TITTERINGTON.

*Errata:* Page 300, line 27, for "either" read "Ether." Page 301, line 17, for "unconscious" read "conscious."

---

## Woman at Home and at Work

**I**T is granted by Socialists that under the present system women as well as men are slaves. We will leave men aside, and for a moment concern ourselves only with women. We are not going to consider the working woman. The question before us is whether woman in the home is more of a slave than woman in industry. When industries were carried on in the home and woman was sole supervisor, there could be no such question; there was no apparent choice. With the introduction and development of machinery, the industries were gradually taken out of the home. Production began to be carried on co-operatively. Then the question arose whether woman should leave the home and follow the industries. Now the question is settled. Women are employed in most every industry. But there were some rudiments of the industries left in the home, and woman is still chained to them. When we speak of woman in the home we do not mean the young and unmarried women living with their parents; we mean a working woman whose husband goes out to earn a living for the family and provide for home.

It is claimed by the upholders of the present system that marriage as it is to-day is ideal: that man and wife are partners and achieve the best through division of labour. That is, while the man goes out into industries to earn money, woman stays in the home to spend it. They think it only natural for unmarried women to leave home and go out to work, but it is most unnatural for married women to leave home and go out into industries. Of course, the unnatural generally means the uncustomary; everything usual appears natural.

We will consider the working woman in industry first. We are not concerned now with whether conditions have forced her out to work or whether it is simply choice. She must rise early, swallow her breakfast, and rush out; but her hours of work are limited. The evening is her own. She is free. She can go to the theatre and other amusements; to lectures, and to the library. What she earns for her week's work is her own. She can spend the money whatever way she likes. If she is fond of dress and luxuries she can buy them. If she prefers books and study and debates and discussions there is no one to keep her from enjoying them. When she grows dissatisfied with one kind of work or with a master she can easily change both; it is no sin nor disgrace. She may perhaps be lonely, but not miserable. If she earns enough to save she may entertain hope to be independent in old age. Of course, we are now supposing that this woman always finds work and earns enough to live, not aristocratic, but decent.

For the sake of exact comparison we will take an example of a woman from an average working man's home. I have before me a picture of a working woman in her home. She is portrayed in six positions; with sleeves rolled up above her elbows she stands over the wash-tub washing. She has turned around and I see her at the board ironing. In a short time she is on the floor scrubbing. A little while later she rushes into the kitchen to attend to the cooking. She sits down to make baby's dresses. Before dusk she is out with the baby in the carriage. Quite a luxury. No one will deny that this is a true picture of a working woman in the house.

Supporters of the present system claim that they don't want protection for women. Women are supposed to be the weaker sex. They will not let women go out to work in one industry but they will keep her at home where she has at least five industries to attend to, washing, ironing, cooking, general housecleaning, sewing, and last, not least—nay, the most important of all—the rearing of children. If there is love and harmony between the working man and his wife then the burden on her is certainly lightened. But if as is natural with an overworked man, the husband makes home the place to give vent to his temper and whims and expects to be pleased and obeyed, the woman surely is a martyr.

Woman in the home works unlimited time, almost never gets rest or reward. She cannot afford to dislike the work or get tired of her husband. She is even deprived of the advantage woman in industry has, that of changing masters freely. Woman in the home is not at all emancipated and she has no right to look down upon woman in industry as a slave. Of the two, the woman in the home is the more miserable and helpless slave. Let it be remembered that these are the mildest examples of the two forms of woman slavery.

No consideration has been given to the fact that the position of woman in industry, like the position of all workers, is precarious.

Her employment or unemployment depends on whether there is a great demand for the commodity she produces; whether that commodity can be safely produced and yield profits, and on the supply of labour in the labour market. Indirectly the woman in the home is subject to the same laws.

The only way to remove any form of slavery is to strike at the root of the evil. We know that more than heredity, environment affects man's and woman's character, morals and ethics. By removing the cause we strike at the effect. Capitalism is the father of wage slavery. One form of slavery has its reflection and effects on another form. To abolish slavery, we must first abolish the system which makes the existence of slavery possible. Morality, ethics, religion, will not flourish or have a good effect on people whose material conditions do not enable them to live up to their ideal. The economic question solved, the solution of subsidiary religious and moral question will surely follow.

No amount of impudence, abuse or scolding will better society. Let both the women in industry and women in the home awaken to their interests, stand up and demand their right to live and be free. During this year let the cause of Socialism be strengthened by at least fifty thousand good and earnest women, determined to lend a helping hand in the noble endeavour to uplift Humanity.

MARY SOLOMON,  
—*The Weekly People*, New York.

## A Cathedral Message

He paused one moment and then entered.

His limbs were bent, his shoulders bowed and his face pale But his eyes looked straight and fearlessly before him.

He saw the stately pillars raising their proud capitals above him—magnificent avenues of stone supporting the carved arches of the lofty roof. Beauty and strength united.

He heard the wonderful chords of the organ—now soft and gentle as the swaying of a lily—now mighty and magnificent as the entry of brotherhood into a sordid and selfish world. He heard the voices of boys singing—singing at the throne of God.

Silently he moved along the side aisle, his head thrown back. And all the wealth of Peace, Beauty and Strength in that old Cathedral entered into his soul.

He sat down. A strange feeling came over him. A strange longing thrilled him-- a longing for something that he could neither grasp nor express, but that he could feel eating its way into his Life.

Peace. Beauty. Strength.

The music ceased. He gazed up the long, dimly-lit aisle, and at the far end the sun peeped shyly through a richly stained glass window of purple and gold. And a tender, mystical light played round the massive pillars and crept upward into the dim corners of the roof.

Peace. Beauty. Strength.

Was that the message that his soul craved for?

Peace that he and those he loved might live free from the awful struggle for existence. Peace in which to Think, to Feel, to Know. Beauty that would enter into their lives and flood them with sunshine and romance. Beauty that would pierce its way into the blackest corners of their working world and save them from their gruesome horrors.

Strength to demand Peace and Beauty for all men. Strength to get it and hold fast.

The light diminished, and the stained glass window of gold and purple slowly faded. Fainter and fainter it grew until it was nothing greater than a yellow speck.

It moved. It came towards him. It came with a horrible, rattling sound—nearer—still nearer. It was close upon him, and he crouched back in the darkness as it thundered past. He began to walk but the aisle had changed, the lofty pillars had shrunk, the roof had descended within a few feet of the ground, the walls had closed round him. With bent knees and shoulders he hurried on, but narrower and narrower grew the way. Grimy wooden pillars supported the low uneven roof. Water trickled down the walls and created a filthy slush, through which he walked. Darkness and ugliness engulfed him. Work and Capitalism united.

Another speck of light came towards him and more trucks thundered past from the coal face. He heard their hideous rattle and the voices of boys shouting to the pit ponies—shouting at the feet of the Capitalism.

Silently he moved along to his comrades. His head was bent, but his eyes flashed as all the filth, ugliness, and sin of the mine entered into his soul.

"Comrades!" he shouted. "How much longer will you stand this? How much longer will you strike on and on with the pick and and yet never reach the foundation of Life? How much longer will you crawl through filth to your graves while others walk in sunshine? When will you claim your right to be Men? When will you claim your share of Peace, and Beauty? Peace, in which to Think, to Feel, to Know. Beauty to penetrate into the darkest corners of your lives. When will you show your Strength?"

"Lor', man, don't rave ; get on with your work."

"What? This from you—my mates? Don't rave ; get on with your work! Don't rave! When I think of the Light and Beauty—the knowledge and art that my soul thirst for! Don't rave! O you fools! If only I could make you understand all that *they* have and all that *you* have not!" . . . .

Someone touched him and he woke. Half dazed he staggered out of the Cathedral. The door closed.

SYBIL HIRD.

---

THE MAN WITH THE HOE  
(*Written after seeing Millet's painting*).

---

BOWED by the weight of centuries he leans  
Upon his hoe and gazes on the ground.  
The emptiness of ages in his face,  
And on his back the burden of the world.  
Who made him dead to rapture and despair,  
A thing that grieves not and that never hopes,  
Stolid and stunned, a brother to the ox?  
Who loosened and let down this brutal jaw?  
Whose was the hand that slanted back this brow?  
Whose breath blew out the light within this brain?

Is this the Thing the Lord God made and gave  
To have dominion over sea and land ;  
To trace the stars and search the heavens for power ;  
To feel the passion of Eternity ?  
Is this the Dream He dreamed who shaped the suns  
And marked their ways upon the ancient deep ?  
Down all the stretch of Hell to its last gulf  
There is no shape more terrible than this—  
More tongued with censure of the world's blind greed—  
More filled with signs and portents for the soul—  
More fraught with menace to the universe.

What gulfs between him and the seraphim !  
Slave of the wheel of labour, what to him  
Are Plato and the swing of Pleiades ?  
What the long reaches of the peaks of song,  
The rift of dawn, the reddening of the rose ?  
Through this dread shape the suffering ages look ;  
Time's tragedy is in that aching stoop ;

Through this dread shape humanity betrayed,  
 Plundered, profaned, and disinherited,  
 Cries protest to the Judges of the World,  
 A protest that is also prophecy.

O, masters, lords and rulers in all lands,  
 Is this the handiwork you give to God,  
 This monstrous thing distorted and soul-quenched ?  
 How will you ever straighten up this shape ;  
 Touch it again with immortality ;  
 Give back the upward looking and the light ;  
 Rebuild in it the music and the dream ;  
 Make right the immemorial infamies,  
 Perfidious wrongs, immedicable woes ?

O masters, lords and rulers in all lands,  
 How will the Future reckon with this Man ?  
 How answer his brute question in that hour  
 When whirlwinds of rebellion shake the world ?  
 How will it be with kingdoms and with kings—  
 With those who shaped him to the thing he is—  
 When this dumb Terror shall reply to God,  
 After the silence of the centuries ?

EDWIN MARKHAM.

## Production and Progress

**I**N order to give a satisfactory explanation of the title at the head of this article one must try to find out what light the history of society throws upon it. The history of society is not synonymous with what is generally understood as History. Far from it. History, generally speaking, as Spencer points out, is nothing more than a chronological table—a passing show of pomp and pageantry viewed from the distance, intrigues of kings and queens, stories of great men, "lighting a little hour or two." Such, looking from a critical standpoint, is the popular conception of history ; but the history of society is the field of other forces. Society was in being before the foundations of so-called history were laid. History of the popular type is only possible after an artificial basis has been formed for a considerable time, when society has attained a certain level of civilization, and intellectual development. History, in its wider sense, however, is the succession of the events constituting human progress, their causes and effects. This is the sound basis of historical evolution. Dispensing with the exceptional, superficial events, we must examine, if possible, the motive force or forces.

Present events exhibit this driving power, and we may safely assume that this power was in existence before the annals of school history, because, as already pointed out, society existed previous to the time denoted in the term history, used in its narrow sense. If so, then our standpoint of investigation must be one of viewing all existing things in a constant process of change, studying all institutions in the phases of growth, culmination and collapse. Viewing history in this light one must admit that there is no stereotyped uniformity. Effects have never, in any age, been the prototype of the preceding one. Then the motive force itself must have changed too; "nothing which does not change can produce change." The only factor that changes, in the broad sense of the term, is the economic factor, and is material. Economic conditions are the prime movers in history, although the notice of motion may appear in the House of Commons. "The material factors outside the economic remain constant, or nearly so, and whatever influences they do possess are tributary to the main economic factor." The evolution of society is the result of the development of material conditions. This is the great underlying principle. Under primitive communism the mode of production was simple and self-sufficing if natural means of life and food were adequate. A scarcity of these supplies would probably compel a tribe to wander in search of the means of subsistence, and more often than not, brought it into conflict with the surrounding tribes, resulting in the absorption of one cannibalistically or in the subjugation of one into slavery. This is a changed form of society. The commencement of slave labour is a new method of production. This step, from an evolutionary standpoint, is very pregnant with progress. It is the outcome of quiescent communism, and superior to cannibalism.

From this period of slavery, involving simply the producing of goods by the slave for his master, and the corresponding means of exchange, simple barter, there was a gradual merging into serfdom. This was due, no doubt, to the fact that under slavery it was to the owner's interest to keep the slave in good condition, and it was advisable, nay inevitable, if the owners wished to remain supreme that serfdom be adopted. It guaranteed their existence and dominance and removed the responsibility which the owning of slaves incurred. This change allowed the dependents, by means of money payments, to become free men, and eventually, by this and other means, all labour evolved into free labour and the corresponding transfer of goods by means of money took place. This step marks the industrial phase, the prevailing mode of production being capitalistic.

The characteristics of this method are the divorcement of the labourer from all means of production, the power to sell his own labour (a state of so-called economic freedom), freedom of contract and collective bargaining, whilst in addition to the foregoing modes

of exchange is added credit. All the foregoing transitions from one stage to the other was slow, and almost imperceptible. Modes of production are not in air-tight compartments or rigid divisions.

It must not be assumed from the foregoing remarks that all other influences are completely ignored. There is a constant interaction between ideas and the economic environment, but, at the same time, it is only under given circumstances and in response to definite needs that ideas are formed. It was impossible for Plato to advocate the Minority report, or for Confucius to discuss the Veto. Yet the survival of the psychic is almost as imperative as the physical. In every phase of production the economically dominant class largely determines the moral and ethical codes and the social institutions. As Nietzsche has it, "All forms of morality are but weapons in the struggle for power." Let us take a very modern example, the Industrial Revolution of 1760.

The introduction of new and improved machinery necessitated the building of mills, factories, and workshops, in order to be profitably employed. This signified the creation of a new type of worker. The factory hand evolved from the domestic craftsman. It was a change from comparative isolation to industrial aggregation, from individual interests to collective conceptions.

The action of industrial intensification changed the intellectual outlook. Collective problems demanded collective solutions. The ultimate outcome was incipient Democracy and modern ideas, which are now reacting upon economic conditions, destroying the *laissez faire* policy and encouraging State responsibility. Thus we have the ideas originating from economic conditions, themselves the result of the mode of production, and ultimately reconstructing them, and so we go on *ad infinitum*. History's story is the struggle of interests, and further, it is in the internal and not external relations. One class is uppermost for a time, but in the very means which raised it to power are embodied the causes of its downfall and dissolution. With each successive artificial foundation there comes the different social environment and the efforts to make it permanent by institutions, laws, and religions. But all in vain. The social order is ever unstable. In this fact lies the hope of humanity, the economic emancipation of man, the return to the communistic phase, but upon a much higher plane: from this age of anarchical production to the co-operative ideal.

The modes of production restrict or aid society's development in proportion as the means of existence are compatible with a higher, fuller and nobler life. From primitive communism the modes of production are the paramount determinants of the evolution of society. The solution of the prevailing economic problem is the key to future progress.

MEREDITH F. TITFRINGTON.