

THE  
“Plebs” Magazine

---

Vol. IV.

June, 1912.

No. 5.

Copyright Entered at Stationer's Hall.

---

## EDITORIAL

THERE is an ominous familiarity for the English workers about the title of this paragraph but—there are two institutions of that title in this Merrie England (?). One is the place within the meaning of the Act, which is the final resting place of a large proportion of the people of this happy land after a lifetime's practice of those charming virtues—Work, Thrift, Self-Denial and Patriotism—the worn-out “Sons of Toil,” “The Thin Red Line of Heroes,” and those who man “The Steel Walls of Old England.” Having done their share towards maintaining the Commercial, Military and Naval supremacy of the mighty Empire, on which the sun, &c., their rulers are too tender-hearted to allow them to want—and so they are cared for in those delightful institutions sometimes known as The Union, again as The Workhouse, the two titles having no doubt been chosen with a due regard to commemorating—and rewarding—the twin virtues of Patriotism and Labour. But there is another Union, THE Union, known to Society with a capital S. It is situated in Oxford. It has no other title—it is not a *work* house. In it the gilded Elders and youths of the University meet to enjoy a relaxation from their strenuous activities—but wait! once at least every week during Term those mighty intellects are in action, settling the Problems of the Vulgar World that hurries on its unheeding way outside its classic walls. If the battles of England were won on the playing fields of Eton, how much more true it is that the legislation of England is settled in “The” Union! We suggest to the would-be solvers of classic toys that this probably accounts for the origin of the saying about being able to drive a carriage-and-four through any Act of Parliament—four-in-hands are more in the line of most Oxford men than ideas and clarity of thought. We are moved to reflect on the above-mentioned intellectual feast weekly (and weakly) held in Oxford by reason of the prominence given by the Press to the final triumph of Ruskin College—the admission of six of its students to the Presence. (Typical paragraphs from London newspapers appear in

another part of the *Magazine*.) This final "recognition and honour" from Oxford University seems to have overwhelmed both the Press and Ruskin College—Labour has arrived! It is the thin edge of the wedge! Now right merrily let the Boring from Within proceed, but peradventure it will take the form of the "boring" mentioned in Exodus xxi, 6.



STILL this happy evidence of the Identity of Interests between Ruskin College and the University has introduced the elder son of the killing-of-the-fatted-calf parable in the shape of some of the undergraduates, who pronounce their views in their organ, *The "Honour" Among Thieves 'Varsity*. This journal thus delightfully welcomes the new venture, and we reproduce in their own classic language *their* views of the class from which the newcomers hail:—

The fact remains that tinkers, tailors, soldiers, sailors, apothecaries, ploughboys, gentlemen, and — (on second thoughts, I hope not) may now discuss on the floor of a House which has up to now been the peculiar property of University men (with the exception of invitations extended to *distinguished* visitors) questions of public interest. The House of Commons is a heterogeneous collection enough, and now the Union is taking a leaf out of its book.

It is to be hoped that the students of Ruskin College will not be so altogether overwhelmed with the "honour" conferred on them, in being allowed to rub shoulders in "The" Union with the above "gentlemanly" type, as to fail to appreciate the full contemptuousness of the above reference to the class they represent. Perhaps it is too much to hope that some student of Ruskin College may rise to the occasion by suggesting to "The" Union Committee as a subject for debate the following resolution: "That in the opinion of this House the University may not be inaptly described as a den of thieves." Such a motion would allow of a fine historical survey—both of the foundation and evolution of the University and of the County and Commercial families which support it. That the traditions of the past are well maintained by the present generation of University residents is best appreciated by another quotation from the columns *The 'Varsity* (May 16, 1912). Speaking of the necessity of having a window-box, the writer facetiously remarks:—

There is another splendid reason for having a window-box this year; if you don't, then you will be pressed for payment in regard to last year's window-box, and that of the year before, and your brother's window-boxes, who went down in 1896, and whose window-box bill from Messrs. Plantham & Waterham is still unpaid.

Still unpaid! That might well be the undergraduate's motto, for a debt is only necessary to be paid by "honourable" men when it refers to racing or cards, hence the expression, "debts of honour." How far even this latter "honour" is maintained is seen when it is

mentioned that the late leviathan bookmaker of Tattersall's, Mr. R. H. Fry, is said to have had book debts amounting to over half-a-million pounds; while another's, the late Mr. Dick Dunn's, family is in exceedingly straightened circumstances the while his late "gentlemenly" clients graciously allow their "debts of honour," amounting to tens of thousands, to remain unsettled. Honour and the Gentlemen of England! Of course mere debts to tradespeople and servants get little consideration from His Mightiness, the undergraduate; parents and family are sometimes amenable to a little pressure from the "bestly" tradespeople and the "wretched" servants, otherwise they may whistle for a settlement of their accounts. In face of all this our lords and masters have the face to lecture the workers on "their love of beer and skittles and their neglect of the education of their children"!! and these very "honourable" undergraduates to talk about "thieves"!!! If ever the above-mentioned resolution is discussed at "The" Union it should be carried without a dissident.



THE condescension of "The" Union in admitting Ruskin College students (in limited numbers, of course!) to membership is beyond all praise. In future we may be quite sure that so far as Ruskin

College is concerned, it will not need to be taunted with

**Aims!** lacking the knowledge conveyed by the text: The ox knoweth his owner, and the ass his master's crib. That the Ruskin men will get the same consideration from the members of "The" Union as is meted out to the newcomers in the other Union by kindly Guardians we may rest assured—and the latter place, if they should be unfortunate enough to need its kindly shelter, will not come so strange after their experiences in the former—to them indeed it will be, if not the workhouse, The Union. In return they will no doubt be able to add a little genuine interest to the weekly debates. It will be entertaining, as suggested by the *Oxford Times*, to the University members to hear "how the poor live," to hear of the actual everyday experiences of tinkers, tailors, &c. Of one thing we may be sure, the University members will in their interested moments see they are not contaminated by touching the "unclean thing" arisen from the nether world to be butchered to make an Oxford Union holiday. It may be that some of the Ruskin men will be capable of administering a little punishment (theoretically) to the Elect. We hope so. But the circumstances are not propitious. Nursed on the same obsolete doctrines—called forth from the same decadent sources—inbibed in the same vitiating atmosphere, with the additional disadvantage of less training, what can be the outcome, but added confusion of thought? even if they escape the other evil of becoming prigs. Even a personal knowledge of the facts of working-class life are of small moment when interpreted by ruling class theories; the illumination of these facts advantageously to the workers are only possible through the revealing might of proletarian

science. "Reverence of the blind type is the fruits of latter-day Capitalism" and the working-class movement which has not lost its reverence for such gilded dross as the Oxford University has not fully placed itself on the open road towards the Light of Freedom; such childish pleasure as is afforded by servile representation at "The" Union is not for the militant army of the Dawn.



It is fitting that "The" Union recognition of Ruskin College should come at the present juncture, it is the answer of the co-partnership theorists to the Labour Unrest. Everywhere the hosts of Labour are girding up their loins for crucial contest between the Haves and Have-nots. To the demands of the workers for Bread such pitiful Stones as are being flung from the rich man's table to Ruskin students are nothing less than insults to our intelligence—the very latest of the attempts to hocus-pocus us away from our goal. The letter printed elsewhere from the Secretary of Ruskin College to *The Times* (London) is the price the Movement is being ask to pay—for its betrayal to the enemy. Ruskin College is *not* turning out propagandists, we are told, *that* is why the Central Labour College is so antagonistic to it. This is at least frank and, so far as the authorities of Ruskin College hope, truthful. It is no doubt eminently satisfactory news to the capitalists but—what about the workers? Are things then so very satisfactory from the workers' point of view that no change in conditions is necessary? Why then the Labour unrest, so mournfully cackled about by the powers that be? There can be no smoke without fire, and the Labour Unrest is a healthy sign of the rising tide of proletarian dissatisfaction with the existing Order, and its determination to win for itself and its successors a greater measure of the wealth it produces. Knowledge is power, therefore—Educate! Educate!! Educate!!! Scientific propaganda breeds intelligent discontent, therefore—Agitate! Agitate!!! Agitate!!! Intelligent discontent means increased industrial and political organization, therefore—Organize! Organize!! Organize!!! The Central Labour College therefore allies itself openly with the other two armies of Labour—the industrial and political—so that in helping to extend scientific understanding of the class struggle by vigorous propaganda the near future may find us not only ready and willing but able to take, hold, and control in the interests of all the machinery that now enslaves. Quit you like Men! Be Strong!

F. J. C.

---

Blue is all right in the sky,  
All right in a maiden's eye,  
But don't get it in your system;  
It will kill you by-and-by.

JOE CONE,

## Syndicalism and Industrial Unionism

THE prosecution of Syndicalists for treason recently has drawn a great deal of attention to the industrial doctrines which go under that name. Much that has appeared in the capitalist press has been of such a nature as to make it difficult to appreciate the distinction, if any, between that and Industrial Unionism. The matter is further complicated by the fact that little or no separate organization exists representing the latter doctrine. While Syndicalism as represented by *The Syndicalist* is rather of a chameleon character in its pronouncements on the subject—one month standing for the gospel of "the mines for the miners and the railways for the railway men"; the next for social ownership with industrial administration. Where so little independent organization exists, as is the case with both these bodies, the particular theories each stand for are necessarily subject to adoption by third parties and an amalgam produced which cannot strictly be said to be one or the other. In view of the forgoing matter this last statement seems somewhat of a paradox, and perhaps it is; clearness is not, generally speaking, the strong point about these industrial theories we have now under consideration. The whole subject is further complicated by the attempts of some Syndicalists to confuse Socialism, as a theory, or a set of theories, with some particular State conception of it. In the hope of partially unravelling the knot some analysis of the two theories and perhaps their relation to Socialism may not be altogether inopportune.

Syndicalism, with all its bewildering kaleidoscopic changes, may be said to hold clearly to one point, we do not know that it can be exactly described as a principle, that of non-parliamentarian. We use the latter phrase to avoid misconception; non-political and anti-parliamentarian have been used in connexion with it, and so far as the general interpretation of these epithets go, not altogether unfairly. But even this point is not peculiar to the Syndicalist camp, as one of the two Industrial Unionist organizations started in England, the Industrialist League, is also non-parliamentarian. The only other point that separates the Syndicalists from the Industrial Unionists is the question of organization (even this is not quite clear since Bowman has been compelled to relinquish, temporarily, the editorship of *The Syndicalist*). The point about organization is that the Syndicalists do, or did, not object to the maintenance of the present form of Trade Unionism, separate unions for each craft; while, on the other hand, the Industrial Unionists believe in organization by industry, i.e. one big union for each separate, or definite industry. The other point is that of the importance and place of the General Strike.

So far as it is possible to follow the arguments advanced in favour of the General Strike it would appear that the workers are to down tools *en masse* until such time as the employers recognize the futility of further warfare. The way to this state of affairs being bridged from the workers' side by partial individual or family storing up of necessaries and partial looting of stored up products, the latter not being marketable owing to stoppage of transportation service and not protectable from plunder because of the paucity of State and municipal forces. Whether this argument is quite complete we will candidly admit is open to doubt, that at least, is what we gather from the treatise on the subject which appears to find considerable favour among Syndicalists, particularly the Anarchist section, namely, Roller's *Social General Strike*. There appears to be something lacking in this conception on the part of the Syndicalists. In the first place it would seem that it is organization of the military type, granted it were capable of carrying out its scheme of paralysing industry to the extent suggested, that is, power to conquer, but not to construct industry. To put it more plainly, an army can by force obtain possession of the machinery of production but it is not able to carry it on as a going concern, it has to call in civilians for that purpose. Similarly it would appear that the Syndicalist General Strike would be dependent for its success on forcing the co-operation of the capitalists or their supporters to assist in the resumption of productive activities. Otherwise the cessation of production, complete and general, cannot be understood, such organized might, if capable of organizing the carrying on of production, would never consciously submit to the least suffering being inflicted on its supporters, such as a General Strike on the lines suggested must entail. All this quite apart from the questions as to whether the organizations had sufficiently control over the black-coated brigades of all kinds and the various ungraded groups and individuals who fill in the pores of productive society to prevent them acting as special police or in any other way assisting the threatened forces of "law and order."

Syndicalism would seem to theorize as though it had a world to make, instead of a world to re-mould. On all hands we perceive evidences of the fact that political representation is not now considered the be-all and end-all of modern social life, that there are other forces as important or even more important for the future progress of the workers. That ought not to lead us to make the mistake of trying to ignore or belittle the power of Parliament. At present much leeway has to be made up to strengthen the effectiveness of the workers' industrial organization. Well and good, let us to the work with a will, strengthened by the knowledge that the more effectively this work is accomplished the more rapidly will political solidarity among the workers be secured. At times, maybe, we may be called upon to choose between the rival claims of industrial and political organizations—not often, the writer thinks—and in that

case, as always, the oneness of our decision will be the measure of our effectiveness for the side chosen. In the main, however, it may be safely assumed that the work of industrial and political organization will be most effective when carried on side by side. One may easily be disgusted with much of the political effort from the Labour side without necessarily assuming that *all* future Labour political work and workers will of necessity be as feeble. The healthy activity of several seemingly fossilized old Trade Union leaders during recent months was not the result of any revolutionary theoretical advance on *their* part, but due to the new ideas in the minds of their followers (?) forcefully expressed. Thus it will be with future politics, create a new atmosphere among the rank and file, and the leaders will stride on with Seven League boots.

Progress is not made by flying to extremes. When the Trade Unions were turned from their "no politics" standpoint to political Labour representation it seemed as though the social revolution could not be far off. We rode the political nag to death however. Work that rightly belonged to industrial organization was turned over to the Labour Party, with much satisfaction, no doubt, to the permanent Trade Union officials, but little gratification to the rank and file in the shape of improved conditions. Having belittled the industrial arm to the top of our bent, in favour of the political arm of Labour, we had to set about righting the balance. This accomplished, let us see that the balance is maintained, that the renewed interest exhibited in organization by our class is used to the best and wisest possible end, only in this way can we guard against periods of apathy and reaction due to over-emphasis of the power and place of organized activity, political or industrial: only in this way can we reap to the full the power which the new conditions make possible. Never before in the history of organized Labour has a more carefully thought out and responsible scheme of constructive work and active propaganda been needed than at the present time, never a more fertile field for our labours, and the less provocative our work and the more explanative our propaganda the more lasting and successful the results.

Industrial Unionism is, as the name implies, a theory of industrial organization based on the unity of interests of all workers, the *class*, as against the craft interests of Labour. It arose undoubtedly as a result of the consciousness of the levelling power of the machine. New mechanical forces simplifying or abolishing the old-time skill of the handicraftsman, such was the stage necessary to be reached before a general concept of the oneness of the interests of wage-labourers could be generally grasped. This understanding is being more and more forced home on the workers. The condition for modern industry is the aggregation of capital, and the necessary concomitant to that from the workers' point of view is the solidification of their ranks against the common exploiter. The lessons of

the past have borne fruit, it has been observed that during a strike in one part of the country the orders have been diverted to another and less disturbed area. Not only this but frequently during disputes with one section of their workers the masters have been able to use other organizations of workers to temporarily fill the place of those on strike. This has led to endless disputes among the workers themselves greatly to the profit of their employers, until at last the futility of these barren struggles have been borne home to the workers, and taking a leaf out of their masters' book they likewise have set about the work of establishing monopolistic control of their forces.

Industrial Unionism being based on the class struggle does not stop short at maintaining or even improving the conditions of wage-slavery, it aims at the abolition of capitalism and the establishment of a classless society industrially controlled, and the industrially controlled has a meaning here which, so far as we know, has not yet been grasped, or at least promulgated by Syndicalists, viz., that of preparing by organization for the carrying on of the work of production and distribution by and for society. Each industrial union will aim at preparing itself for the work of carrying on as well as controlling the industry in which it is engaged. Theoretically it will work *not* for the General Strike, but for the abolition of strikes; for the strike *inside* not outside the workshop, and ultimately for the general lock-out of the capitalist class.

Industrial Unionism does not mean a form of organization where all workers will be bunched together regardless of the part they play inside their particular industry, but rather a means of securing the general support of all the workers engaged in that industry for the protection and improvement of their common lot. Thus the internal organization will be sectionalized on the departmental basis, so that the workers engaged in any particular and peculiar process or on any specialized part of the commodity produced will have the opportunity of discussing and deciding the requirements of their own work, subject to ratification by the industry as a whole. Statistics relating to the market conditions, and the exact nature of organization among any or all sections of industry will be carefully compiled, so that as complete an understanding of the possibilities of a successful struggle with the employers, either for improved conditions or maintenance of the old, will be available at short notice for the guidance of the members. Notices to employers will be brief, a scale of demands in line with the information aforementioned and unalterable except by the consent of the majority of the membership of the Union will be presented; all struggles will be entered upon on the basis of improved conditions all round. The form of organization will also take into account the maintenance of a close touch with the whole of the members, with facilities for calling group and general delegate meetings at a few hours' notice: in this way both secrecy



and dispatch will be assured. Group meetings of the industrial council, representing the whole of the industries, will be likewise arranged for, regular and extraordinary. Such in brief are the aims of the Industrial Unionists as the writer understands them.

The Industrial Unionist is a Socialist—a Marxian Socialist—but not a blind adherent to the letter, to the applications of scientific Socialism to last century conditions, rather a wholehearted believer in the *principles* of Socialism as laid down by Marx and Engels. What is good in the application of their principles he is not afraid to maintain, nor what is bad to reject, age has nothing to do with it only so far as evolution has necessitated the sloughing of the outworn. Principles are only useful so long as they faithfully and accurately interpret the facts, so soon as the facts are shown to contradict principles the latter must be placed in the lumber room with the other obsolete things, unwept, unhonoured, and unsung. One of the necessary activities of the organized workers we believe to be political action, we believe it is a requisite part of the armoury for waging the class struggle, and the facts of every day would seem to prove it. The controlling of the juridical machinery is in Parliament as the Syndicalist prosecutions recently have proved, we believe it will be thus controlled for many years to come. The control of such machinery, or at least the influencing of such, is of importance to our complete freedom to propogate our views. We protest against the Syndicalist sentences, we do not believe in letting it remain a merely nominal protest, our best protest would be zoo Labour-Socialist Members of Parliament with a mandate to protect our freedom now menaced, we think a general industrial stoppage would be more effective in securing the release of the Syndicalists, neither is practical politics, if the term is permissible, immediately. Perhaps the Members of Parliament are nearer than Industrial Unionism—we work for both. Both aims are in line with Socialism, Socialism is organization from the bottom up, politically and industrially. Socialism is Industrial Unionism, Industrial Unionism is Socialism. Educate! Agitate! Organize!

BRUMAIRE.

---

Forms and ceremonies that have no fruit in action are not marks of a living truth, but of a dead dogma . . . It is when beliefs die, and love has faded into indifference, that forms are necessary, for to the living no monument is needed, but to the dead. Forms and ceremonies are but the tombs of dead truths, put up to their memory to recall to those who have never known them that they lived and died long ago.

H. FIELDING HALL.

It is the opposition of *good* people to progress that is really formidable,

BENNARD SNELL,

## Materialist Philosophy

**T**HE materialistic philosophy is not a deduction from assumed premises. It is the induction from facts carefully ascertained and construed together. These facts history furnishes in abundance. They leave room for no alternative other than either reject the facts as false, an impossible thing; or, accept the materialist conclusion to which these facts point. From the inexhaustible quarry of historic facts a few leading ones will suffice.

The sense that involuntary poverty is an evil to him who is afflicted therewith is found in all literature, and in all ages. The sense of the evil has affected people in two ways. What those ways were is typified by the best types of the people differently affected. Isaiah and Plato may be taken as the oldest types of one set; Aristotle and Xenophon as the oldest types of the other set.

The set typified by Isaiah and Plato undertook to remove the affliction of involuntary poverty, then and there. Their reasoning was that, involuntary poverty being an evil, the moral sense must revolt against it; and, seeing that morality could not abide by the suffering of mankind, all that was needed was to render man moral. A quickened morality was to establish paradise on earth—Isaiah's "Kingdom of the Lord of Hosts," Plato's "Republic."

The set typified by Aristotle and Xenophon looked upon involuntary poverty as an evil, but a necessary, an unavoidable evil. The Aristotelian passage, cited by Marx,—“If every tool, when summoned or even of its own accord, could do the work that befits it, just as the creations of Daedalus moved of themselves, or the tripods of Hephaestus went of their own accord to their sacred work, if the weaver's shuttles were to weave of themselves, then there would be no need either of apprentices for the master workers, or of slaves for the lords”—this passage strikes the key-note of the reasoning of this set.

There is not on record, in the history of intellectual development, another instance of an error of judgment embodying a truth of such colossal proportions as the error which the Aristotle-Xenophonian school uttered in the passage cited above. There is no other instance of error big with such constructive powers. The Aristotle-Xenophonian school looked upon involuntary poverty as unavoidable because the tool did not move of itself. Under such mechanical conditions, the alternative was—either economic dependence, that is, involuntary poverty, for all, with leisure, hence, the opportunity for intellectual expansion for none; or, economic dependence, hence, involuntary poverty with its train of sufferings for the masses, and the consequent economic independence for some.

The Aristotle-Xenophonian school grasped the sociologic law that decreed intellectual progress. Pardonably unable to project itself into the future so far ahead as the time when mechanical conditions

would be so radically revolutionized that the "weavers' shuttles would weave of themselves," this school considered slavery, which meant labour and poverty, to be unavoidable. By so doing the Aristotle-Xenophonian school planted itself upon material conditions as the prime factor to determine social institutions and morality. The fruitfulness of their posture is inestimable.

In the first place, it was a shield against wishes that were impracticable. The Isaiah-Platonian school, by aspiring and grasping at a goal for which society afforded no material foundation, led from disappointment to disappointment, and finally to the psychologic spot where the road forks—one road striking in the direction of extreme Reaction, to a frame of mind in which the well-spring of lofty sentiments is dried up, and the masses are looked upon as brutish herds, who get no worse than they deserve when starved or beaten over the head into quiet; the other road striking in the direction of Hypocrisy, the original sentiments being preserved only in phrases, while actual conduct is hard to distinguish from Reaction—each of the two roads being worse than the other.

In the second place, the Aristotle-Xenophonian school furnished the key to the successive correction of whatever principle, which, however correct at one time, time may subsequently have rendered incorrect. By subjecting Aspiration to Material Possibilities, the key furnished by this school opened the portals for loftier and ever loftier sentiment in the measure that Aspirations, once lacking material foundation, were furnished with the same by the material conquests of advancing society, and things, once held impossible, had become accomplished facts. The passage from Aristotle cited by Marx contrasts the two schools, and it illustrates the incomparable superiority, moral and material, of the Aristotle-Xenophonian posture over the Isaiah-Platonian.

The Aristotle-Xenophonian is the Materialist Philosophy.

The Materialist Philosophy subordinates the Heart to the Mind. By so doing, the Materialist Philosophy is the Guardian of Social Morality.

Mass-humanity, the facts of history demonstrate, ever adapts its moral conceptions to its material needs. The Anti-Materialist does not, he cannot escape that law of human action.

The Anti-Materialist not only cripples himself, he injures society. By expecting universal Good Will, the application of the Golden Rule, in short, ideal morality under conditions in which for instance, "the weavers' shuttles do NOT weave of themselves," the Anti-Materialist renders himself stone blind to the advent of the material conditions when "the weavers' shuttles DO weave of themselves." Expecting the impossible, the Anti-Materialist impedes the inauguration of the possible. The consequence is inevitable. It is seen in the fact of the churches, the centres of Anti-Materialism, being filled with Reactionists and Hypocrites.

The Materialist, on the contrary, ever adapting Aspirations to Material Possibilities, never can inflict upon society the alternate and double injury of promoting Reaction, or Hypocrisy, or both. The highest possible Ideal that material conditions afford he stands for—none beyond that. Where material conditions, as, for instance, when the mechanical appliances for production are so rudimental that the abundance needed for the welfare of all is a physical impossibility—his Mind will curb the beatings of the Heart, and he will abstain from preaching the New Jerusalem. He knows the deep morality of the warning against the shouting of "Peace, peace, where there is no peace," and the deep damnation of the practice. On the other hand, when material conditions have so improved—as, for instance, when the mechanical appliances for production have reached the present stage of perfection that an abundance for all is possible without arduous toil—then will the Materialist's Mind give full rein to the throbbings of the Heart, and he will proclaim the advent of Man's terrestrial wellbeing. He will do so because aware of the deep damnation of upholding "War, war, when there can be peace," and the lofty morality of insisting that there be "Peace, peace, when there can be peace."

Being the carrier of the highest Morality, Socialism is Materialist, Materialism being TRUE, Anti-Materialism FALSE, and false pretence.

D. DE LEON.

---

## Historical Materialism

THE hard-headed British worker is supposed to have a deep-rooted objection to theories; plain and simple facts he will revel in, but theories, we are told, do not appeal to his practical mind.

This undue preference for facts, as opposed to theories, is frequently applauded, as though it represented the highest wisdom; the underlying assumption of those who adopt this attitude would seem to be that in the nature of things facts and theories are either independent or antagonistic, and that while facts have considerable utility, theories are mere "will-o'-the-wisps" that lead nowhere in particular. Perhaps this attitude is a result of a healthy reaction from the metaphysical method of *a priori* reasoning, whose speculative theories were frequently divorced from all semblance of material reality; if so, like all reactions, it has been carried too far in its protest. Besides, such an attitude has no longer the excuse and justification it formerly may have had. Science and worldly development have, in their combined action, superseded the horde of metaphysicians, and relegated them to those "homes of lost causes," the universities, where in the appropriately mediæval atmosphere of Oxford and Cambridge they may elaborate their airy theories for the amusement of one another while the world goes on its way.

The value of modern science, perhaps, like the value of modern material production, lies not so much in the use so far made of its accumulated results, as in the insight it gives to correct and proper methods. The relation of thinking to being, of theory to fact, is a problem that has troubled the philosophers of all ages, and it is only since the development of modern science that this problem has been solved.

The relation of fact to theory is now recognized as being simply the relation of the particular to the general: concrete facts constitute the materials out of which are formed theories, or general truths: When it is clearly seen that theories are simply the general principles drawn from material facts, the stupidity of those who would reject theories, or belittle their importance when compared with facts, soon becomes obvious. While facts are recognized as the indispensable material for theories, theories are seen to be equally as necessary to a proper understanding and utilization of facts. Facts are primary, theories are secondary, and they both are equally necessary in the advancement of general truth.

There never was a time when the workers stood in greater need of scientifically-grounded theory than they do at the present moment. The industrial upheavals of the last twelve months have shown that the workers of this country possess energy, courage, determination and solidarity sufficient to force them into open revolt against present intolerable conditions, but for the lack of a clear grasp of the general principles underlying the working-class movement they do not yet make the most effective use of their power by directing their energies in a manner that would give them the greatest and most permanent results.

Without that theoretical knowledge which will give them a general view of the forces of capitalism which they find themselves up against, and lacking a theoretical understanding of the historical part the modern working class is called upon to perform in helping on the general progress of mankind, there is a grave danger of the workers having their energies exhausted, and their movement set back for another period without much improvement having been made in their conditions. The theory which more than any other explains the modern class struggle and gives the workers the greatest amount of illumination as to their own position and function in connexion with it is the theory known as Historical Materialism. The surest test of any theory in social science, as in any other, lies in its ability to predict results. "To see, is to foresee," declared Comte, and how well the discoverers and promulgators of the Materialist Conception of History foresaw the modern developments of capitalism, and the class conflict arising therefrom is realized the moment we compare recent happenings with the predictions outlined in the Communist Manifesto.

The Manifesto was written by Marx and Engels in the year 1848—sixty-four years ago—and, in writing this challenge to capitalism, and what was equally intended as a rallying-call to the workers of all countries, the authors took as their key the theory of Historical Materialism discovered by each of them, independently, three or four years earlier.

Not only did this theory provide its authors with the key for the interpretation of all past history, but it also enabled them to subject capitalism to that searching analysis which makes the Manifesto, even to-day, one of the finest introductions to a study of the capitalist system and all its incidental problems. It has been announced that a committee of Cabinet Ministers is about to undertake an investigation into the causes of the prevailing industrial unrest; as a preliminary study, each member might very profitably read the Communist Manifesto; it might give them an insight into the real causes of recent conflicts, and help them to avoid the recommendation of any more of their quack remedies of which we have had more than sufficient. Historical Materialism, which formed the standpoint from which the Manifesto was written, is the theory which sees in the material developments represented in the production and distribution of goods, the basic cause and fundamental explanation of all the changes which from time to time take place in the social and intellectual life of a people. According to this theory, the tools in use at any particular period, and the methods of production and exchange involved thereby, primarily determine the social relationships, and, therefore, the morals, laws, religion and general ideas which prevail in that epoch; consequently, the changes which take place in morals, law, religion, &c., must be sought for in the changes already made in the economic structure due to the development of the productive tools. Viewed from this standpoint, the social history of mankind is seen to be a slow and unconscious process primarily determined by the changes and improvements made in the productive forces of society. It was in the making of tools out of the sticks and stones and other objects of nature that man first took his departure from, and gained his supremacy over the rest of the animal kingdom, and it is in the improvements made to his tools and methods of production, including the utilization of natural forces, such as wind, water, steam, gas and electricity, that man has succeeded in raising himself from a position of helpless savagery to the more commanding position which he occupies in civilized society.

His journey must have been an exceedingly difficult one, and immense periods must have been covered in the succeeding stages that marked his progress upward in his human career; but each succeeding achievement due to his inventive genius would make the next step so much easier, and give impetus to the forces which determined the rate of the speed he travelled. The discovery and

utilization of fire, the invention of the bow and arrow, the acquirements of the arts of making pottery, the taming and rearing of animals, the cultivation of food-crops both for himself and his domestic animals, the smelting of iron ore and the production of iron tools—these are some of the outstanding achievements which determined man's progress previous to the dawn of civilization. It was at this stage, when man had so far mastered the dragon of nature so as to be able to produce more than sufficient to satisfy his immediate wants, and when, on the other hand, the demands made on his productive energies were greater than he was prepared voluntarily to meet, that slavery arose in quite a natural way to serve his needs during the next stage of the journey. Historically viewed, slavery, in spite of its incidental cruelties, was a "just" and necessary institution in its proper time and place. Without coercion, man never would have taken upon himself the traditional curse to the extent needed for the development of civilization. That human exploitation was introduced simply to serve the selfish purposes of a few is another proof that even selfish purposes may sometimes contribute to ultimate social good. But methods and institutions which in their own good time and place temporarily serve the general social needs become, later, so many handicaps to man's further social progress. And so we find that slavery which alone made possible all the civilizations of antiquity ultimately became one of the main causes of their downfall.

The chattel slavery of ancient days was succeeded by a modified form of human exploitation, the serfdom of the feudal system, which prevailed in Western Europe throughout the middle ages. The feudal system, however, in spite of the "eternal laws and principles" of the Roman Catholic Church by which it was protected and upheld, proved itself no more eternal than the economic systems which it had succeeded.

The chief contributions to historical progress by feudalism consisted in its achievement of evolving something like order out of the anarchy prevailing in consequence of the dissolution of ancient civilization, and its equally important achievement of providing the means and of preparing the ground for the development of the present industrial system which succeeded it. The capitalist system which arose out of the conditions which brought dissolution to old feudal society did not put an end to human exploitation in spite of its interest in securing the "emancipation" of the serfs. On the contrary, the capitalist class has become the most ruthless and the most universal exploiting class of any in the world's history. The only satisfactory feature about it is that it is no more permanent than preceding exploiting systems, and that in its short history of two or three hundred years it has succeeded in developing the productive forces to an extent that renders all further human exploitation unnecessary and absolutely harmful to the interests of future social progress.

Not only has the development of capitalism produced the forces that make the freedom of all men a possibility, but it has also produced the men for handling the forces in a way that will make that freedom a reality.

The modern working class, as distinguished from all other exploited classes in history, is in a position, and has all the material means at its disposal, for securing its own emancipation, and also for putting an end to any further forms of exploitation. The essential need at this moment is that the workers shall have a right conception of the position they occupy in the world's economy in order that they may make full and efficient use of the forces which they are called upon to handle. The essential pre-requisite to intelligent and right action is clear and correct methods of thought, and to gain the necessary clearness in thought, the first essential for the workers is that they should rid their minds of all the bourgeois conceptions superimposed on them by the representatives of the capitalist class whose cause they at present serve. Nothing will enable them to do this more effectively than a clear and intelligent grasp of the theory of Historical Materialism. When they realize that "the ruling ideas of any particular age are ever only the ideas of its ruling class," and that the conditions which hitherto justified the rule of the capitalist class have already been superseded by conditions that no longer make that rule necessary or desirable—when, in fact, the workers learn by conscious theory the necessity of developing ideas in harmony with their own needs instead of allowing themselves to be dominated by the traditional ideas which serve the requirements of only a privileged section, progress will be very much accelerated and the day of working-class emancipation will be near. Surprise and indignation have recently been felt and expressed in working-class circles at the way in which the forces of the State have been used against the workers, and in the interests of the capitalists, during their recent industrial struggles. The indignation is excusable and betokens a healthy working-class instinct, but the surprise reveals a naïve innocence that is suggestive of anything save a high standard of intelligence. Already, in 1848, the authors of the Communist Manifesto declared that the modern State is but the executive committee for managing the affairs of the bourgeoisie.

And what can be said for the intelligence of those workers who, possessing political power, deliberately go and use it to elect their exploiters to power and to office? Have they any legitimate cause for complaint if these same persons elected by working-class votes use their official positions in the interests of the class whom they really represent, and send troops and police to protect blacklegs and to subdue strikers, or appoint judges and magistrates to administer capitalist law in the interest of the capitalists? Do the workers expect that in a society organized on the capitalist basis, and with



representatives of the dominant class in all the principal offices of the State that they are going to get laws either made or administered in ways that are favourable to working-class interests? If so, it is time they were disillusioned, and nothing is so likely to hasten their disillusionment as the theoretical understanding of historical progress and of the forces represented in the present social order. It is to assist the workers in arriving at that understanding that this article has been written, and that this magazine is published. If by either means the workers can be stimulated to investigate for themselves the causes which have led to their subjection and to acquire an understanding of the principles that will lead to their deliverance, then the purposes of the editor and of the present writer will be equally served. In any case, this much at least is certain: That while instinctive revolt and spontaneous action on a widespread scale may be useful agencies in helping to destroy the present capitalist order, constructive theory and well-organized and deliberately-planned effort will be needed to completely overwhelm the upholders of ruling-class interests and privileges, and to engage in the difficult and necessary work of social reconstruction for the purpose of securing, on the basis of equal social relations, the world's socially-produced wealth for the world's social producers.

C. WATKINS.

---

## Correspondence

---

### RUSKIN COLLEGE, OXFORD

TO THE EDITOR OF *The Times* (London, April 20, 1912.)

SIR,—Your valuable article on Syndicalism contains the following statement concerning some of the younger leaders of the Syndicalist Movement:—"A certain number of the most intelligent, and ambitious, have undergone a special intellectual training at Ruskin College, which seems to have been applied largely to turning out agitators."

Will you allow me to say that Ruskin College, as now governed and controlled by responsible representatives of the great labour organizations is not applied to turning out agitators? The very fact that the Central Labour College is bitterly hostile to Ruskin College ought to be clear enough proof that Ruskin College is a genuinely sound educational institution where young working men are induced not to believe in Syndicalism, or any other "ism," but to study economic and social subjects on their merits, broadly, sanely, and thoroughly. Ruskin College has so many false accusations to meet from reactionaries of all classes, that I am sure you would not wish to increase our difficulties by lending support to any opinion that Ruskin College is in any way a propagandist institution.

\* See Editorial for comments relating to the following letters.

Our one aim is to equip our students to be of the greatest possible service to their fellow men by enabling them to study seriously all the chief theories and branches of economics, industrial and constitutional history, political science, and sociology.

Yours faithfully,

Ruskin College, Oxford, April 18th.

HY. ALLSOPP, *Secretary.*

## OXFORD AND LABOUR

*Daily Telegraph*, London, May 10, 1912.

The Standing Committee of the Oxford Union Debating Society has decided, says the *Pall Mall Gazette*, to allow six Ruskin College students to sit on the floor of the "House" and to take part in debates.

The President of the Union is chiefly responsible for this innovation, which has been introduced, in spite of much opposition, in order that members shall have early opportunity of becoming acquainted with the Labour view of modern political problems.

The students of Ruskin College, who are all drawn from the working classes, greatly appreciate the favour, and a permanent "Labour" group will be formed. It was arranged that they should be represented at last night's debate by one miner, one bootmaker, one bookbinder, and three engineers.

The motion down for debate is: "That in the opinion of this House it is the duty of the Government to carry out the reconstitution of the Second Chamber foreshadowed in the Preamble of the Parliament Bill."

In order that the Union shall have the advantage of hearing from all the industries represented by students at Ruskin College a scheme of rotation will be adopted.

## OXFORD UNION SOCIETY

*The Standard*, London, May 14, 1912.

In reference to a paragraph from a Labour correspondent which recently appeared in these columns, announcing that six students of Ruskin College, Oxford, had been given the privilege of attending and taking part in the debates of the Oxford Union Society, the President of the society, Mr. R. M. Barrington-Ward, writes to correct a mis-statement.

It is not the case that the proposal to admit the Ruskin College representatives met with serious criticism, and was only carried by "the determined support of the president." On the contrary, the resolution of the Standing Committee to the effect described met with no hostile criticism, and was carried unanimously.

Of all men God makes one  
Demand: No coward compromise!  
Whose work's half done or falsely done,  
Condemned with God his whole work lies.—IBSEN.

## The Labour Unrest

The following letter from Mr. H. M. Hyndman, the veteran socialist, to the *Daily Mail*, May 16th, 1912, is of sufficient interest to our readers to justify our reprinting it. It ought to have opened the eyes of some of the "blind leaders of the blind" who air themselves so regularly in the columns of that most veracious newspaper.

To the Editor of the *Daily Mail*.

Sir,—The present deep discontent of the mass of our working people is necessarily due to more than one cause. But, first, why should they not be discontented? What have they got to be satisfied with? I know what they are getting, and their mode of life generally all over Great Britain as well as, or perhaps better than, any man of my class. My wonder is that they have not "held up" the whole industrial machine long ago, seeing that, in consequence largely of their own ignorance and apathy and in part to our hopelessly out-of-date political system, they have been unable to obtain any serious improvement in their condition for a full generation at least. A mass strike, or a general strike, is not by any means a satisfactory weapon for the workers to use in the terrible class war of our period. But it is at any rate a weapon, as we have had occasion to discover last summer and this spring, and may have reason to recognize still more unpleasantly before we eat our turkey and plum pudding and drink a glass or so of champagne at Christmas in this year 1912. When the unskilled scavengers at Liverpool and the carters and dockers in London taught the well-to-do that their work was as necessary to "civilization" as that of the colliers and infinitely more important than that of Peers or politicians, lawyers or parsons, they learnt something themselves at the same time, and so did the pitmen more recently. But that way lies anarchy? Quite so—from the point of view of the non-producers; not necessarily from that of the workers.

I agree with Mr. Wells that the political lawyers who now manipulate us and cozen us are to a great extent responsible for the antagonism being as marked as it is. But I do not agree with him in thinking that improved education, as education is commonly understood, has a great deal to do with the increasing unrest. I doubt if education is much, if at all, better than it was a generation ago. Our schools are very bad, and snippety reading is almost worse than no reading at all. Nor do I believe that working-class discipline has improved. A quarter of a century ago one working-class organization in London, at any rate, could take tens of thousands of men in military order to Hyde Park. There is no organization in this metropolis that could do it now. I deeply regret this lack of education and discipline, things being as they are in this country. That is uglier than anything else.

Why, however, should the class disaffection be so marked now, and how does it come about that skilled and unskilled labourers are making common cause to-day as they never did before? The silly notion that the trade unionist official and the "paid agitator" are responsible for all the trouble

may be discarded at once. Trade unionist officials are almost invariably opposed to strikes, as I have pointed out time after time, and agitators, paid or unpaid, can have no hope of success unless there are real grievances to agitate about. The remarkable feature about all the recent strikes has been that the majority of the strikers were ready, not to say eager, to go much farther than their leaders thought prudent.

I hold that the growing unrest is mainly due :

1.—To the increasing pressure of life and anxiety for the future due to the rapid introduction of wages-saving machinery, with its tendency to level skilled and unskilled labour. This and the simultaneous combinations of employers, which render partial strikes hopeless, have had a great effect on the men.

2.—To the steady decrease in the purchasing power of wages, in consequence of the relative cheapening of gold, which Socialists, I may add, were the first to point out and insist upon.

3.—To the failure of the Labour Party to champion effectively the cause of the workers in the House of Commons, and its subservience to one of the capitalist factions. This puts an almost irresistible argument into the mouths of the advocates of the mass strike and general strike as the only means of bringing the power of organized Labour to bear upon the social situation. If political action is played out, they argue, then for untrained and undisciplined and unarmed citizens the strike alone remains as a means of forcing the profit-making and profit-absorbing classes to reason. I do not myself believe that political action is useless because the Labour Party, as at present organized, has proved a failure, nor do the great majority of the active strikers so believe ; but impatience and disgust with existing economic and social conditions have undoubtedly been intensified by the ineptitude and pusillanimity of the political Labourists in the House of Commons.

4.—To the steady propaganda of revolutionary Socialism, based upon the theories of surplus value, unpaid labour, and the class war. This has been going forward upon an ever-increasing scale for more than thirty years. There is a great deal more of it to-day than there was yesterday, and there will be a great deal more still to-morrow than there is to-day. Socialists do not stop teaching and agitating for Social Democracy because barrister politicians are dexterous, or attorney politicians are tricky, or Liberal-Tory politicians have "come to an understanding." On the contrary, the cajolery and bad faith of the Railway "settlements" ; the chicane of the "People's Budget," which heavily taxed the people ; the century-old dodgery of the Minimum Wage Courts ; the official Blackleg Labour Exchanges ; the family-party confidences and agreements against the workers between the two front benches ; and, above all, the outrageous tyranny and fraud of the Insurance Act—accepted in the first instance by both factions—have given us texts to preach upon which, bearing out as they do all our predictions, have inspired many a street-corner orator and leaflet-writer with real eloquence of exposure and denunciation.

These, I say, are in my opinion the main reasons why the Labour unrest "has taken a stirring shape" at the present time. The worthy people, too, who reckon upon "the innate conservatism of the British working man" should take account of the fact that the coal miners who have recently given this bourgeois realm a bit of a shake have always been the most reactionary section of the British trade unionists, and have so shown themselves at Trade Union Congress after Trade Union Congress. When they joined the Labour Party we all felt that another powerful obstacular element had been introduced into that body. Yet we see what we do see.

In short, I am at one with my friend Mr. H. G. Wells in thinking that we have entered definitely upon a revolutionary period. But I very much doubt whether all the higher motives that ever actuated the upper class of humanity at any period of its history can now be of much avail. The disaffection is too deep-seated. The distrust has gone too far.

H. M. HYNDMAN.

---

## Master and Man

**S**AID the master to the man  
 "It is time that I began  
 To show you that our ways blend,  
 And that we've a common end.  
 I respect you very much,  
 For your courage is of such  
 Stuff, that nothing makes you quail.  
 I have never known you fail  
 In the mine, when fire and flood  
 Threaten; and on fields of blood,  
 When your country calls you go  
 Bravely forth to meet the foe.  
 It is great! I acknowledge  
 Men do less fresh from college.  
 Now, why all this talk of strikes,  
 And behaving like the shrikes?  
 There is sick-pay when you ail,  
 And as long as you are hale,  
 For work you need not roam—  
 You can eat your bread at home—  
 And you know that we respect  
 You, What more can you expect?"

The man replied "I fear you dine  
 Not wisely, but too well.  
 You view the world through ruddy wine ;  
 Your heaven creates my hell. .  
 You pride yourself on being smart,  
 And think that I'm a fool.  
 You think that I can't read your heart  
 In making me your tool.  
 You praise me for my courage shown  
 In flood and fire and field :  
 You use me till my strength has flown ;  
 Take all my labours yield.  
 You praise me for my bird's-eye view,  
 In which all things look small ;  
 The good I miss is scanned by you ;  
 While I remain your thrall.  
 Your soul revealed steams in your hand,  
 It has an evil smell ;  
 Devils will dance a saraband  
 To welcome it in hell.  
 You measure things with huckster rod,  
 You judge with huckster brains,  
 You deem me just a simple clod,  
 And praise me for my pains."

W. G. E. P.

---



---

## Reviews

**F**ACILE pens, brilliant controversialists, carping critics, modern dramatists, novel writers, literary cynics, "the man in the street," and all who give utterance, written and spoken, return with the regularity of a social law to the sweet singer of the Elizabethan days. To some Shakespeare is a fetish, to others a myth ; to some he requires an explanation, to others he must be accepted without question ; to some he is a genius, human and up-to-date, whilst others, as a literary force, consider him as dead as a dodo and outdistanced by the modern problem play and play writers. Who has not heard of Corelli and Shaw ? Even Carnegie places him at the head of his list of twenty of the world's greatest men ; the other nineteen are mostly inventors of steel processes.

All has not been said on Shakespeare, although much has been said and subsequently rearranged.

*Shakespeare*, by Mr. Maséfield, will repay perusal.

The book opens with a statement, doleful and dour, presumably the author's, which complains of life's drabness and sordidness, and the general ignoring of Shakespeare. This is followed in Ch. I by a crisp and concise life of the divine William without legendary trimmings or excessive rhetorical flourishes. That concluded, a vivid portrayal transplants the reader within the Elizabethan theatre with its actors and accommodation. The rest of the book is taken up by an interesting analysis of the plays and poems which often leaves the beaten track of Shakespeare's commentators. Mr. Maséfield's method is to say when the play was written and published, and the origin of its plot. The fable of the play is then summarized and followed by a brief criticism sufficient to develop the points raised. We are told that Shakespeare thought that "evil comes from oppressions," and this view is evinced from the arguments. The book has much to recommend it, a good subject, a pleasing and refreshing style, a departure from stock appreciations, and a small price, with which unfortunately the binding is in agreement.

\* \* \* \* \*

If someone were to write upon "The Evolution of the Preface," they would have ample subject matter, and probably be able to make startling revelations with regard to the motives which underlie their remarks which are generally written at the conclusion of a book, although they appear at the commencement. It is suggested that Shaw for example, should publish plays and prefaces separately. One would have the option of choice. The preface to Mr. J. H. Hobson's book, *The Science of Wealth*, apologizes for defects in the book, and refers one to *The Industrial Systems* for further details.

Science is systematized knowledge of an explanatory character. This book is largely concerned with descriptive data, in fact *The Science of Wealth* errs on the side of description rather than definition and runs perilously near being no science at all. It is to be remembered, however, there is a preface. The problem of the book appears to be how the unproductive surplus shall be transferred into a productive surplus, whilst practically nothing is said as to the Social Process that makes this unproductive surplus possible.

At the outset it is stated, wealth "is marketable, articles taken at their market value," which appears to be a tentative shot at what Marx terms exchange value. Later this information is put forward, "A rise or fall in prices will produce a shrinkage or expansion of wealth which has no substance." Is this explanatory of the consumption of goods, of utility, of use value? However, all this anxiety is nicely rounded off by the broad definition of wealth essentially in keeping with Ruskin, which is well being, goodwill, service and so on, and a complaint that the ordinary definition is too "materialistic." Take care ye who swear by "The vast accumulation of commodities" of the "evils of obsession." The interdependency of trades and the general movement of industry claims

alike the readers' and writers' attentions, and here a clear knowledge of fixed and circulating capital propounded by the "too materialistic" school will be found invaluable. Should one be in doubt about the mysticism of money Ch. IV *may* help. Money is shown to be a means to the distribution of industrial energy and products and this morsel of consolation is given:—"Money was invented to save the risks and trouble of such barter and to enable every worker to be paid in general wealth." As an epigram from the psycho-economic school the following is quoted, "True saving is buying producers' goods." This appears to suggest not so much the increased consumption of a higher standard of living as an increase in the productive sphere. The key note of the book is again struck in this phrase above, the transference of that wealth spent in luxury and extravagance to the saving, thrifty capitalists engaged in increased productions. But one knows these virtues are imposed by the influence of competition in the social process of production. We are told that land, capital, ability, and labour must claim portions of the industrial product, and "The price of labour is determined . . . by consideration of cost and scarcity effecting the relation of the supply to the demand. Exchange and prices are treated later and ideas of average capitals are helpful. Robinson Crusoe is again to the fore. It is awful to imagine what would be the state of economics if Defoe had never lived. Demand and supply figure largely in this work and new terms are introduced.

The book will while away an hour or two, and possibly increase one's vocabulary. It will be found to be helpful in many ways, but the direction, the enlightenment will take may not redound to the credit of the theories, but nevertheless a useful purpose will be served. Both books are in the Home University Library of Modern Knowledge. 1/- each, published by Williams and Norgate.

MEREDITH F. TITTERINGTON.

---

## Heroes !

WHEN I think sometimes of what wondrous fame  
 Hath fallen upon men of noisy deeds,  
 Of laurel flung for every drop that bleeds,  
 And grateful nations busy with a name,  
 I turn to those who, deaf to praise or blame,  
 Labour in silence for their brothers' needs,  
 Sowing in darkness those immortal seeds  
 One day to blossom in men's souls like flame.  
 Ah, those unrecognized, unhailed, denied,  
 Those heroes of what land or age they be,  
 Who mutely anguish at the task undone,  
 Those wonderful white Christs, not crucified  
 On a high place for all the world to see,—  
 But striving on, unnoted and alone !

THEODOSIA GARRISON,