

THE
"Plebs" Magazine

Vol. III.

June, 1911.

No. 5.

Copyright Entered at Stationer's Hall.

EDITORIAL

IT has become the fashion in certain quarters to deprecate the Central Labour College Movement on the grounds of its being partisan and narrow. On the other hand, it has been the boast of the deprecators, who are usually found on the side of Ruskin College and the Workers' Educational Association, that their movement is non-partisan and their education broad.

**The
"Assurances."**

In the *Times* of the 12th inst., Mr. Henry Allsopp, the Secretary of Ruskin College, writes, assuring those interested in the "Higher Education," that the education given at that institution "has been purely non-political and non-sectarian." This should fetch a considerable portion of the £8,000 required for the Building Fund. But this is by no means the only occasion on which Ruskin College has given such assurances. Mr. Allsopp's predecessor was most skilful in the assuring line, so that the present secretary is simply living up to the traditions of Ruskin College. And yet the latter is styled a Labour College. As we have already seen however, it is only the sign that is partisan, the drawing-power that is sectarian. Ruskin College cannot avoid, and does not seek to avoid, the partisan character of the area from which it draws its students. It is the education of the working class that it desires to take charge of, it is the brains of the proletariat that it seeks to surcharge with non-partisan ideas. The Workers' Educational Association occupy precisely the same position. It too proclaims its non-partisan and non-political character, and, as in the case of Ruskin College, all for the sake of the working class, or rather—to use that term beloved by the W.E.A.—the workpeople. The experiment would be nothing without the dear good "workpeople." And all this solicitude about the latter has developed as a result of these significant "changes which have been taking place in the constitution of English society." In simple terms, it is the growing restlessness of the working class, their increasing hostility to the present order of social relations, and their more and more partisan and political attitude, that has brought

forth this non-partisan and non-political education movement as an attempt to stem the onflowing fourth estate. "As a result of these changes, it has become incumbent upon Universities to watch carefully every sign that a new class is ready to receive their guidance, in order that the seed of University culture may be deposited wherever it has suitable material on which to work.*" Those who sow such seed as this will reap the harvest thereof. The material will be made suitable to the depositors. But for the Labour movement it will be as a crop of weeds choking the growth of Labour's liberation.



To be non-partisan and non-sectarian appeals to many as a highly desirable condition. Many workers are carried away by an enthusiasm which, in point of fact, has been roused by their enemies, who by their protestations of fidelity and brotherly kindness appear on the surface to be friendly disposed towards working-class interests. This is true on every field, industrial and political, as well as educational. It is on the latter field however that the deception is most difficult to be seen, and

**As to
Non-Partisan
Education.**

that, for the very reason that education seems to be removed from the battle-field on which the classes clash. The ideas of classes are not something which stand outside of class antagonisms, or are independent of class relations. The mind is not free to think as it pleases. Thinking is a form of work, and, like every other form of work, requires an object. The object of mental work is the material of experience. Thought is begotten by the contact of mind with other objects. Everything may become the object of thought—including thought itself. This is true for all, irrespective of whether the mental apparatus is in the head of a patrician or a pleb, a capitalist or a wage-earner. Before thinking can begin the physical needs must first be satisfied. That is true also for capitalist and wage-worker. The bodily needs are the most indispensable. How are these secured? Does the capitalist get his living in the same way as the wage-worker? No! Not only do they differ in their methods of securing a livelihood but what is more to the point, their methods are diametrically opposed. *The capitalist satisfies his bodily needs by exploiting labour-power. The wage-labourer can only secure his subsistence by selling his labour-power to the capitalist, i.e., by furnishing the latter with quantities of unpaid labour.* The bodily needs of the capitalist are thus satisfied at the expense of the labourer. The leisure time of the one is acquired by converting the whole lifetime of the other into labour time. It is this antagonism which lies at the bottom of the Labour movement. It is this which must be eliminated before its consequences—the poverty and suffering of the toiling masses—can be banished and the era of equality and fraternity

* Oxford Working Class Education Joint Committee's Report, Ch. iv. p. 53.

ushered in. It is not enough to simply *feel* oppression in order to remove it. We must know *how* this oppression arises and continues, if we would overcome it. The act of overcoming must be an act of the working class. It cannot be performed by philanthropists or by patronage of any kind. *It is a partisan and class achievement.* True the victory of the working class involves the disappearance of all classes. But it is *the victory of a class* nevertheless. Until then, as long as the economic foundations of society are such as make exploitation and therefore classes possible, it is mere humbug and cant to talk about neutrality and non-partisanship. And those from whose mouths such phrases fall can do nothing for the Labour movement but bungle and betray it. They are either ignorant or knavish and the effect will be the same in any case. The knowledge which we as workers require to fit us for the fight and for the victory is marked by the same class and clear-cut division as that which marks all our other activities as a movement. We have a definite object to fight for and we need a definite knowledge in order to fight successfully. We have already seen that knowledge finds its source in experience. We have also noted that the bodily needs must first be satisfied before knowing can commence, and that the method of satisfying these needs by those who live on the unpaid labour of others, is not only different but antagonistic to the means by which the wage-labourers eke out their existence.

The experience of the capitalist in the way in which he gets his living is different to that of the worker. The ideas of the capitalist about the method by which he secures his livelihood differs from the ideas of those who are conscious that they are exploited and impoverished by that method. And just in the same way that the economic antagonism deepens and becomes more acutely felt and recognized the longer the capitalist mode of production is experienced, the older that system grows, so also does the antagonism upon the field of ideas, of education, assert itself more and more clearly. While, therefore, the industrial organization of the workers, the Trade Union, upon the industrial field, and the political party of Labour an expression of the same opposition upon the political field, the Central Labour College bears witness to the fact that the struggle has extended to the field of education, that there also, the working class are compelled to line up independently and self-sufficiently. *To strike a non-partisan attitude in education is to deny the existence of that economic antagonism which is at the root of the Labour movement and which only that movement can uplift and destroy.* Ruskin College and the W. E. A. who pride themselves on their neutrality and non-partisanship stand self-condemned. They announce themselves to be incompetent to give an education that is in harmony with the actual social conditions. They place themselves in a position that denies the first and fundamental principle on which the very existence of the Labour movement is conditioned, viz., *that the interests of Capital and*

Labour are not identical and harmonious but different and hostile. That is what non-partisanship in the educational field amounts to. False economics are its first-fruits. And that is precisely what we find when we examine the teaching given at Ruskin College or in the W.E.A. classes. When we ourselves sat at the feet of the economic lecturer at Ruskin College, Mr. Furniss, who has been described by the authorities of that institution as "one of the greatest economic experts that Oxford has ever produced"!! we were taught that "profits are a compensation for risk, and wages of superintendence," that "interest is paid because capital is productive." These are a very few of the many gems of economic expertness. We have a considerable collection of them in our lecture notes and we hope to have an early opportunity of arraying them before our readers, so that they may still further observe how "fearfully and wonderfully made" is the economic expertness that Oxford produces. This is what is euphoniously styled by the apostles of a broad and non-partisan education as "pursuing knowledge for its own sake," which of course sounds very beautiful and disinterested so long as one does not dwell upon it too critically. To do that is to discover that it is simply a platitude intended to conceal a most interested and egoistic design. Just look at this specimen from the scriptures of the W. E. A.

The time has come for the working man to demand a share in the education which is called "liberal," because it concerns life, not livelihood; because it is to be desired for its own sake, and not because it has any direct bearing upon his wage-earning capacity.*

The negatives in this passage take the guilt off the positives. "Life, not livelihood"! The professors should have added, "Take no thought what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink, or wherewithal ye shall be clothed, for your fatherly W.E.A. knoweth of what ye have need"—a "liberal" education. This must be life "for its own sake." We are bound to confess that this "Higher" education is too high for us poor earth-born and capitalist-ridden mortals. The Law of Wages has so clipped our wings that we have been unable to soar to that sublime professorial peak where people live on a "liberal" education. We have however discovered, looking through the bars of our "narrow" prison-house of wage-labour, that a certain class of people have been able to live very "broadly" without concerning themselves about the production of their livelihood, and that they have accomplished this by very "liberally" "narrowing" down the livelihood of the producer to about a third of his product, appropriating the other two-thirds *not* "for its own sake" but for the sake of the appropriators, because it is more blessed to live on unpaid labour than to labour for the miserable living of a wage-slave. And these are they who are so anxious that the workers should have a broad, liberal, non-partisan education, "to be desired for its own sake and not because it has any direct bearing upon his wage-earning capacity." Oh, how partisan are these non-partisans! We can well understand

* Oxford and Working Class Education Joint Committee's Report, Ch. iv. p 52.

why the education they are so anxious to give is to have no bearing upon the wage-earning capacity, why it is not to concern livelihood. Because it means that to throw the light on these things is *to reveal their appropriating capacity, to disclose the sources of their livelihood*, and that is precisely what they want to conceal, that is clearly the design of such institutions as Ruskin College and the W.E.A. Both are partisan, both stand for class dominance and rule. The prevailing order is to be preserved through the intellectual hypnotists, whose training fits them for unfitting the movement that seeks to put all dominance and oppression under its feet. The partisan nature of the Central Labour College, like the partisan nature of the political and industrial organizations of the working class, is in harmony with the real conditions of society. The Labour Movement, whatever the aspect of its activities, cannot avoid in the very nature of its existence being partisan, cannot hope to succeed without recognizing the conditions of its being and the necessity of its opposition to all that is not travelling its way. And just as the party of the disinherited can alone put to an end all classes and class rule so the knowledge necessary for this attainment can be acquired only from the stand point of the disinherited. Indeed in so far as the end and aim of the Labour movement is concerned, *the party of the disinherited is the party of the disinterested*. It does not strive like the parties of the past to rise and establish its rule over others. It strives to put an end to all parties by eradicating the conditions which breed them. The party of the working class thus represents the general welfare and is the the party of humanity. It is those institutions like the University and the W.E.A. and Ruskin College who represent a partial end, a particular form of class rule. It is they who are prevented by their class position from impartially recognizing and admitting the actual conditions of modern society. They represent the "interests" and their knowledge can therefore not be disinterested. Such institutions as these stand for that class who have their dividends to lose. The Central Labour College represents the great mass whose unpaid labour is the substance of these dividends and "who have nothing to lose but their chains." *Ruskin College and the W.E.A. deny the existence of class antagonisms in order to preserve them. The Central Labour College affirms the existence of class antagonisms in order to destroy them. Ruskin College and the W.E.A. are non-partisan for partisan ends. The Central Labour College is partisan for non-partisan ends.* We live and struggle to-day in a society of class rule and class oppression, and the movement that would contribute towards the elimination of this rule and oppression must stand squarely and openly upon the existence of these things, must adapt itself to its environment. Any institution that ignores or conceals the economic antagonism inherent in the present system may be counted out as a force in the Labour movement. The organized workers should not be scared away from an institution because they are told it is "narrow," but they should inquire

just precisely what that narrowness means. They will then find that the educational movement known as the Central Labour College is no more narrow than their industrial and political organizations. And they will further recognize that a non-partisan Labour institution is as absurd and impossible as the brotherhood of Capital and Labour.



WE have been asked on two or three occasions why it is that the Central Labour College is only concerned with the social sciences, why it objects to teaching astronomy or botany. "Do you object to

**The Study of
Social Science.**

a working man studying astronomy?" we have been asked. Of course we don't object to a working man studying whatever he chooses! But it should be quite obvious that astronomy or botany has nothing to do with the Labour movement and its problems. It has been suggested that sun spots play an important part in economic phenomena. Jevons has found in them the cause of crises. We are afraid that those who hold such views have, like Hamlet, been "too much in the sun." We have so far had no reason to look for the causes of poverty and unemployment in the clouds because we have already discovered these causes on the earth, in society's anatomy. To look for illumination on social problems elsewhere is to become clouded, a not at all undesirable condition for a worker to be in from the point of view of his "givers of work" and his non-partisan educators. As we have already stated, the Labour movement is a social movement, the forces that it has to contend with are social forces and therefore the knowledge which it requires for its work is a knowledge of these forces, of social science, e.g., sociology, history, economics. These therefore should form the main objects of study at a Labour College. In so far as society has developed out of the simple field of nature, a general knowledge of organic evolution is essential. And that could be in no more masterly hands than those of Mr. Dennis Hird who treats of this subject at the Central Labour College. It is not we who shut out the working class from a knowledge of chemistry, physics, or astronomy, it is not at our door that the charge of narrowing down the education of our class to social sciences should be laid. It is capitalism that is responsible for this, that is the great *narrower*. Only when the producers cease to be sellers of their labour power for wages, when the greater part of the results of their labour are no longer appropriated by the owners of capital, only when the producers become economically free and equal will it be possible for them to freely participate in the fields of scientific investigation and to enjoy the result thereof. The immediate task of the working class is therefore to establish these necessary social conditions, and for that purpose the only knowledge that is immediately necessary and practical is an understanding of the social forces and conditions of to-day.

W. W. C.

The Real Tartarin

FOREWORD

[DURING the "strike" era at Ruskin College news of the dispute reached, among other places, East Orange, U.S.A. In that place dwelt another rebel named Michael Monahan. He hated, and hates, with the tenacity of a good man the "keep on the rails" policy of modern life. He likes to leave the line occasionally to drink in the beauties of Nature, to listen to the voices of the singing birds, to catch the fragrance of "incense breathing morn," to "idle" over a glorious sunset, linger over a good book, poem, or painting—in short, he lives to live. M. M. is justified in all this by the greatest of all reasons, he has "the hearing ear, the seeing eye, and the understanding heart." Small wonder then that he metaphorically embraced "Dennis" as a man and a brother. All this is mentioned because at least one other has reason to remember that day "the news reached a far country." Monahan edits "a magazine of individuality." Go slow, ye Marxians, go slow! this is not heresy and ye think it is. Monahan's individuality is peradventure along the law of life. It hates the shabbiness, the lack-lustre, the shoddy, the adulterated, the snobbishness, the general unloveliness which is the main accompaniment of this modern manufacturing society. Its hope lies in the future—not in the past. The magazine is for the discerning many, to acquaint them with the thoughts of the understanding few. It does not aim at quantity, but it strikes quality. As one has written: "Once in a great while one comes across a man who has read wisely, lived fully, and who, tempering enthusiasm with judgment and knowledge with kindness and temperament, can write. The assortment is sufficiently rare to give the gods pause; and this should be the achievement of Michael Monahan, a writer with Irish name and mental girth and French suppleness and subtlety of wit."

M. M. has also fathered a work—*Palms of Papyrus*—published at 105. Is it any wonder after what has been written that the sin of covetousness has entered into the heart of the writer these many moons. One does not know whether to revile the poverty which spells separation from the *Palms*, or the writer whose ability breeds unsatisfiable desire.

Book and magazine—*The Papyrus*—are published by Mitchell Kennerley, 2 East 29th Street, New York, U.S.A. The price of the magazine is 5s. per annum, postpaid. The following story is taken from the June number.]

ALTHOUGH it is nearly fifteen years since I published *The Adventures of Tartarin*, Tarascon has not yet forgiven me for writing them; and travellers worthy of belief assure me that every morning, when that tiny Provençal town opens the shutters of its shops and shakes its carpets in the balmy breath of the great Rhone, there breaks forth from every threshold and from every window a united fury of clenched fists and flaming black eyes, one vast cry of rage directed towards Paris. "Oh, that Daudet! If for once he came this way!" As Bluebeard says in the story, "Come down, or I come up."

And without joking, one day, Tarascon did "come up!"

It was in 1878, when provincials swarmed in the hotels, on the boulevards, and on that gigantic bridge connecting the Champ de Mars and the Trocadéro. One morning, the sculptor Amy, a native of Tarascon, naturalized in Paris, beheld, piercing their way into his house, a formidable pair of moustaches, arrived by the excursion train, under pretext of seeing the exhibition, but in reality to have an explanation from Daudet on the subject of the brave Commandant Bravida, and the *Defense de Tarascon*, a little tale published by me during the war.

"*Que!*—we will go to that Daudet!"

It was always the first word of those Tarascon moustaches on entering the studio; and, for a whole fortnight, the sculptor Amy had this phrase ringing in his ears: "And now then, when shall we find that Daudet?" The unfortunate artist was at his wits' end to find any way of sparing me this serio-comic visit. He took the moustaches of his compatriot to the Exhibition, lost them in the gallery of "dwellings of all nations," in the machinery department; poured down their throat English beer, Hungarian wines, mare's milk, and every exotic and varied drink he could find; deafened them with music of all kinds: Moorish, Tzigane, Japanese; worried them, tired them to death, and dragged them—like Tartarin on his minaret—to the summit of the Trocadéro turrets.

But the enmity of the Provençal rankled deep, and even from this lofty height, spying over Paris, he said with a frown,

"Can we see his house?"

"Whose house?"

"*Te!*—why Daudet's, of course!"

It was the same thing everywhere. Happily the excursion train got up steam again, and carried away the unsatisfied vengeance of the Tarasconian; but although that one had departed, others might arrive, and all the time the Exhibition was open, I never slept.

It is a serious affair, after all, to feel concentrated upon one's self the hatred of a whole town. Even now, whenever I go south, I feel

an awkwardness in passing Tarascon; I know they still bear me a grudge, that my books are prohibited in their libraries, are not even to be found at the railway bookstalls, and from the first moment I behold through the railway carriage window the castle of good King René, I feel myself ill at ease, and long to whisk past that station.

That is why I seize the present opportunity, to offer publicly, with my apologies to the people of Tarascon, the explanation which the former commander-in-chief of their militia came at that time to demand of me.

Tarascon was for me only a pseudonym picked up on the way from Paris to Marseilles, because it had a fine sonorous roll in the accent of the South, and sounded as the name of the station was shouted, like the triumphant war-cry of an Apache warrior. In reality, the home of Tartarin, and the scene of the famous cap-shooting parties is a little farther off, five or six leagues on the other side of the Rhone. There it was that as a child, I watched the baobab tree, languishing in the confinement of its tiny mignonette pot, faithful image of my hero, cramped within the precincts of his little town; there the Rebuffas sang the duet from *Robert le Diable*; from thence it was, in short, that in November, 1861, Tartarin and I, armed to the teeth and *chechia* on head, started to hunt the lion in Africa. To tell the truth, I did not go there altogether expressly for that purpose, being desirous above all things, of repairing my somewhat dilapidated lungs in the warm sunshine. But not in vain, heaven be praised, was I born in the land of the mighty cap-shooters! and from the moment I set foot on the deck of the *Zouave*, where they were getting on board our enormous case of arms, I imagined, more Tartarin than Tartarin himself, that I was going to exterminate all the wild beasts of the Atlas.

Ah, what a fairy tale was that first voyage! How vividly I can recall the moment of departure; the blue sea before me—blue as cobalt—all ruffled by the wind, flecked with sparkling spray, and the bowsprit of the vessel, which again and again rose in the air, dipped in the wave, trembled a moment, all white with foam, and ever pointed seawards; once more I hear in the broad sunlight, the hour of noon strike from all the clocks of Marseilles, and once more my twenty years of life ring in my head a joyous peal.



There is in the language of the poet Mistral, a word which comprises and defines clearly a whole instinct of the race: *galeja*—to joke, to make fun. And it conveys to the mind the flash of irony, the sparkle of malice, shining in the depths of the Provençal eyes. *Galeja* recurs on all occasions in the conversation, in the form of a verb or substantive. "*Vesses pas? Es uno galejado.*" "Don't you see? It is only a joke." *Taisote, galéjairé.* "Hold your tongue,

naughty jester." But to be *galejaire* does not exclude from the character either kindness or tenderness. They amuse themselves, *te!* They must laugh; but in that country laughter is the accompaniment of every sentiment, of the deepest as of the most tender.

I too am a galéjaire. In the fogs of Paris, in the splashing of her mud, in the sadness lurking in a great city, I may perhaps have lost the taste and faculty of laughter; but in reading *Tartarin*, any one may see that there then remained in me a store of gaiety which promptly broke forth in the glorious sunlight of "down there."

The story of *Tartarin* was not written till long after my journey in Algeria. The journey took place in 1861-2, the book was written in 1869. I began to publish it in parts, in the *Petit Moniteur Universel*, illustrated with amusing sketches by Emile Benassit. It was an absolute failure. The *Petit Moniteur* was a popular paper, and the populace are puzzled by printed irony which makes them think they are being laughed at. No words can describe the disappointment of the subscribers to this halfpenny paper, who delighted in *Rocambo* and the writings of Ponson du Terrail, when they read in the first chapters of the life of *Tartarin*, of the songs, of the baobab tree; their disappointment even expressed itself in personal abuse and threats of discontinued subscriptions. I used to receive letters which said: "Well, then, what follows? What does all this prove? Idiot!"—and then came a furious signature. Paul Dalloz suffered the most, for he had gone to great expense in advertisements and illustrations, and paid dear for this experience. After a dozen or so of numbers had appeared, I took pity on him and carried *Tartarin* to the *Figaro*, whose readers were better fitted to understand it. . . .

Then came fresh tribulations. The hero of my book was then called Barbarin of Tarascon.

Now there unfortunately happened to live at Tarascon an old family of the name of Barbarin, who threatened to go to law with me if I did not at once take their name out of this outrageous tomfoolery. Having a holy horror of courts of law and justice generally, I agreed to replace Barbarin by *Tartarin* in the already corrected proofs, which had, therefore, to be re-read line by line in a most scrupulous hunt for the letter B. . . . At last the book was published, and succeeded well enough in the circulating library, notwithstanding the local flavour, which could not be to the taste of every one. One must be of the south, or know it very well indeed, to understand how frequent a type amongst us this *Tartarin* is, and how, under the glorious sunshine of Tarascon, which fills its people with warmth and electricity, the wild absurdity of brains and imagination becomes developed in profoundly exaggerated forms, as varied in shape and dimensions as the fruit of a bottle-gourd.

Judged impartially, at a distance of years, *Tartarin*, with its careless and madcap style, seems to me to possess the qualities of youth, life and truth; a truth however beyond the Loire, which exaggerates, dilates, but does not lie, and is Tarascon to the backbone all the time. The quality of the writing is neither very finished nor very concise. It is what I venture to call "peripatetic literature," spoken, gesticulated; accompanied by all the easy manners of my hero. But I must own that with all my love of style, of fine prose, harmonious and full of life and colour, this is not all that is needed, in my opinion by the novelist. His truest joy must always be to create beings, to set on foot by their truth to nature types of humanity which shall thenceforward be known in the world by the name, the expression and gesture he has bestowed upon them, and which have caused them to be talked of, detested, or liked by those who read of them, without reference to their creator, or without so much as mentioning his name. For my own part, my emotion is always the same, when *apropos* of some passer-by, one of the thousand marionettes of our human comedy, political, artistic, or of the world, I hear it said, "He is a Tartarin—a Monpavon—a Delobelle." A thrill runs through me then, the proud thrill of a father, hidden amongst the crowd who applaud his son, and who all the time is longing to exclaim, "That is my boy!"

ALPHONSE DAUDET.

Social and Biological Struggles

[Continued.]

IV

ONE of the sociologists of the school now under consideration has recently made a general onslaught upon the new doctrine, but instead of going to original sources and analyzing the works which I have enumerated, in which it was first promulgated and most elaborately expounded, he has seen fit to attack a work in which it is simply set forth by the author, though with all due credit to the discoverer and chief expounder, and without claiming any originality in the matter at all. He seems to be wholly ignorant of the works named and of their authors, except as he has met with them in the book which forms the object of his polemic. He does, indeed, mention Gumpłowicz, and calls him a Pole, although he has been a professor in the University of Graz nearly all his life. He also mentions Ratenhofer, whom he calls a German, apparently for no other reason than that his works have been mostly published in Leipzig. As a matter of fact this new and vital doctrine, like the new doctrine of value in economics, is essentially Austrian, and the discovery of both these principles is probably due to the prolonged reflection of penetrating minds upon the series of social struggles which that land of many races has had to pass through.

But the author to whom I have referred has seen fit to direct his shafts at an American who is guilty only of having perceived that this principle lies at the foundation of sociology, as Ratzenhofer admits. This author characterizes the doctrine as social Darwinism, although none of the works treating it contain that or any similar expression. He is a peace reformer, and any admission that there has ever been any social virtue in war is highly offensive to him.

We are interested now only in pointing out how completely this author misunderstands the teachings of Darwin whose name he so freely invokes. He sees in Darwinism nothing but war—*bellum omnium contra omnes* (war of all men against all men). Nevertheless, ten years earlier he had said :

Just as the perfect being wins in individual struggles, so the most perfect nation wins in international struggles. Darwin's law acts as inexorably in the case of collectivities as in that of individuals. The resultant of international struggles is also the triumph of the best.

But his mind seems to have undergone a great change since that date, and he now sees no good in social struggles, but only evil.

All his examples from biology refer to the relations subsisting between predatory animals and their prey, which he looks upon as a war of extermination; whereas, as Darwin clearly saw, a predatory animal cannot exterminate its prey without at the same time exterminating itself. In fact, between a predatory animal and its prey there is no struggle at all. A struggle implies some sort of reciprocity between the parties to it. But between a wolf and a sheep there is no mutuality. All the "struggling" the sheep can do is to escape from the jaws of the wolf. Even the most robust ram in such a case would have no instinct except that of flight.

This author makes the same mistake as Professor Loria in saying that the great difference between animal and human struggles is that the former are always between different species, while the latter are between individuals of the same species. This is regarded as the final and conclusive argument. It simply shows how completely these authors fail to understand the most rudimentary principles of the biological struggle for existence. Darwin himself lays down the law that the struggle is always most intense between organisms that are most similar. The reason is obvious. It is essentially a struggle for subsistence. Any environment contains certain elements which a given organism can appropriate. Similar organisms appropriate similar elements. When too many organisms of the same general kind exist on a given area, all using the same forms of subsistence, it is evident that they will exhaust their resources, and there will be a struggle among them for the supply of their wants. This is a universal law in biology and applies to plants as well as to animals. To all outward appearances there is perfect peace. Any landscape in a state of

nature presents an aspect of complete tranquility, but the biologist knows that this is an illusion, and that there is going on an intense competition among all living things for the means of subsistence. If a given area is watched for a sufficient length of time, changes will be perceived. Certain forms will be found to have gained the ascendant and advanced in number and vigor, while certain other forms have lost ground and begun to decline. The former will ultimately come to dominate the field, and the latter will disappear, having succumbed in the struggle for existence. The observing botanist will note the existence of varieties among plants. The leaves of some will be of a deeper or a paler hue, some will develop hairs, down, tomentum, bloom, &c. All these differences in outward appearance are due to corresponding differences in the minute structure and constitution of the plants, and these differences of structure in turn enable the plant to appropriate slightly different elements from the soil, air, sunlight, &c., and thus to escape in so far from the struggle for subsistence. It is thus that varieties arise. The differentiation at length becomes specific, and we have an explanation of the "origin of species." The great principle according to which all this goes on is natural selection, and it requires generations to effect the changes. Our anti-social Darwinists seem to have no conception of this law, and never get beyond the crude idea of bloody battles in which the weak are "devoured" by the strong.

It is true that closely-allied species do compete with each other and one species often drives out another, but this is where both species require nearly the same food. Thus the brown rats in America have practically exterminated the black rats, which were formerly abundant. The latter seem to have been introduced earlier and flourished in our houses and barns until the brown or gray rats came. These required exactly the same kind of food, and being superior in certain qualities, they were able to multiply until they consumed all the food there was for rats, and the black rats, being unable to obtain any food, perished. The same occurs in a pure state of nature and on a large scale, but the great competition is always among individuals of the same species, resulting, as already described, in the gradual production of slightly different varieties and ultimately of distinct species, and thus causing all the variety and multiplicity that nature presents, and accounting for its power to appropriate all the elements of subsistence that the earth affords.

This competition is universal. It occurs among the most innocent and peaceful creatures, and even, as already remarked, among plants. But it also occurs among predatory animals, not as between them and their peaceful prey, but among themselves. If lions and tigers in the same area lived on precisely the same prey they would compete, and when the prey became scarce, the more successful of the two might exterminate the less successful. But it is probable that

these animals in their native jungles live on quite different prey, and are thus both able to subsist together. Natural selection would bring about this result. The competition here is therefore the same as elsewhere, viz., between individuals of the same species. It may result in the production of varieties and new species, but its main effect is to keep down the number of individuals of each species, so that there can never exist more than a certain number of lions, tigers, leopards, &c., in a given region.

V

It is obvious how completely different this all is from the bloody picture drawn by the well-meaning persons whose biological vagaries we are considering. But their errors in biology are scarcely less gross than their errors in ethnology. I had not proposed to consider these here, but there is one that it may be well to point out as typical of them all. This is the much-discussed doctrine of "social pathology." This is one of the most specious and pernicious of all sociological fallacies. It consists in regarding all social phenomena that do not meet with the approval of these writers, as abnormal and as social diseases. The social phenomenon commonly called war is regarded as especially irregular and morbid, and comes in for the principal share of denunciation, which seems to be the form of medical treatment chiefly prescribed. But as the entire history of mankind has been characterized by incessant war, it follows that disease has been the prevailing condition and leading characteristic of human society. One might well wonder that mankind should have even survived, much more that the race should be able to present the robust appearance which it does present. If disease prevailed over health in any such degree among individuals surely we should have a moribund race of weaklings, even if they could exist at all.

It is therefore evident that the entire doctrine of social pathology must be fundamentally false, and that what is called war must be in a certain sense a normal condition. But a very little inspection shows that what is called war is simply the struggle of the races for existence and for predominance, and is at least analogous to the biological struggle for existence, which no one would think of calling pathologic. Although, as I have shown, the principle involved in the race struggle is not the same as that involved in the organic struggle, still it has the same effect, and results in the survival of the fittest, which, as all know, are not always the ideally best. But in pure sociology we are not dealing with ideals any more than we are in biology. We are dealing with facts and searching for truth, and the fact is that the course of human development has been characterized and determined by the struggle of races, peoples, and nations, and whatever progress has been attained has grown out of this struggle, which is a perfectly normal and healthy condition, and,

properly understood, does not possess the evil and immoral attributes that have been ascribed to it. It is ethically colourless, or, as they say, amoral or anethical, and is simply the consequence of a universal, even cosmical law of nature.

Nor has this historical study anything to do with the question of the abolition of war in the present advanced stage of civilization, unless, indeed, here as everywhere, an understanding of the past places us in a better condition for stating and solving that question. To accuse, as these writers do, the historical and scientific sociologists who have discovered and expounded the law and process of social development, of being for this reason apologists of war among modern nations, is a cheap rhetorical flourish, unworthy of anyone who aspires to be accounted a philosopher.

LESTER F. WARD.

Machinery and Culture

A HARMONIOUS, well-rounded development of physical and mental powers, a deep concern in the questions relating to nature and society, a philosophical bent of mind, i. e., the search after the highest truths for their own sakes—none of these could be found under circumstances where production is carried on by crude methods except among those classes who remained free from the necessity of toil. Until the commencement of the era of machinery this was possible only by throwing upon others the burden of labour, by exploiting them. The most ideologic, the most philosophic race that history has yet recorded, the only society of thinkers and artists, devoted to science and art for their own sakes was the Athenian aristocracy, the slave-holding landlords of Athens.

Among them all labour, whether slave or free, was degrading; and justly so. It was no presumption on the part of Socrates when he said: "Traders and mechanics lack culture; they have no leisure, and without leisure no good education is possible. They only learn what their occupation requires of them; knowledge itself has no attraction for them. They take up arithmetic only for the sake of trade, not for the purpose of acquiring the knowledge of numbers. It is not given to them to see higher. The merchant and mechanic say: "The pleasure derived from honour and from knowledge is of no value when compared with money-making." However able smiths, carpenters, and shoemakers may be in their own trade, most of them are animated only with the souls of slaves; they know not the beautiful, the good or the just."

The economic development has progressed greatly since those days; the division and sub-division of labour has reached a point undreamt of then; and the increment taken by the system of pro-

duction for sale has driven both the former exploiters and cultured people into the class of producers. Not unlike the mechanics and the farmers, the rich also, are wholly taken up with their business. They do not assemble in gymnasiums and academies, but in stock exchanges and markets; the speculations in which they are absorbed do not concern the questions of truth and justice, but the prices of wool, whiskey-trust stock, corporation bonds, and dividends or coupons. These are the speculative thoughts that consume their mental activities. After these "labours" they have neither strength nor taste for any but the most grovelling amusements.

On the other hand, as far as the cultured classes are concerned, their education has become a merchandise. They, too, have neither time nor stimulus to indulge in disinterested researches after truth, or to strive after an ideal. Each one buries himself in his speciality, and considers every minute lost that is spent in learning something that cannot be reduced to dollars and cents. Hence the movement, which is becoming quite general, and in which the *New York Sun* has taken a conspicuous lead, to abolish public colleges, or to remove the study of Greek and Latin from existing ones. Whatever the pedagogic grounds may be upon which this movement seeks to place itself, the real reason for it is the vulgar and vulgarizing desire to have the youth taught only such things as are "useful," i.e., such things as can be converted into money.

Even among scientific men and artists, the instinct after a harmonious development in all directions is perceptibly losing ground. On all sides specialists are springing up. Science and art are degraded to the level of a trade. What Socrates once said of the mechanics, now holds good of these. Philosophy is on the decline—that is to say, within the classes that are here considered.

In the meantime a new sort of labour has sprung up—machine labour; and a new class—the proletariat.

The machine robs labour of all intellectual activity. The working man at a machine needs no longer to think; all he has to do is silently to obey the machine. The machine dictates to him what he has to do; he has become an appendage to it. What is said of the machine holds good also, although to a slighter extent, of handicraft; the division and sub-division of labour in the production of a single article, which was once brought forth by a single man, among innumerable working men, establishes the same conditions and paves the way for the introduction of machinery.

The first result of the monotony and absence of intellectual activity in the work of the proletarian is to dull his mind.

The second result is that he is driven to revolt against excessive hours of work. To him labour is not identical with life: life commences only when his labour is at an end. To those working men to

whom labour and life were identical, freedom of labour meant freedom of life. The working man, however, who can be said to live, i.e., enjoy life only when he does not work, can enjoy freedom of life only by being free from labour. As a matter of course, the efforts of this class of workers cannot be directed towards freeing themselves from all work. Labour is the condition precedent for life. But their efforts will necessarily be directed towards reducing their hours of work far enough to leave them time to live.

This is one of the principle sources of the struggle on the part of the modern proletariat to shorten the hours of work; a struggle which would have had no meaning to the mechanics and the farmers of former social systems. The struggle of the proletariat for shorter hours is not aimed at economic advantages, small or large, such as a rise in wages or the reduction of the number of the unemployed; the struggle for shorter hours is a struggle for life.

A third result is that machine labour is deprived of mental activity, The intellectual powers of the proletariat are not exhausted by their labour as are the intellectual powers of those workers who are not lashed to the machine; with the proletarian the intellectual powers lie fallow or are suspended during work. For this reason the craving of the proletarian to exercise his mind outside of his hours of work is strong. One of the most remarkable phenomena in modern society is the thirst for knowledge displayed by the proletariat. While all other classes kill their time with the most unintellectual pastimes, the proletarian displays a passion for intellectual culture. Only he who has had opportunity to move among the proletariat can have any adequate conception of the ambition of its members to learn and enlighten themselves. But even he who stands far away may have some inkling thereof if he compares the papers, magazines, books, and pamphlets that circulate among the working men with those that are current in higher circles.

But, above all, this thirst for knowledge is entirely unselfish with the working man. The worker at a machine will not be able to raise his income through the knowledge he may acquire. In seeking truth he does so for its own sake, not for the sake of material profit. Accordingly, he does not limit himself to any one domain of knowledge; he tries to embrace the whole; he seeks to understand the whole of society and the whole world. The hardest problems attract him most; carried on by this instinct he often loses himself in the clouds.

It is not the possession of knowledge, but the desire to acquire it that constitutes the philosopher. It is among the despised and ignorant class of the modern proletariat that the philosophical spirit of the most brilliant members of the Athenian aristocracy is revived.

But the free development of this spirit is not possible in modern society. The proletariat is without means to instruct itself; it is deprived of opportunities for systematic study; it is exposed to all the dangers and inconveniences of planless self-instruction; above all it lacks sufficient leisure. Science and art remain to the proletariat a promised land, which it looks upon from a distance, which it struggles to possess, but which it cannot yet enter.

Only the triumph of Socialism can render accessible to the proletariat all the sources of culture; only the triumph of Socialism can make possible the reduction of the necessary hours of work to such a point that the working man can enjoy leisure enough to acquire all the knowledge that he desires. The capitalist system of production awakens the desire for knowledge in the breast of the proletariat; only the Socialist system of production can satisfy it.

It is not the "Freedom of Labour" but the freedom from labour, such as machinery will make possible in a Socialist Commonwealth, that will bestow upon mankind freedom of life, freedom to engage in science and art, freedom to delight in the noblest pursuits.

Weekly People, New York.

Book Review

Landmarks of Scientific Socialism. (Anti-Duehring). By Frederick Engels, translated by Austin Lewis. Chicago: Charles H. Kerr & Co. Cloth, PLEBS, 2s. 9d.

BY UNANIMOUS vote as expressed in their enormous circulation in all the languages of the earth two volumes have come to be looked upon as the great propaganda classics of Socialism,—the *Communist Manifesto* and *Socialism, Utopian and Scientific*.

Most Socialists know that the latter work is but three chapters of an elaborate reply written by Engels to one Eugene Duehring, whose only title to fame now lies in the fact that he was fortunate enough to be intellectually demolished by Frederick Engels. Many Socialists have doubtless wondered why the remainder of the *Anti-Duehring* has not been translated into English. They liked the "sample" and would have gladly devoured more had it been accessible. Those who had read the German usually replied to this question by stating that a large part of the untranslated portion was taken up with personal controversy and ridicule of Duehring, which would be unintelligible to one who did not know the object at which the sarcasm and invective was aimed.

In the translation which now lies before us this difficulty has been most happily met. Austin Lewis, the translator, has not hesitated to cut out these uninteresting and unimportant portions, or to shorten and summarize them, while he has made accessible to the English speaking world, a great mass of valuable material.

As those who have read the introduction to *Socialism, Utopian and Scientific*, will remember, Duehring had signalized his "conversion" to Socialism, like many another convert, by setting about the reformation of Socialism, and the better to do this he evolved an entire philosophy of human life. In order to thoroughly answer him, Engels was forced to follow his devious wanderings in all paths of human investigation. The result is that in this book we have the best summary of the Socialist philosophy, as a philosophy, that has, perhaps, ever been written.

Herr Duehring had based his philosophy on "eternal truths," and on his own system of physics, chemistry, biology, ethics and economics, and into all these fields Engels follows him.

He starts off with a definition of Socialism, which in some respects can scarcely be improved upon :

Modern Socialism is in its essence the product of the existence on the one hand of the class antagonisms which are dominant in modern society, between the property possessors and those who have no property and between the wage-workers and the bourgeois ; and, on the other, of the anarchy which is prevalent in modern production. In its theoretical form however it appears as a development of the fundamental ideas of the great French philosophers of the eighteenth century. Like every new theory it was obliged to attach itself to the existing philosophy however deeply its roots were embedded in the economic fact. (p. 36.)

Engels places himself firmly upon the dialectic method with these words :

If we examine nature, the history of man or own intellectual activities, we have presented to us an endless coil of inter-relations and changes in which nothing is constant whatever be its nature, time or position, but everything is in motion, suffers change and passes away. (pp. 40-41.)

Upon this basis he proceeds to develop the philosophy of historical materialism.

We cannot concern ourselves long with his discussions of metaphysics, or of natural science, because in both these fields the positions he maintains are now practically accepted, so far as their fundamental principles are concerned, and it is only in his illustrations, which necessarily were taken from contemporaneous science, that there has been change. It is, however, interesting to see this early Socialist championing the cause of Darwin at a time when most scientists were still denying the truths of evolution.

The chapter on "Morals and Law" serves to dispose of some old bug-a-boos of "eternal truths" and "justice" and "equality" that are still found in the minds of the great mass of capitalist thinkers. His treatment of the "equality" idea is worthy of reproduction :

As well known, the bourgeois class as soon as it escaped from the domination of the ruling class in the cities, by which process the mediæval stage passes into the modern, has been steadily and inevitably dogged by a shadow, the proletariat. So also the bourgeois demands for equality

are accompanied by the proletarian demands for equality. Directly the demand for the abolition of class privileges was made by the bourgeois, there succeeded the proletarian demand for the abolition of classes themselves. This was first made in a religious form and was based upon early Christianity, but later derived its support from the bourgeois theories of equality. The proletarians take the bourgeois at their word, they demand the realization of equality not merely apparently, not merely in the sphere of government but actually in the sphere of society and economics. Since the French bourgeoisie of the great Revolution placed equality in the foreground of their movement, the French proletariat has answered it blow for blow with the demand for social and economic equality, and equality has become the special battle cry of the French proletariat.

The demand for equality as made by the proletariat has a double significance. Either it is, as was particularly the case at first, in the Peasants' War, for example, a natural reaction against social inequalities which were obvious, against the contrast between rich and poor, masters and slaves, luxurious and hungry, and as such it is simply an expression of revolutionary instinct finding its justification in that fact and in that fact alone. On the other hand it may arise from reaction against the bourgeois claims of equality from which it deduces more or less just and far-reaching claims, serves as a means of agitation to stir the workers, by means of a cry adopted by the capitalists themselves, against the capitalists, and in this case stands or falls with bourgeois equality itself. In both cases the real content of the proletarian claims of equality is the abolition of classes. Every demand for equality transcending this is of necessity absurd.

So the notion of equality, in its proletarian as well as in its bourgeois form, is itself a historic product. Certain circumstances were required to produce it and these in their turn proceeded from a long anterior history. It is therefore anything but an eternal truth. And if the public regards it as self-evident in one sense or another, if, as Marx remarks, "it already occupies the position of a popular prejudice" it is not due to its being an axiomatic truth but to the universal broadening of conception in accordance with the spirit of the eighteenth century.

It is in the portion dealing with "Political Economy" and "Socialism" however, that the most valuable material is found.

Here we have clearly set forth the idea that each social stage must have its own political economy and that there are no universal economic laws, truths which some of our colleges have not yet learned, although they are slowly and grudgingly, and never with credit, accepting the truths set forth by socialist writers of more than a generation ago. Here is the way Engels states this point:

Political economy is, in the widest sense, the science of the laws controlling the production and exchange of the material necessities of life in human society. Production and exchange are two entirely different functions. Production may exist without exchange, exchange—since there can only be exchange of products—cannot exist without production. Each of the two social functions is controlled by entirely different external influences and thus has, generally speaking, its own peculiar laws. But on the other hand they become so mutually involved at a given time and react one upon the other that they might be designated the abscissas and ordinates of the economic curve.

The conditions under which men produce and exchange develop from land to land, and in the same land from generation to generation. Political economy cannot be the same for all lands and for all historical epochs. From the bow and arrow, from the stone knife and the exceptional and occasional trading intercourse of the barbarian to the steam engine with its thousands of horse-power, to the mechanical weaving machine, to the railway and the Bank of England is a tremendous leap. The Patagonians do not have production on a large scale and world-commerce any more than they have swindling or bankruptcy. Anyone who should attempt to apply the same laws of political economy to Patagonia as to present-day England would only succeed in producing stupid common-places. Political economy is thus really a historical science. It is engaged with historical material, that is, material which is always in course of development. At the close of this investigation it can, for the first time, show the few, (especially as regards production and exchange) general laws which apply universally. In this way it is made evident that the laws which are common to certain methods of production or forms of exchange are common to all historical periods in which these methods of production and forms of exchange are the same. Thus for example with the introduction of the specie, there came into being a series of laws which holds good for all lands and historical epochs in which specie is a means of exchange.

Again those who are expecting a recognition of the injustice of social relations to bring about Socialism would do well to ponder these words of Engels:

While political economy in a narrow sense arose in the minds of a few geniuses of the seventeenth century, it is, in its positive formulation by the physiocrats and Adam Smith, substantially a child of the eighteenth century, and expresses itself in the acquisitions of the great contemporary French philosophers with all the excellencies and defects of that time. What we have said of the French philosophers applies also to the economists of that day. The new science was with them not the expression of the condition and needs of the time but the expression of eternal reason; the laws of production and exchange discovered by them were not the laws of a given historical form of those facts but eternal natural laws; they derived them from the nature of man. But this man, seen clearly, was a burgher of the Middle Ages on the high road to becoming a modern bourgeois, and his nature consisted in this that he had to manufacture commodities and carry on his trade according to the given historical conditions of that period.

(Herr Duehring having applied the two man theory¹ to political economic conditions and having decided that such conditions are unjust, upon which conclusion he bases his revolutionary attitude, Engels remarks as follows):

If we have no better security for the revolution in the present methods of distribution of the products of labour with all their crying antagonisms of misery and luxury, of poverty and ostentation, than the consciousness that this method of distribution is unjust and that justice must finally prevail, we should be in evil plight and would have to stay there a long time. The mystics of the Middle Ages who dreamed of an approaching thousand years' kingdom of righteousness had the consciousness of the injustice of

¹ "Robinson, 'sword in hand,' makes Friday his slave."

class antagonisms. At the beginning of modern history three hundred years ago, Thomas Muenzer shouted it aloud to all the world. In the English and French bourgeois revolutions the same cry was heard and died away ineffectually. And if the same cry, after the formation of class antagonisms and class distinctions left the working, suffering classes cold until 1830, if it now takes hold of one land after another with the same results and the same intensity, in proportion as the greater industry has developed in the individual countries, if in one generation, it has acquired a force which defies all the powers opposed to it and can be sure of victory in the near future—how comes it about? From this, that the greater industry has created the modern proletariat, a class, which for the first time in history can set about the abolition not of this or that particular class organization or of this or that particular class privilege but of classes in general, and it is in the position that it must carry out this line of action on the penalty of sinking to the Chinese coolie level. And that the same greater industry has on the other hand produced a class which is in possession of all the tools of production and the means of life but in every period of prosperity (Schwindelperiode) and in each succeeding panic shows that it is incapable of controlling in the future the growing productive forces; a class under whose leadership society runs headlong to ruin like a locomotive whose closed safety-valve the engine driver is too weak to open. In other words it has come about that the productive forces of the modern capitalist mode of production as well as the system of distribution based upon it are in glaring contradiction to the mode of production itself and to such a degree that a revolution in the modes of production and distribution must take place which will abolish all class differences or the whole of modern society will fall. It is in these actual material facts, which are necessarily becoming more and more evident to the exploited proletariat, that the confidence in the victory of modern Socialism finds its foundation, and not in this or that bookworm's notion of justice and injustice. (pp. 182-183.)

Duehring argued that exploitation is based upon force and that therefore political force is the dominant fact and not economic power. Again Engel's reply has a very modern sound, as an answer to those who seek to use the capitalist state as a means of abolishing present conditions without abolishing the class character of that state, or to those who consider that the possession of that state by the capitalist class will enable them to permanently enslave the workers :

If political conditions are the decisive causes of economic conditions the modern bourgeoisie would necessarily not have progressed as the result of a fight with feudalism, but would be the darling child of its womb. Everybody knows that the opposite is the case. The bourgeoisie, originally bound to pay feudal dues to the dominant feudal nobility, recruited from bond slaves and thralls, in a subject state, has, in the course of its conflict with the nobility captured position after position, and finally has come into possession of the power in civilized countries. In France it directly attacked the nobility, in England it made the aristocracy more and more bourgeois and finally incorporated it with itself as a sort of ornament. And how did this come about? Entirely through the transformation of economic conditions which was sooner or later followed either by the voluntary or compulsory transformation of political conditions. The fight of the bourgeoisie against the feudal nobility is the fight of the city against the country, of industry against landlordism, of economy based on money against economy based on natural products. The distinguished weapons

of the bourgeois in this fight were those which came into existence through the development of increasing economic force by reason of the growth at first of hand-manufacture and afterwards machine-manufacture and through the extension of trade. During the whole of this conflict the political power was in the hands of the nobility, with the exception of a period when the king employed the bourgeoisie against the nobility in order to hold one in check by means of the other. From the very moment, however, in which the bourgeoisie still deprived of political power began to be dangerous because of the development of its economic power the monarchy again turned to the nobility and thereby brought about the revolution of the bourgeois first in England and then in France. The political conditions in France remained unaltered until the economic conditions outgrew them. In politics the noble was everything, the bourgeois nothing. As a social factor the bourgeoisie was of the highest importance while the nobility had abandoned all its social functions and yet pocketed revenues for social services which it did not any longer perform. Even this is not sufficient. Bourgeois Society was, as far as the whole matter of production is concerned, tied and bound in the political feudal forms of the Middle Ages, which this production, not only as regards manufacture but as regards handwork also, had long transcended amid all the thousand-fold gild-privileges and local and provincial tax impositions which had become mere obstacles and fetters to production. The bourgeois revolution put an end to them. But the economic condition did not, as Herr Duehring would imply, forthwith adapt itself to the political circumstances,—that the king and the nobility spent a long time in trying the effect—but it threw all the mouldy old political rubbish aside and shaped new political conditions in which the new economic conditions might come into existence and develop. And it has developed splendidly in this suitable political and legal atmosphere, so splendidly that the bourgeoisie is now not very far from the position which the nobility occupied in 1789. It is becoming more and more not alone a social superfluity but a social impediment. It takes an ever diminishing part in the work of production and becomes more and more, as the noble did, a mere revenue consuming class. And this revolution in its position and the creation of a new class, that of the proletariat, came about without any force-nonsense but by purely economic means. Further more, it has by no means accomplished it by its own will-ful act. On the other hand it has accomplished itself irresistibly against the wish and intentions of the bourgeoisie. Its own productive forces have taken the management of affairs and are driving modern bourgeois society to the necessity of revolution or destruction. (pp. 190-1-2.)

Other phases of political economy and Socialism are taken up and discussed in the same fundamental manner.

While this larger work can never become so popular, nor so fundamental as *Socialism, Utopian and Scientific*, it is not too much to say that the time will come when every Socialist who makes any pretensions to familiarity with the fundamentals of Socialism will have a copy of this translation in his library.

A. M. SIMONS.

THE "PLEBS" LEAGUE.

Third Annual Meet

AUGUST 7th, 1911,

AT

**TAPHOUSE'S MUSIC ROOM,
Magdalen Street, Oxford.**

Meeting will commence at 3 p.m. sharp.

CHAIRMAN : T. P. KEATING.

AGENDA :

1. Report of year's work.
 2. Financial Statement.
 3. Future of the Magazine.
 4. Other Business.
-

N.B.—Members who are in arrears with League or Magazine subs. should endeavour to clear their accounts before July 25 next, to allow of the books being made up to the end of July.