THE

"Plebs" Magazine

Vol. II. April, 1910. No. 3.

EDITORIAL

THE March Editorial elaborated at some length the origin, growth, and finally the antagonism between the forces of knowing and doing, of theory and practice. The latter contradiction we pointed out is simply the reflex of economic antagonism. So long as society is divided by this economic cleavage, just so long will all the contradictions consequent on that cleavage, including that between theory and practice, remain. *They can only be eliminated by eliminating the economic cause.* But to whom does the performance of this task fall? Is it everybody's affair? Is such an elimination to be accomplished by all classes irrespective of the economic differences upon which these classes are based? We are as yet not speaking of the methods to be employed for that accomplishment. We simply seek an answer to the question. Whose is the task? To say that it is the business of all classes is to say there are no classes: to say that there are no classes is to say that there are no economic antagonisms to eliminate, which is absurd. And yet it is just such an absurdity which serves as a premise for our "humanistic methodizers," for those who "forget" the *disease* in order to "remember" *a cure.* This confusion is only intelligible where we recognize that it is the product of an economic system, having Capital at the one pole and Wage-Labour at the other pole, and between these two poles, a class that is analogous to the intermediate stage between solid and liquid matter, viz. pulpiness. *It is not at the intermediate, but at the extremes that we find an answer to our question.* There we find the fundamental contradiction and at the same time the means for its elimination. Economic development has already signed the death warrant of the capitalist class and appointed the working-class executioner. It is the last class on the historic list and it alone can rid society of economic antagonisms. All class struggles in the past lead up to this, the final class struggle. But in each case their rule was grounded on the subjection of a class below. *There is no class below the working class.* And thus it is that its emancipation involves the disappearance of classes and therefore of class rule from society.

Who shall Accomplish?

If then the task falls for accomplishment to the army of Wage-Labourers, to those who having nothing to dispose of but their labour power; if no other class can deputize for them in this work, then it follows that the means and method of accomplishment are to be found within this economic category and not outside of it. The organization of the working class is strong only as it is self-reliant; it succeeds only as it is self-sufficient. The evolution of the working-class movement presents itself to us as a coming to consciousness of these principles, industrially and politically. *Independent doing* is the principle which is applied to the accomplishment of its historic mission. To do, it must *know* how to do. If then the *doing* is independent so must the *knowing* partake of the same independent character. Before a doctor can remove a disease he must *know* what the disease is. The subject of his knowing is the object of his doing. It is just the same with the working-class movement. For what purpose is it organized? To overthrow economic servitude. But it is not enough to know that the system is wrong—that labour is robbed of its produce. What would we think of the detective, who, being called in to investigate a case of robbery should content himself with simply noting the number of jewels stolen? If he knew his business and hoped to get on the track of the criminal, he would set about investigating by what means the thief gained an entrance, or how he made his exit and so on. *Knowledge of the process* by which the robbery was carried out would be to him the necessary condition for the running down of the robber. So it is with the Labour Movement. It can only attain its end by a full and clear understanding of the capitalist process. To overcome it must first understand. *But it has to understand that which is to be overcome.* To say "Knowledge is power" is to say nothing which is intelligible unless we at the same time qualify the "knowledge" and the "power." The power as we have already pointed out having for its object the *elimination* of economic antagonisms and the rule of classes, can only be exercised by the exploited class, the lowest on the list, *and by none other.* The knowledge or understanding of these antagonisms and their development being an essential weapon in the battle of elimination, can therefore only be furnished out of the experience of the exploited class *and out of none other.* That is the logic of our position as an educational organization, having nothing in common with other educational bodies because of the very fact, that it is born out of the industrial and political experience of a class that has nothing in common with other classes.

Understand to Overcome.

⁂ ⁂ ⁂

For Miss Mc Millan "there is no such thing as working-class education," and yet again there is "the history of working-class education," and further, "there is, in a sense, such a thing as

working-class education." Unlike Dame Quickly, she does not know when to have it. Miss Mc Millan puts the question, "What is democratic education?" We are still waiting for an answer. Evidently she had a kind of apprehension that the task was of the superhuman order. "At this moment, then, every friend of Labour is not only bound to speak the truth, but to try first of all to find it. The position is not an easy one" (!!) And so Miss Mc Millan, unable to find the pearl of great price in the tearful vale of "violent action," and "pharisaical aloofness," betakes herself in a fairy chariot to a world where class distinctions cease from troubling and the cultured are at rest. "We knew . . . that the IMMUTABLE LAWS and ETERNAL VERITIES had laughed at our puny distinctions and ignored them for ever." We have no wish to involve Miss Mc Millan in a breach of confidence with Eternity, but we confess a strong curiosity to examine these distinction-obliterating wonders. Evidently Eternity does not in this case at least, descend to particulars, and personally we have no particular desire to ascend into the "timeless and spaceless." But we are at a loss to understand how this eternal "hilarity can find a place in those 'serious' and 'solemn' moments for all the friends of labour." Surely the "immutable and eternal" laugh that can ignore the distinctions, can also ignore the solemnity that these distinctions appear to arouse, or is it possible that of the laughter and the solemnity, *one is of the mock order.* We are aware that both may produce tears and it may be that the eclectic soul in its humanistic yearnings and liberal loosenings would desire to combine a little of both. Until the "verities" vouchsafe a revelation of this mystery unto us, we will continue to murmur our *Ave Margaret* night and morning. The principle of democracy upside down—which is bureaucracy right side up—is sharply brought out in Miss Mc Millan's epoch-making utterance. The "laws" and the "verities" have their source *above.* Possibly our "timid" policy of pharasaical aloofness" has been responsible for our failure to see the wisdom of this arrangement and to look from a lowlier point of view. It is in accordance with this "from below" principle that we have pleasure in inverting Miss Mc Millan's pronouncement, "*The laws of capitalism and the verities of a class struggle laugh at those 'immutable laws' and 'eternal verities' and ignore them for ever.*"

As it is Above.

⁂ ⁂ ⁂

MISS MC MILLAN is indeed hopelessly confused if she regards the specialized nature of our educational policy as bearing any analogy to the ultilitarian aim of technical education. And yet this seems to be what she laboured throughout to prove. That the "Plebs" League has a useful aim in the promotion of working-class education is perfectly true. But that this aim consists in teaching working men industrial efficiency in their particular trades is absolutely without foundation, Because we place political economy in the

forefront of our curriculum we fail to see what connexion there is between such and technical education. Just as a knowledge of anatomy is a primarily essential to an understanding of the human body so is a knowledge of economics a pre-requisite to an understanding of society. We seek to lay bare the real relations between capital and labour, and the laws which determine the development of these relations so that the working class may understand its task and how best to accomplish it. This, however, seems, if we understand Miss Mc Millan rightly, unnecessary: "Can you fight without getting your arms loose? And do you rightly believe that these arms once really free you will need lessons as to the exact way you should move your muscles?" Example: Professor Smith humanely educated at Oxford has his arms free. Freddy Welsh has had lessons "as to the exact way to move (*his*) muscles." They fight; the "liberally educated" and loose-armed Professor goes to the floor "baffled," and the cause needs not a "wide" education to discover.

The Lamentations of Miss Mc Millan.

What must the "eternal verities" think about the following? "With what perseverance does labour prepare only for battle never for restitution." How does restitution arrive? Does it come before the battle or after? Do we restitute for battle or battle for restitution? Or is restitution to be brought about by a *tuition of rest*? Rest is a principle that has much to recommend it and the working class we hope will some day participate in a larger measure than at present. But they must first *wrest* and that involves strength; their own strength—and that in turn implies knowledge which is not to be obtained in the 'Varsity "with all its priceless associations and its splendid apparatus." This latter fact seems strange to Miss Mc Millan. "A defiant Bill or a dozen perhaps—not the land of England. A labour college—not Oxford and all its resources." Let us take up the dirge. *Secular Education—not Religious teaching and all its resources! Trade Unionism—not Capitalism and all its resources! A working-class political party—not Liberalism and all its resources! A remedy—not the disease in all its resources!* But Miss Mc Millan will not join us in our pibroch. We have changed the key, she says. "It is well for labour men to keep aloof in their trade union." Reason: "for that is the meaning of a trade union." "Also to keep aloof and clear in their political organization." Reason: "for that is the meaning of a Labour Party." But now reason has to be abstracted from. For Miss Mc Millan there has been reason, there is no longer any. She "*forgets*" the scientific method to "*remember*" some "lawyers proofs." She began in mystification, she ends in obfuscation. Ignoring distinctions that are real, she introduces spook distinctions. Just fancy "The student is not in action, he is preparing for action." Surely if he is preparing for the action and that action is the overthrow of the enemy, he does not go to the enemy to be prepared. Reduced to the last analysis all Miss

Mc Millan's arguments conclude in a negation of the existence of the working class as an economic category. When she has answered the question "What is Democracy?" the task of answering "What is democratic education?" may be less difficult, at the present she is quite unable to rid herself of bourgeois ideology as is evidenced time and again in her article. With her, to "become citizens" is to "become free." It does not seem to occur to her that *real democracy is not based upon citizenship*, which is a bourgeois abstraction of an archaic order, *but upon economic equality*. It is to that end that all independant working-class organization is directed. It is for that purpose that the "Plebs" policy of an independent and specialized education is promoted.

W. W. C.

The Establishment of Sociology

PROFESSOR LESTER F. WARD
Brown University

(*Continued*)

TO be more specific, sociology shows us that human institutions constitute the structures, organs, and organic parts of society, and that they are not independent, but are connected into one great system, which is society. It has not only done this as the result of a study of society in its finished form, but it has confirmed this truth by a study of the origin of human institutions. It has shown how they have arisen. It has traced them back to their primordial, undifferentiated forms, and studied their development from this state of homogeneity to their present state of heterogeneity. It has watched first their differentiation and then their integration.

The general result is that we have come to know what society really is. Sociology has enabled us to orient ourselves in this great maze of human life, to see what the human race is, how it came into existence, approximately when and where it began, in what ways it has developed and advanced, and how it has come to be what we find it. "Know thyself," said the old Greek philosopher; but man never did really know himself until these studies of origins had been undertaken and successfully carried out.

Involved in this we have the true genesis of all the most important human institutions—religion, language, marriage, custom, war, cannibalism, slavery, caste, law jurisprudence, government, the state, property, industry, art, and science. Instead of a great bewildering maze, a vast meaningless chaos, society reveals itself

as a true genetic product of uniform laws and forces, a product of social causation, and stands out in clear relief against the background of history.

But sociology has done more than this. It has not only discovered the laws of society; it has discovered the principles according to which social operations take place. It has gone farther even than physics, which has thus far only discovered the law of gravitation, but has not yet discovered its cause or principle. Sociology has not only established the law of social evolution, but it has found the principle underlying and explaining that law. Just as in biology the world was never satisfied with the law of organic evolution worked out by Goethe and Lamarck until the principle of natural selection was discovered which explained the workings of that law, so in sociology it was not enough to formulate the law of social evolution, however clear it may have been, and the next step has been taken in bringing to light the sociological homologue of natural selection which explains the process of social evolution. That principle is not the same as natural selection, but it serves the same purpose. It also resembles the latter in growing out of the life-struggle and in being a consequence of it; but, instead of consisting in the hereditary selection of the successful elements of that struggle, it consists in the ultimate union of the opposing elements and their combination and assimilation. Successively higher and higher social structures are thus created by a process of natural synthesis, and society evolves from stage to stage. The struggling groups infuse into each other the most vigorous qualities of each, cross all the hereditary strains, double their social efficiency at each cross, and place each new product on a higher plane of existence. It is the cross-fertilization of cultures.

The place of sociology among the sciences has been definitely fixed. It stands at the summit of the scale of great sciences arranged in the ascending order of speciality and complexity according to the law of evolutionary progress. It rests directly upon psychology, in which it has its roots, although it presents a great number of striking parallels with biology, chemistry, physics, and even astronomy, show that there are universal laws operating in every domain of nature. The motor principle of sociology is psychic, and the study of this principle has shown that social phenomena are produced by the action of true natural forces, which, when abstraction is made of all perturbing elements, are found to be as regular and reliable as are the forces of gravitation, chemical affinity, or organic growth.

As a result of this it has been possible to establish the subscience of social mechanics and to work it out with something like the completeness that has been attained in the mechanics of physical nature. At least it has been possible to distinguish clearly

between static and dynamic phenomena in society. This distinction, dimly seen by Comte, and still more dimly by Spencer, when fully and clearly apprehended, throws a flood of light over the whole field of social phenomena. Social statics is found to constitute the domain of social construction, and to explain the origin of all social structures and human institutions. It underlies the social order. Social dynamics, on the other hand, is the domain of social transformation, and explains all change in social structures and human institutions. It is the science of social progress. The laws of both these sciences have been to a large extent discovered and formulated, and their workings described.

All this has been accomplished by a careful study of the social energy alone. But sociology has not stopped here. It has plunged boldly into the far more difficult and recondite field of social control. The social energy is so powerful as to exceed its proper bounds and threaten the overthrow of the social order, and would do so but for some effective curb to its action. The motor power of society has to be guided into channels through which it can flow in harmony with the safety of society. This guiding or directing agent is a far more subtle element than the motor force itself, and one much more difficult to understand. But sociology has not shrunk from the task of studying it and unfolding its laws and operations, and these have been sufficiently mastered to be in large part formulated and described. This fairly complete mastery of the dynamic and directive agents of society has placed sociology in position to deal in a thoroughly scientific way with all the facts and phenomena of society—with its origin, its history, and its present condition.

Finally, with the light shed by social dynamics on the spontaneous modification of social structures and the consequent progress of society in the past, and further guided by the established law of social uniformitarianism, which enables us to judge the future by the past, sociology has now begun, not only in some degree to forecast the future of society, but to venture suggestions at least as to how the established principles of the science may be applied to the future advantageous modification of existing social structures. In other words, sociology, established as a pure science, is now entering upon its applied stage, which is the great practical object for which it exists.

"Cheerful Chuckles" are unavoidably held over till next issue.

Will Members and Readers please note that Subscriptions for League Membership and Magazine are now due.

The undermentioned is one of the two papers given at the Central Labour College Debating Society, on March 7th last, the other will appear next month. Mr. Frank Hodges, of Monmouth Western Valleys District, S.W.M.F., took the affirmative, and Mr. M. F. Titterington of Leeds, Halifax, and Bradford Staff Pressers Association, the negative. We think they are worthy of a wider audience and so print them without apology.—Ed.

Is Optimism Irrational?

A GREAT WRITER once declared that "all was for the best in this, this best of all possible worlds." Such an outlook upon life, upon the universe, expresses the essence of optimism. The term "Optimism" has its original in the Latin word "Optimus," meaning the best. If the sentiment expressed in the above phrase be true, then it is logically true to state that all is for the worst in this worst, the worst of all possible worlds. For the simple reason that such a conclusion is an intellectual necessity. The human mind is limited to one world, to one humanity. The one must be inevitably the best, and the worst, because it is the only one.

It is not to my purpose to disprove the existence of optimism. There are certain types of optimism in human lives; types with which I propose to deal. But there is no optimism based upon what we consider to be rational grounds.

There is a type of optimism distinctly physical, recognized by medical men as organic, or, if you like, *Gastric Optimism.*

There is a second variety, to which we can give the high sounding appellation, *Emotional Optimism.*

This last kind, being so closely related to religion, I should like to term *Celestial Optimism.* It is then the specific character of religion to be terrestially pessimistic, and celestially optimistic. It is the blind, groping optimism of faith.

There is yet another variety which savours of rationality. A type of mongrel rationality composed of certain elements of faith, combined with an attempt to explain the universe upon a teleological basis, i.e. that every effect in the cosmos is so arranged, so ordered, that although superficially it may appear evil or undesigned, it is in reality an expression of the best. It is intrinsically good. If I can prove that all these taken together, or, each one taken separately, are not based upon rational grounds, then, I think that the case for rational optimism is dead.

Let us deal briefly with the first. Do not be alarmed with the name—*Gastric Optimism.* This type presupposes a good digestive apparatus. One eminent medical authority states, that in perfect health the nerves combine to produce the "Organic sense of well-being." "In health every man has an organic bias towards imism." This is the general type of optimism. Is not that

man able to sleep securely upon the broad pillow of cosmos, who, having a good digestion, satiated with the flesh, fowl, and fruits of this earth, lays himself down, muttering complacently, "God is in His heaven, all's right with the world." Such is the optimism of that poet, one of the greatest pessimists that ever lived; Omar Khayham.

Here with a Loaf of Bread beneath the Bough,
A Flask of Wine, a Book of verse—and Thou
Beside me singing in the Wilderness—
And Wilderness is Paradise enow."

This optimism is that of the whole sentient creation. It has appetites. Satisfaction of them is the only optimism possible; and is imperative. Human life, as all other life, is made up of sensation. No sensation, no life. If one is optimistic at all, one merely hopes for more sensation. It is as true of *psychic sensation* as of any other. a man hopes and strives for a new society, a new economy, a pleasure economy. What is a pleasure economy? A stage in which the pleasureable sensations preponderate over the painful. This provides a physical, organic basis for all optimism.

Why does a man marry? Why do men and women marry? To experience more happiness. Happiness comes through struggle either by the individual or the race. He seeks to avoid pain. Pain is always there, lurking behind him and within him as some fearsome sprite, whose name is Eternity. He is at all times in the "fell clutch of circumstance," battered by the "bludgeonings of chance." To ask him to be optimistic is to ask him to hope for the best, which hope implies the lack of the best. You may say a man is more happy if he be optimistic. I agree with you. But it is the happiness of sentient life. Pure reason is too cold a process to admit the warmth of happiness. When you speak of the future happiness of society, your phrases are irrational, because all that is to experience happiness is a little, almost invisible, mass of jelly called a nucleus, that pursues its little life undisturbed and undeveloped. Stowed away in the hidden recesses of the body it is content. Why speak of future happiness for it?

Let us deal with another variety of optimism. That which I have termed *Celestial Optimism*. Mankind as a whole, has never been optimistic about a terrestial or earthly life. It has always struggled in the icy grip of an unsympathetic environment, and has always been defeated. Mankind itself is merely a becoming, it is no absolute quantity. The individual life has been, and is, a pilgrimage "from the darkness to the dark." From the cemetery we travel a circuitous, torturous route back to the vaults of death. Mankind in this its own sojourn has invented the idea of "Immortality," the most alarming, the most appreciated, yet the most elusive idea ever generated in the social heart. The tragedy of this life could only be explained by the concept of immortality. Perfectly natural, in every way it has cheered mankind in its absolute despair. It was, and is

still, greedily snatched at as the balm of all earthly life. Taking the mass of humanity to-day it is buoyed up by the concept of an eternal life. Men snatch at it as greedily as a Minister of State snatches at a coronet. Both are promised elegant headdresses. It is the faith which anticipates a happy hunting ground, or a harem, or a harp. We all share in this kind of optimism.

Is this rational optimism? It cannot be demonstrated to be founded on fact. Therefore it revolves itself into faith. To make optimism rational it must allow of scientific demonstration.

We will treat for a moment of that other variety of optimism; which I have termed *Mongrel Optimism* for the want of a better term. This may be expressed in the words of Pope to a large degree: "Whatever is, is right"; of which passage Dickens said, "This means that nothing that is, or ever has been, is wrong." This introduces a standard of rightness, at best arbitrary. Whatever is, certainly is, and could not have been otherwise by the very law of causation. But whether it is good or bad, or the best we can imagine, is another matter. This is resolved into a question of design or telesis behind the Universe. Every phenomenon being intrinsically good because it fits in with a given end. "A Providence that shapes our ends, rough hew them how we will." But there are scores of obvious facts that the physicists or geologists could give you which would prove otherwise. We concern ourselves with the distinctly human point of view. We do not impute motives to God. Prof. Ward gives some appalling examples of "Lack of adaption" in *Dynamic Sociology*, Vol. II. Scientists have expressed what Omar has expressed in verse upon this theme:—

Ah Love! could thou and I with Fate conspire
To grasp this sorry Scheme of Things entire,
Would we not shatter it to bits—and then
Re-mould it nearer to the Heart's Desire?

Such optimism comes from the idea that "What is evolved was first involved." A movement from the heart of God back to his breast. It could be aptly described as a boomerang movement. Optimism may be justified, or may even be rational if the universe be considered rational. But "Who knows? Who knows?"

Whatever order or design appears in the Universe, is basically the law of adaptation. Determinism is the key to the understanding of the cosmos. The cosmos is haphazard. No one knows the How or the Where! Faith alone supplies an answer. Let it suffice that faith is non rational. So is the animal or organic optimism to which I have already referred. Intellect is the antithesis of Optimism. Take an historical survey of the great thinkers of the world if you are anxious to prove that pessimism is the comcomitant of intelligence.

And now I proceed to demonstrate why I think Optimism is Irrational. Suppose we take a hopeful view of life. Into what does

this hope resolve itself? Into the idea that some day, at some remote period, pleasure will be in the ascendency. Assuming for the moment that the hope is well fouunded. Does it illuminate the disc of our innermost souls? Does it justify any definite attempt to attain it? Superficially, yes! Fundamentally, no! I proceed to explain.

Life is itself a process. So is society. To the individual it is a prolonged gurgle and an extinction. We are from eight to twelve years coming to consciousness. We are sometimes longer. We are conscious of our being at most, forty years. We feel the vitality of life for a much shorter period. We exploit nature for a few years: we conquer her. Then she rounds on us; takes her essence quietly, sometimes violently, away. Physiologically, dying or death, is a prolonged process. Finally we are one with the elements. During our sojourn we touch other life at different points, we make friendships, we form loves. These two are the only real things in life. The only things that makes a prolonged stay upon this earth, bearable. At twenty years of age we feel the cosmic tides surging through us. We associate with persons of the other sex. To avoid the eternal torture rack, we marry. By design or accident we bring forth from the innermost of our beings that which makes the continuance of the process possible. Other life is created to tread in the same horror-strewn pathway as its parents trod. Like you it asked not to come; like you it will go without being consulted, without consulting. Your consciousness, one time proud and haughty, saying:—"I am the master of my fate, captain of my soul,"—will flit from you like snow upon the desert's dusty face. You feel it slipping from you, your last moments are a convulsion. When leaving his loved ones, the thoughtful man asks but one favour:—I would like nature to confer one boon upon me. I would like to know that my elements remain with the elements of those I love in that infinite graveyard. Please do not tell me that that is an individual outlook. It is what you all feel in the last analysis.

I will deal in conclusion with the social aspect of life. Here the fiendish laughter of the cosmos rings out more mockingly. As in the individual, where nature gives life merely to snatch it hastily away, so in society itself, we have the mockery developed upon a far grander scale. We are here touching questions far more fundamental than questions of Socialism. These thoughts will prove that Socialism itself will be merely the light scene in this majestic tragedy. It has been said that we are immortal in the race. That is the subterfuge for all thought, when once personal immortality is discarded. In the first place the race is not immortal, and therefore not absolute. It had a beginning and will have an end. The misery of life has been intensified by the growth of society because a higher intelligence has been evolved, and consequently, the human being more susceptible to pain. The

history of humanity comes as a shock to the intelligent, sensitive soul. He asks if it will ever be thus. Society finds itself at any epoch surrounded by various problems. But hope "springing eternal in the human breast" beckons society alluringly onward to a brighter day. This from the beginning. But come a little lower. In actual fact the process known as society is a greater mockery than any, e.g. Are you not aware that there is a cosmic power urging men to reproduce their kind? This in turn reproduces society, each new generation inherits the problems of the past, creates its own, endeavours to solve them, lives its little fitful life, passes away with the same hope that the newer generation will live happier and richer. Remember when you bring life into the world you are creating a new society, with its concomitant or even increasing despair. Problems are at an end if you refuse to reproduce. You look forward to five hundred years hence, and you say: there, individuals will be happy. It is purely a question of relative happiness. If it were absolute happiness it would be at once reduced to an eternal monotone. Yet you would go on obeying blindly the cosmic force—reproducing your kind for five hundred years; plunging millions of lives into this noisome vortex in order that series or batches of individuals, that at any time might exist, should be happy for forty years and then expire.

You who believe in evolution know what is meant by the law of dissolution. This is as far as rationality has reached: I leave Mr. Titterington to harmonize it with optimism. The toil, the suffering of humanity, kicking against the goads, the achievements, the glories, if any, to be resolved into the nebulæ. This rings down the curtain upon the last scene. If there is any optimism it is only of that kind that attempts to make the best of what is inevitable. That hope which inspires men to exploit the material life with advantage. But there is no rationality in optimism of this character. It cannot establish harmony where there is the discord of nature. The only harmony I can conceive, is when the music of the spheres will not be broken into by the agonizing cry of humanity, in short, when humanity has ceased to exist. "It is a consumation devoutly to be desired."

> And if the Wine you drink, the Lip you press,
> End in the Nothing all Things end in—Yes—
> Then fancy while Thou art Thou art but what
> Thou shalt be—Nothing—Thou shalt not be less.

FRANK HODGES.

Volume I. of the "Plebs" Magazine is now ready. This is most tastefully bound in half-leather; and should be on the book-shelf of every member. It would make an excellent and useful present, price 3/-, and is obtainable from The Editor.

Evolution

The following remarkable poem appeared some few days since from the pen of MR. LANGDON SMITH. This reprint is taken from a copy which appeared in *T.P.'s Weekly*.—Ed.

WHEN you were a tadpole and I was a fish,
In the Paleozöic time,
And side by side on the ebbing tide
We sprawled through the ooze and the slime,
Or skittered with many a caudal flip
Through the depths of the Cambrian fen
My heart was rife with the joy of life,
For I loved you even then.

Mindless we lived and mindless we loved,
And mindless at last we died;
And deep in a rift of the Caradoc drift
We slumbered side by side.
The world turned on in the lathe of time,
The hot lands heaved amain,
Till we caught our breath from the womb of death,
And crept into life again.

We were Amphibians, scaled and tailed,
And drab as a dead man's hand;
We coiled at ease 'neath the dripping trees,
Or trailed through the mud and sand,
Croaking and blind with our five-clawed feet
Writing a language dumb,
With never a spark in the empty dark
To hint at a life to come.

Yet happy we lived, and happy we loved,
And happy we died once more;
Our forms were rolled in the clinging mould
Of a Neocomian shore.
The æons came, and the æons fled,
And the sleep that wrapped us fast
Was riven away in a newer day,
And the night of death was past.

Then light and swift through the jungle trees
We swung in our airy flights,
Or breathed in the balms of the fronded palms,
In the hush of the moonless nights.
And oh! what beautiful years were these,
When our hearts clung each to each;
When life was filled, and our senses thrilled
In the first faint dawn of speech.

I was thewed like an Auroch bull
And tusked like the great Cave Bear;
And you, my sweet, from head to feet
Were gowned in your glorious hair.
Deep in the gloom of a fireless cave,
When the night fell o'er the plain,
And the moon hung red o'er the river bed,
We mumbled the bones of the slain.

I flaked a flint to a cutting edge,
And shaped it with brutish craft;
I broke a shank from the woodland dank,
And fitted it, head and haft.
Then I hid me close to the reedy tarn,
Where the Mammoth came to drink;
Through brawn and bone I drave the stone,
And slew him upon the brink.

Loud I howled through the moonlit wastes,
Loud answered our kith and kin;
From West and East to the crimson feast
The clan came trooping in.
O'er joint and gristle and padded hoof,
We fought, and clawed, and tore,
And cheek by jowl, with many a growl
We talked the marvel o'er.

I carved that fight on a reindeer bone,
With rude and hairy hand,
I pictured his fall on the cavern wall
That men might understand.
For we lived by blood, and the right of might,
Ere human laws were drawn,
And the age of Sin did not begin
Till our brutal tusks were gone.

And that was a million years ago,
In a time that no man knows;
Yet here to-night, in the mellow light,
We sit at Delmonico's;
Your eyes are deep as the Devon Springs,
Your hair is dark as jet,
Your years are few, your life is new,
Your soul untried, and yet—

Our trail is on the Kimmeridge clay,
And the scrap of the Purbeck flags,
We have left our bones in the Bagshot stones,
And deep in the Coraline crags;

Our love is old, our lives are old,
And death shall come amain;
Should it come to-day, what man may say
That we shall not live again?

Thus life by life, and love by love,
We passed through the cycles strange,
And breath by breath, and death by death,
We followed the chain of change,
Till there came a time in the law of life
When o'er the nursing sod
The shadows broke, and the soul awoke
In a strange dim dream of God.

God wrought our souls from the Tremadoc beds
And fashioned them wings to fly;
He sowed our spawn in the world's dim dawn,
And I know it shall not die.
Though cities have sprung above the graves
Where the crook-boned men made war,
And the ox-wain creaks o'er the buried caves
Where the mummied Mammoths are.

Then as we linger at luncheon here,
O'er many a dainty dish,
Let us drink anew to the time when you
Were a tadpole and I was a fish.

LANGDON SMITH.

The Case against Ruskin College

IV.—THE METHODS OF JUDAS

AT first the policy of the now dominant party in regard to Mr. Hird was one of kindness. In October, 1906, a student, Mr. Ernest Lightowler, modelled a bust of the Principal, which was presented to the College. A great gathering witnessed the ceremony of unveiling. Professor Lees Smith who occupied the chair remarked that the *esprit de corps* of Ruskin College was superior to that of the public school, and of the College in the University to which he belonged, and he went on to attribute this to Mr. Hird, who "had the greatest possible influence in creating the spirit which makes our living here what it is . . . . . these calm placid features . . . . . represent the Principal in his happier moments—that is, they do not represent, they could not represent, the difficulties and the uncertainties, the dislike through which the Principal and the College had to pass, long before the bust was modelled." Mr. Herbert S. Leon, retired stockbroker, and a member of the Executive Committee, described him as "a man for whom I have personally a

great admiration, and if I may be allowed to say so, my feeling of justice has created some sympathy within me for what Mr. Hird has undergone for his principles, and I think that alone, apart from his other qualities, has cemented a friendship, which I trust will last as long as either of us lives." He also remarked that "the quality of the students was good," and "Mr. Hird has been the guide, philosopher, and friend of the College." Mr. Sydney Ball, who also played an eventful part, in what was to follow, paid a no less glowing tribute. He declared that Mr. Hird had "piloted it [the College] through an uncertain and even problematic period to a position which is at once certain and assured. That he has laid hold of the hearts as well as the minds of the students is abundantly evident by this demonstration—a demonstration which I should like to say is as gratifying to the Council as it must be to Mr. Hird himself, for it gives the Council an opportunity of endorsing the Students' testimony to the energy and single-minded devotion with which Mr. Hird has served the interests of Ruskin College. The College has had an important and distinguished present, and it is the hope and confidence of us all that it will have a still more important and distinguished future. It has not only attracted attention and sympathy, but it has established itself in the confidence of Older Oxford, which has come, not, as I think was suggested in the lusty youth of the College, to destroy, but which has come to supplement, and also, I hope, to strengthen, widen, and develop. The College itself suggests more than it has actually achieved. But, we believe that its capacity for suggestion, and also its power of achievement will not easily be exhausted. In its brief, but honourable history, Mr. Hird's name will always be cherished as one of those who deserve best of the College, and this Bust will always remind successive students of the deep debt of obligation which the College owes to him."

Compare this fulsome flattery with the scurrility which has since and still continues to be, poured out upon Mr. Hird and the students who stuck to him. The cloven hoof, however, is plainly evident in Mr. Ball's speech. The speeches of the students, several of whom took part, were full of devoted appreciation and of testimony to the benefits they had derived from Mr. Hird, as tutor and friend. Mr. Hird himself said, "This College was founded to realize great and lofty ideals. I will not say we wished to overturn Society, for I should be misunderstood, and I might fill you with alarm. But some of us, at least, still cherish the ideas of a new and better order of Society, which shall grow with the growth of the ages, till its beauty shall have absorbed the rotten waste of a bungling and crumbling civilization. And when this Movement shall be tarnished by prosperity, and its early ideals be blurred by success, and the palsying hand of time shall have cast it into the grave of respectability, I hope that this Bust will serve in that future to remind some brave

young spirits that in the past days men toiled for truth, and staked their all to rescue the human conscience and human reason from the fetters of authority, and from the manacles of power." Who would have thought this mournful vision would so soon have been realized!

In 1906, the Council having meanwhile been reinforced by two more Dons, Mr. Sydney Ball, M.A., and the Rev. A. J. Carlyle, M.A., and having lost one Labour man, Mr. Keir Hardie, M.P., the anti-labour section proceeded to remodel the constitution of the College. The Council, as before, met once a year, but an Executive was appointed to meet every month, consisting of five Dons, two Labour men (Mr. Richard Bell, M P., and Mr. C. W. Bowerman, M.P.) and Mr. H. S Leon and Dr. Paton of the National Home Reading Union; the last named, however, never attended. It will be seen that the Executive were practically a majority of the Council, and that the latter, therefore, could not but endorse its actions. The function of the Executive had formerly been carried out by the Faculty, which latter was now abolished. Mr. Hird's reluctance to acquiesce in what was pending made it necessary, from the point of spoilers, to rob him of his power, and this work they now felt strong enough to commence. Mr. Lees Smith, having been appointed Professor at the Bristol University College, retired from the teaching staff of R. C., and was appointed "Director of Studies" and permanent Chairman of the Executive. This appointment was a studied insult to Mr. Hird. The new Vice-Principal was Mr. C. S. Buxton, the son of the Postmaster-General. At the same time a new lecturer in Economics, a Mr. Furniss, was appointed. He was even more dogmatically reactionary than Mr. Lees Smith. It seems difficult to believe, but it is none the less a fact, that all these changes in the teaching were made without consulting Mr. Hird, the nominal Principal. At the same time the following Minute was passed :—

> That in view of the appointment of an Executive Committee and the consequent termination of the Faculty, the domestic and educational work of the College be entrusted to a House Committee of three, consisting of the Principal, the Vice-Principal, and the General Secretary; and that they shall be responsible to the Executive, to whom they shall report when required.

It is evident that this Minute cancels the one passed on the appointment of Mr. Hird in February, 1903, which read : That his duties be to be in charge of Ruskin Hall, Oxford, to lecture at the Hall, and to act as Chairman of the Faculty.

No one after this, could reasonably hold Mr. Hird solely responsible for the discipline of the College, yet it is because of his "failure to maintain discipline," and "adequately to interpret to the students the decisions of the Executive" (if we are to believe the statements made on behalf of that body), that Mr. Hird was required to resign. Mr. Hird had no voice whatever in the control of the institution except as a member of the House Committee, where he could be outvoted by his two colleagues, Mr. Buxton and Mr. Wilson.

WILLIAM H. SEED.

REVIEW

THE WORLD'S REVOLUTIONS, *by Ernest Utermann*,
(See Page 3 cover.)

In the first chapter on "The Individual and the Universe" we have a vivid picture, drawn from the personal experience of the writer, of a ship-wrecked mariner on an island in the South Pacific. With this incident as text, it is shown how even so isolated an individual as this lone sailor would appear to be is united with the closest ties, not only to all mankind, past and present, but to the whole cosmical scheme in the uttermost ends of the universe.

The chapters on "Primitive Human Revolutions" are a simple striking description of the great pre-historic revolutions, both physical and human. Here we watch the dawn of invention and see the beginning of a social institution.

Chapter three, "The Roman Empire and its Proletariat" brings before us the class struggles of ancient Rome. We see the first beginning of working-class resistance to tyranny and the mental preparation for the next social stage.

Chapter four is on "The Christian Proletariat and its Mission." This is almost the first attempt to treat biblical history in the light of modern materialism and it throws a bright illumination upon many points. We see the growth of the Jewish people, the economic preparation for the coming of Jesus and the part which he played as a social revolutionist. This revolution was turned aside and its energy exploited by the ruling class under Constantine, "Jesus had transformed the Jewish God of hate into a God of Love and a Prince of Peace. The Church of possessing Christians moulded him into a hideous monstrosity, a God of love who is a God of hate, and a Prince of Peace who brings a sword. . . . . But the modern proletarian remembers the cross on Golgotha."

Chapter five, "Feudal Ecclesiasticism and its Disintegration":—"The betrayal of the Christian movement by the wealthy Christians did not save the Roman State. It had disrupted the proletarian organization, but it could not do away with the proletariat. Much less would it abolish the conditions which created the proletariat. So the Roman Empire fell to pieces." On its ruins sprang the feudalism of the middle-ages which is analyzed, and its progress described with its proletarian revolt and its ecclesiastical tyranny until it had begun to disintegrate under the influence of the beginning of capitalism.

Chapter six, "The American Revolution and its Reflex in France": Here for the first time America enters into world history. In a short space it passes through the stages that have taken centuries in other countries until the ruling classes of America found need for a government which they could control and issued a Declaration of Independence. When the revolution had been fought it was found that King George had only been supplanted by King Capital.

Chapter seven, "Bourgeois Revolutions in Europe": "The history of Bourgeois revolutions is a succession of compromises much boasting and wordy valour before the commencement of hostilities, and vacillations in moments of supreme decision, and of incapacity for grasping the full fruits of victory gained for them by others. That is the ever recurring spectacle in every attempt of the Bourgeois leaders to gain control of the political power. . . . History brands them as the most incapable and aimless class

that ever held the helm of Society. And it will write upon the grave of the Bourgeoisie the flaming epitaph: 'Here lies the capitalist class—a traitor to its ideals, incompetent and an enemy to mankind'."

The last chapter treats of the "Proletarian World Movement," sums up the forces that have gone to lay the foundations of that revolution and make it invincible, and offers a suggestion of its goal.

The book is an important addition to educational and propaganda literature.

General Economic and Social Development in Greece

I. From the Heroic Era to the Revolution of Cleisthenes

"Not democracy caused the downfall of Athens. . . . but slavery, ostracizing the labour of the free citizen."—*Engels.*

The Dawn of Grecian History

ONE thousand years before our era, Greece enters the historic period. History, itself, begins with the invention of a phonetic alphabet and the use of writing in letters. This technical development marks the attainment of a people to the higher reaches of barbarism, to within a stone's throw of civilization. History, like everything else in its infancy, is weak and feeble, its utterances are crude and its childish fancy obscures the actual trend of events. It is thus that we find in the earliest beginnings of ancient history *more poetry than truth.* Nevertheless, human phantasy is not able to invent what has not been perceived previously by the senses, something absolutely new—and thus it is that in early history, consisting mainly of marvellous tales aud poetical embellishments, there is to be found an important residuum of actual fact, which these marvels reflect in an exaggerated and grotesque fashion. That the human mind is but an attribute of the entire universe and that its content can therefore only be an effect of the other parts, is strikingly borne home upon us when we remember, that in the description of their gods men have never been able to transcend the human form.

It is in the Heroic Era, the era of the iron axe, the iron sword and the iron ploughshare, that we get our first glimpse of the Greeks. What races had lived in Greece before the Greeks had arrived there we do not know. The name Greek or Graeci seems to have been bestowed on the dwellers by the Italian tribes, and signifies a tribe on the western coast and therefore near to Italy. The Hellenes was the name by which the people we called Greeks designated themselves. According to their tradition they had descended from a common ancestor Hellen, who had three sons. These latter were the ancestors of the various Grecian tribes —Dorians, Æolians, Ionians and Achaeans. Not only are the Gentile features which we elaborated in our previous article manifest here, but also the fact that descent in the male line had already been established.

The various tribes settled in different parts of Greece and Asia Minor, each existing more or less independent of the other and very often at war with each other. *The history of Greece is not the history of a single nation*, but of a number of tribes at different points of development, each of which at different times threw off the Gentile form of organization and established themselves (after in many cases subdividing) into independent city-states. *This absence of uniformity in Grecian development* may be to some extent accounted for by the fact that these original tribes had divided before their departure from their northern home and that they enter Greece, neither at the same point nor at the same time. *The absence of unity among the Greeks* (excepting one occasion) is in some measure explained by the nature of the country in which they lived. The mountains of Greece and the seaboard of Greece are physical features which excited a great influence upon Grecian development. No spot in the whole land is more than fifteen miles from some considerable mountain range and more than forty miles from the coast. Its mountainous nature fitted Greece admirably for the home of small independent states, each well protected from its neighbours. Its insular position and irregular coast-line rendered almost every district conveniently accessible from the sea, and thus allowed the Greeks to become maritime traders. The numerous islands surrounding Greece provided the sea-going merchants with ideal sporting-grounds. That strong individualism which characterized the ancient Greeks was in a large measure due to the geographical environment which tended to split up the population.

The Defence of the Phœnicians

When Greece was yet in the status of Barbarism, the Phœnicians, a nation that had already entered civilization upon the shores of the Mediterranean, were carrying on a flourishing sea-going trade. The walls of Tyre and Sidon must, from the earliest moment when the mists of antiquity began to lift, have found their way into the hands of the Greek barbarians. These would in time be copied by the Greeks themselves and "home industry" would in this way develop. There can be no doubt that Phœnicia, in art and in handicraft particularly, must have left her impression upon Greece. When Phœnicia, through external invasion and internal dissention withdrew more and more from Greek waters, Greece, her first rival in shipping, succeeded her as mistress of the Mediterranean.

Economic Conditions in the Heroic Era

Our first glimpse of Greece, 1000 B.C., reveals the existence of Gentilism. As already pointed out, the upper stage of barbarism had been entered and iron had become the servant of man, the edged tool with which man clove his way to civilization. The poems of Homer furnish us with some idea of the technical progress attained at this period. The bellows, the handmill, the potter's wheel, the preparation of oil and wine, a well developed fashioning of metals, wagons, war-chariots, the beginning of artistic architecture and fortified towns are among the principal accomplishments. A considerable sea-giving trade had already been developed and the surplus-products of the Grecian tribes were to

be found circulating as *commodities* in the markets of Asia Minor. Such a degree of economic development implies the predominance of the male as a productive agent. We therefore find that paternal law has been established and that the children inherit the father's property. As the result of this institution is to favour accumulation of wealth in the family, the latter begins to usurp the power that was formerly vested in the gens. Some families accumulating more property than others, there develops a distinction in rank reflecting a difference in possessions and finally this manifests itself in an hereditary nobility who seek to exclusively hold the Gentile offices. Wealth thus asserting itself in private hands, we are not surprised to find wars between the tribes, prosecuted for the sole purpose of plunder. Not only do the cattle and lands of the conquered become the property of the victorious tribe, but the conquered themselves supply the increasing demand for more and more labour-power. *The enslavement of those outside the tribe paves the way for the enslavement of those inside the tribe.* Thus do we find in the Heroic Era of the Greeks the presence of elements foreign to the nature of Gentile organization and which have already begun to undermine it. "In short," says Engels, "Wealth is praised and respected as the highest treasure and the old Gentile institutions are abused in order to justify the forcible robbery of wealth." The more this development proceeded, the more did it conflict with the democratic character of the gens. Either the one or the other would have to give way, and that could only be the gens. Nowhere in clearer outline do we witness the downfall and disappearance of Gentile society and the coming into being of its successor—political society, than in the history of Attica.

Early Attica

Attica is that portion of territory situated in the form of a triangle in the the south east corner of Northern Greece. In the heroic era it was inhabited by four tribes forming together the Attic, or as they afterwards became, the Athenian Nation. Each tribe dwelt in a separate part of the land and consisted of three phratries each, while the number of gentes in each phratry was thirty. The gens was therefore the unit of the Attic society. There were twelve different towns corresponding to the number of phratries. Each tribe and phratry managed its own affairs The Athenians, or people of Attica, had very early come into contact with Phœnicia, and soon the former developed a considerable sea trade. In proportion as this development took place, foreign traders, or merchants, entered Attica, but not being Gentile members they could take no part in the tribal affairs. In addition to this, the division of the land among private individuals, and the purchase and sale of the land together with an increasing division of labour between agricultural industry, trade and navigation, caused the Gentiles themselves to get intermingled, with the result that they found themselves in gentes, phratries, and tribes other than their own and therefore were unable to take part in tribal affairs.

A constitution attributed to Theseus, seeks to bring order out of this chaos. It is, however, brought about at the expense of Gentile organization. What was privately conducted by the tribes and phratries autonomously,

s now made collective business to be dealt with by a general council at Athens. But still another act is ascribed to Theseus. He divided the Athenian Nation into three classes, irrespective of gentes, called, (1) *Eupatridae* or well-born, (2) *Geomori* or husbandmen, and (3) *Demiurgi* or artisans, assigning the principal offices to the first class. This division is not only a recognition of property and of the hereditary element in the government of society, but also reveals the uprising of an institution that was to give perpetuity to this class division and to class rule—*the State.* Still, as the voting power remained as before in the gentes, this division did not prove effective in creating a legal distinction.

Economic Development in Attica

The production of a continually increasing number and variety of commodities for the purpose of exchange gives rise to a division of labour between a class engaged in production, and a new class; whose sole function is to exchange what has been produced—*the merchants.* Here in Attica we find merchants' capital at work, developing outside of production, but at the same time subjugating production to its rule. The use of metal coins as a medium of exchange, the possession of which gives to the possessor control of the world of production, gave to the merchant a commanding power. The desire to transform more and more commodities into this money-commodity became translated into a demand for more labour power. The result is an extension of slavery which takes on a harsher character as production for exchange develops. On the other hand this has the effect of branding work for a livelihood as degrading in the eyes of the Gentiles within the tribe or nation.

The possession of land in Attica by private families and the sale of commodities for money, forms the requisite condition for the purchase and sale of land, and the lending of money on land. Usurer's capital is the parasitic twin brother of merchant's capital. Six hundred years before our era the wealthy families in Attica had succeeded in ruining the small land-holders by means of mortgage. Thus do we find at this early period all the primitive forms of unearned income, rent, interest, and profit. When Solon came to the archonship (the highest office at this time, a development from the office of Gentile chief) 594 B.C., things had become unbearable through these economic conditions just outlined. A portion of the Athenians had fallen themselves into slavery through debt, others had mortgages on their lands and were quite unable to clear them off, and as a consequence of these and other evils due to commercial profit, rent, and usury, Attica was on the verge of ruin. *The rule of money sealed the doom of Gentilism.* The division of labour between agriculture and industry, between country and town, between production and exchange, the division of the people according to calling *had created interests apart from the gens, and offices to protect and promote these interests independent of, and overlooking the Gentile institutions.* Already the number of slaves greatly exceeded that of free Athenians. Slavery was quite incompatible with Gentile democracy, and the larger the slave-mass became, the more

sharply the contradiction appeared. At the same time the commercial ascendancy of the Athenians drew into Attica an increasing number of foreign people, who clamoured more and more for the removal of Gentile encumbrances which disenfranchized them. The march of economic development is not an idyll. Like murder, it will out! Gentile society stood convicted of obsoleteness and was sentenced to death. And on behalf of economic development the State officiated as executioner.

The Reforms of Solon

The threatened ruin of Attica by the revolt of the debtors compelled Solon to introduce some measure of palliation, even in the interest of the aristocratic usurers themselves. He proceeded to cancel all debts then existing, to prohibit the enslavement of the debtors, and to fix a limit to the quantity of land any one individual could own. In doing this Solon had of course to violate the property of the creditors. Such a violation is by no means peculiar to Attica. As Engels truly says: *It is absolutely true that no more than 2,500 years, private property could only be protected by the violation of private property.* The French Revolution is a striking example of this in more modern times. Solon introduced another constitutional element into the creation of the rising State, and that of *private property.* Theseus, as we have already seen, divided the population into four classes *according to the measure of their wealth:* each class was invested with certain powers and upon each were imposed certain obligations. Only those of the first class were eligible to the high offices; the second and third performed different grades of military service and were eligible to minor offices. The fourth class, the Thetes or poor freemen, had only the right to speak and vote in the public assembly. They had the very blessed privilege of "choosing" some one from the other three classes to represent them. In addition they had certain military and naval services to perform. However, says Engels, "The gradation of political rights according to private property was not one of those institutions without which a State cannot exist." Even in Athens it played only a passing rôle. Since the time of Aristides, all offices were open to all the citizens.

The effect of the Solonic legislation was not to retard the forces of economic development or to destroy the distinction between rich and poor. Solon himself knew the impossibility of accomplishing any harmonious "merging of class with class." Herodotus ironically informs us, that Solon having compelled the citizens to take an oath that they would not change the constitution for ten years, left the country, so that he himself might not be compelled to rescind it. Meanwhile, speculation in land on a large scale having been made impossible, the wealthy now invested their money in movable property, e.g. slaves, ships, grain, wine, and oil. The consequent rise of the commercial class corresponded to the decline in Gentile organization. This old Gentile nobitity lived for the most part upon the Attic plans, the commercial nobility near the sea, while the mass of poorer Gentiles eked out a meagre livelihood upon the hills. Between these three classes, the plain, the shore, and the mountain, as they were designated, there was continual conflict, the Solonic constitution not-

withstanding. At one time the plain would persuade the mountain to join hands against the shore, at another time the shore and the mountain would be found allied against the plain, and yet again, plain and shore would combine against the revolt of the disposessed. Such a situation has quite a modern flavour about it. There was one feature about this Athenian conflict which commends itself to us, and which is lacking in present-day issues. In Athens when a revolt took place, *everyone was compelled to take sides.* If anyone showed "non-partisan" or "non-political" symptoms, he was justly dishonoured. There was no waiting to see "which way the cat would jump." He who waited was suitably dealt with.

The Downfall of the Gens and the Rise of the State in Attica

The climax to these continual conflicts was reached when Cleisthenes, the leader of the commercial class, "took the people into partnership" and defeated the aristocratic party led by Isagoras, established a political democracy, 509 B.C. *The ruin of Gentilism was by this act completed. And in its place there arose the second form of social organization,* viz. *political society or the state.* Cleisthenes uprooted the four old tribes founded upon kinship, and divided Attica into one hundred demoi or townships, every one of which had local self-government. Ten of these township formed a tribe, also autonomous, and having certain military and naval obligations to fulfil. Finally these ten tribes formed into the last member of the territorial series, viz. the Athenian Commonwealth or State. It was represented by a senate or council of five hundred, elected by the ten tribes, an ecclesia or public assembly where every citizen could enter and vote, and archons or ministers of state, of law and order, together with other minor officials.

Thus while Gentile society was based upon kinship, political society is based upon territory and property. While membership of a gen's was the only condition which had to be fulfilled in order to take part in Gentile affairs, local residence constitutes in Athenian political society the basis of citizenship. Gentile society, in its purity, was a real democracy Where all rule nobody rules. True class distinctions manifested themselves in the bosom of Gentile organization latterly, they simply reflected the march of economic development which divided society along the line of property. And when Gentilism was no longer in harmony with economic conditions, its doom was sealed and it ultimately disappeared. *Political democracy* was its successor. But the demos did not include all of the people. In Athens, the great majority of the producers were slaves and were excluded from political rights. It was because of this, because the Athenian democracy was *based upon slave labour* that it ultimately fell to the floor. And in modern political society there is the same contradiction. It is becoming more and more out of harmony with economic development. Like Gentile society, it too, is fated to go. A real democracy can have but one secure basis: the free labour of economically equal and free producers. And beneath the surface the embers glow, the living embers of *industrial democracy.*

WILL W. CRAIK.

Next Month:—General Economic and Social Development of Greece, *Contd.* II. From the Revolution of Cleisthenes to the Downfall of Greece.