

THE
“Plebs” Magazine

Vol. I.

November, 1909.

No. 10.

Copyright Entered at Stationer's Hall.

EDITORIAL

ENGLAND is not the only country in the world that has had its Ruskin College, or even its Ruskin College dispute. Some seven or eight years ago there was founded a Ruskin College at Trenton, in the State of Montana, U.S.A. In the

**An American
“Ruskin.”** origin, growth and general development of these two widely separated institutions—geographically, there are so many features in common that we feel it will be of sufficient interest to our readers, and to all those especially, who have followed the evolution of the Oxford institution, to warrant our dealing with the matter in these pages.



THE first parallel circumstance is to be found in the fact that both institutions owed their existence for the most part to an American gentleman, Mr. Walter Vrooman. He was the most prominent figure

**Mr. Walter
Vrooman.** in the early days of both the Oxford and Trenton Colleges, and from him they derived their chief financial support. In the second place his association with these colleges was in each instance of a brief character. He practically passed out of the life of the Oxford “Ruskin” within three years after its opening, while he withdrew from the American institution about the end of 1902. Speaking of Mr. Vrooman, Mr. Charles H. Kerr, of Chicago,—to whom we are indebted for the details, and who had the best of facilities for observing the work of the Trenton “Ruskin”, says “He is a genuine whole-souled fellow with the greatest enthusiasm for Socialism as he understands it; but he is hopelessly erratic . . . he wants to be dictator in whatever is doing.”

ANOTHER striking coincidence is brought out in the fact that internal strife breaks out in both colleges with the severance of Mr. Vroeman's connexion. Although these institutions contained within them,

**A Parallel
Development.**

right away from the beginning, only the possibilities of a brief life, yet the germs of dissolution were nourished by certain circumstances springing from the same cause in each case, which shortened the career of both. The American college had for its president Mr. George Mc. A. Miller, whose position was analogous to that held by Mr. Dennis Hird at Oxford. Soon after the commencement of the American Movement, the college was removed from Trenton to Glen Ellyn, in the State of Illinois. Further, it was linked up with other schools and embraced by the University. In this amalgamation it came under the influence of the Chicago Law School, at the head of which was a Mr. J. J. Tobias, who soon afterwards was appointed Chancellor of the University. (In this development we have to note again another parallel in the development of the English "Ruskin.") The part played by Chancellor Tobias is analogous to that performed by Professor H. B. Lees Smith at Oxford. Coming direct from the University, the latter gentleman was appointed to teach permanently at Ruskin College, or Ruskin Hall as it was called at that time, in 1899. We have no information regarding the earlier proclivities of Tobias. But during the earlier days of the Oxford institution Mr. Lees Smith manifested a militant interest in the cause of Labour. One of the founders of the Oxford Labour Party, which sometimes met at Ruskin Hall—for neutrality had not yet shown its teeth—in the course of lectures delivered under the auspices of that party emphasized the self-sufficiency of the Labour Movement. We have a copy of one of these lectures before us in which the following appears :—

The Liberal Party may be good,
The Tory Party may be good,
But the Party for Labour is the Labour Party.

But the "exaggerations" and "efflorescences" of youth were destined soon to pass away. Time and a Professorship pushed the toys of childhood into the fanciful past. In 1907 he was appointed a Professor at Bristol University and Director of Studies at Ruskin College. In 1908 he executed a commission for the Liberal Government in India, and in 1909 he was adopted by the Liberal Party as the Liberal candidate for Northampton. Time had worked wonders for the erstwhile pioneer whose wonderful evolution is, to some extent, illumined by the student's notebook throughout the years of his Ruskin lectureship. Close contact with the University was the task which Professor Lees Smith set himself, to realize which certain obstacles had to be removed. Sociology was a subject taught by Mr. Hird, which the Professor did not regard with favour, and he resolved to have it removed and to substitute for it among other

things—Temperance. How this attempt failed our readers know. Among other schemes there arose the Oxford and Working-Class Education Committee upon which the promoters were careful to appoint five prominent members of the Ruskin College Council. Proposed relations connecting Ruskin College with the University were agreed to by these five members, and so that everything necessary to efface the identity of Ruskin College as a working-class institution in the militant sense of that word might be done, a few internal relations required some alteration. The disposal of the Principal was the finishing stroke in these necessary adjustments of inner to outer relations.



To return to the American institution at the point when it comes under the influence of the Chancellor of the University. An essential part of the work at the American Ruskin College which had been agreed upon by all parties concerned before

The Old Story. the University consolidation was, that economics and sociology should be taught from the working-class point of view; not, however, excluding the capitalist presentation if found desirable. A course of lectures was delivered by Mrs. May Wood Simons, a prominent member of the American Working-Class Movement, on economics, and towards the end of the spring term of 1903, Chancellor Tobias attempted to do for the American institution and its President what was successfully attempted on the English institution and its Principal. Tobias resolved to stamp out "the growing prominence of Socialism in the College." He gave out interviews and newspaper reports asserting that a small group of extremist students together with the President, Mr. Miller, were alone responsible for this alarming tendency, and he undertook to get rid of both students and President forthwith. We have but to turn to the Ruskin Sub-Committee report to again recognize the parallelism of circumstance. On page 4 we read that :

"It has been contended on the one hand by some members of the staff that the Principal has acted in such a way as to identify the College with Socialism. As evidence of this they have brought forward :

(1) His attitude at social functions, that he has frequently suggested the singing of "the Red Flag."

(2) The general tone in which he refers to the work and objects of the College. It has been urged that his influence is used to confirm the students in Socialism."

Of course it is true that his resignation was demanded on the ground of failure to maintain discipline. But as trade-unionists we know well enough that when one of our number is victimized by the employer, the latter does not justify his action on the ground that the worker *used his influence to confirm his fellow workers in Trade Unionism*, but finds some technical point in the sphere of employment.

Dennis Hird was victimized for his opinions, of that we are certain, and the very fact that the defenders of Ruskin College are going about the country, among whom is Dr. Slater; quoting from Mr. Hird's lectures for the purpose of proving his crudeness, rawness, dogmatism, and a host of other worthless falsehoods, confirms us in our certainty.



UP to this point no one will fail to observe the remarkable parallels connected with the development of these two institutions. The explanation of the parallelisms is patent. *Like causes produce like effects.* It is the same song from the same

**The Outcome
of
University
Influence.**

repertoire. And the burden of the song is Socialism. While it is true that the students and the President of Ruskin College Glen Ellyn defeated the schemes of the enemy; while it is true that they retained their position in the College and succeeded in having it put upon a more democratic basis, they omitted to do one thing which lost it its life. That one thing was to shake off the University with its re-actionary influence. Ruskin College, Glen Ellyn, soon passed out of the life of the working-class movement just as Ruskin College is to-day passing.



BEWARE of false guides is a maxim that never had a meaning fraught with deeper significance for the working-class movement than it has to-day. And as that movement depends for its success upon its organized adaption to the march of industrial

The Moral. evolution, and inasmuch as that adaption involves a knowledge of social conditions, laws and forces, it is a matter of vital importance that the educational domain of the Labour Movement be secured against the influx of corrupting elements. "We must have the guidance of the University in education," said a well-known trade union official recently. We have shown what are the actual results of such guidance, in two kindred institutions. The argument is, however, only another edition of "We must have the guidance of the capitalist in politics." Both are based upon a lack of knowledge as to the real position and mission of the working class in society. They represent a caste who arrogantly believe themselves to be the quickest to understand everything, the most capable to govern everything, the worthiest to direct everything, whose credentials are parchment and diploma, and whose creed is summed up in the couplet:

Work to the labourers
Power to the educated people.

The workers, to them, are a mass of barbarians, to tame whom is their lofty function. Understanding of the historical initiative and self-consciousness of the working class, they have none. And having

nothing, they nothing give that can assist the Labour Movement in its efforts against the modern hierarchy embodied in the State. Such knowledge does not flow from University guidance, from a thinking caste, from an intellectual aristocracy who regard themselves as the trustees of the world's wisdom, but from the democratic material reality. To attempt any manner of affiliation between these antithetical forces of democracy and aristocracy either in industrial, political, or educational life, is to turn from the surrounding reality, which is fatal. The day of success becomes the day of defeat. Against such alliances, and particularly against educational alliances with the University the PLEBS raises the warning hand and utters the warning cry, a warning that is at the same time a proclamation of the all-sufficiency of a proletariat borrowing nothing but from itself and hoping nothing but from its strength alone.

A proof of this article has been forwarded to Mr. Macdonald accompanied by an offer of the use of the pages of the Magazine for the purpose of a reply. We are therefore expecting a reply for next issue.—*Editor.*

Easy Outlines of Economic Science

No. 9—A Criticism of Mr. J. R. Macdonald's

Socialism and Society.

HAVING completed those outlines devoted to a brief introduction of some of the fundamentals of Marxian Economics, it is proposed to devote this and the remainder of the series, i.e. two more articles, to a refutation of some criticisms of Marx.

Mr. Macdonald's book is chosen because it has had a fairly wide circulation in the Labour Movement. The references to Marx are sometimes sympathetic, sometimes arrogant, but always irritably patronizing. They amount substantially to the claim that Marx was intellectual heir to Hegel; was consequently pre-Darwinian, and therefore, as regards the laws of social change, non-scientific. However, let Macdonald speak for himself. "But his (Marx's) conception of the method of social change misled him as to how the Socialist forces were to act. Darwin had to contribute the work of his life to human knowledge before Socialism could be placed on a definitely scientific foundation" (pp. 98-99). "Change presented itself to Marx not as a process of functional adaptation, but as a result of conflicting economic interests seeking equilibrium. Hence to this day the metaphysical and logical faults of the Hegelian dialectic are vitiating the theories and dogmas of one Socialist School—the Marxian" (pp. 101-2). Biology alone was competent to give the clue to the proper understanding of the process of evolution because

it was the *science* which dealt with the modes of change followed by organisms, *and biology was as yet but stuttering its wonderful tale*" (p. 104). "But Hegel was no biologist, and Hegel, not Darwin, was intellectual father to Marx" (p. 105). The place which Marx occupies is on the threshold of scientific sociology but not altogether over it" (p. 109). (*Italics ours*).

Thus Macdonald on Marx! Before dealing with these *statements* let us follow Macdonald and see what Marx had missed by unfortunately being—as it is alleged—a pre-Darwinian. Starting with what he calls his "key idea" in his mind, Macdonald glances over the pages of history. Now then we are to be initiated into the superior rites. The "key idea" is going to unlock the methods of social change. Ye Marxians, Attention! Sir Oracle is going to speak! "History" says Macdonald (p. 37) "is a progression of social stages which have preceded and succeeded each other like the unfolding of life from the amæba to the mammal, or from the bud to the fruit. To-day we are in the economic stage. Yesterday we were in the political stage. To-morrow we shall be in the moral stage." Without stopping to inquire as to how people lived before there was an economic stage; whether "yesterday", when we were in the political stage, the people ate and drank politics, or whether they were clothed in that seemingly unsubstantial attire; but brushing this aside as a mere rhetorical flourish we follow Macdonald through one of the "social stages." "The next chapter" he proceeds (p. 39) "is marked by the organization of the masses into a political unity and their initiation into the rights of citizenship. The opportunity for progress through this second stage comes first of all from the needs of the central authority—the sovereign—to maintain its position against the local and clan disintegrating forces, or against rival sovereigns." Then follows the remarkably irrelevant interjection—"This leads to the establishment of some measure of political and economic freedom for the Plebs—in other words a nerve connexion between the central nucleus and the surrounding mass." (Notice the biologic "key idea"). "Meanwhile the mass itself ceases to be amorphous and becomes differentiated into functions, e.g. trades and classes." Passing aside the obvious error—that an amorphous mass (shapeless, undifferentiated) should have already been differentiated into sovereigns and clans, not to speak of Plebs who already had some measure of political and economic freedom—passing this aside, it remains to ask of this "key idea"—How did this mass cease being amorphous and become differentiated into trades and classes? But the only answer the "key idea" vouchsafes an answer as sad and sorrowful as the one given by Poe's raven—is, "The economic stage is beginning; the political one is fading away into the accomplished past" (p. 40). All this we presume is biology "stuttering its wonderful tale." If so, we are at one with Macdonald as regards the stuttering. It is a

pity space will not allow us to fully quote the next page (41) for it is chock-full of this wonderful stuttering, together with still more wonderful and irrelevant—that is to those who do not stutter—interjections about what is going to be.

But, however strong the temptation to go on with Macdonald, we must resist it as we have more important work to do. We have given an example of what Marx is alleged to have missed, and even if it were true we do not think Marxians would have great cause to regret. We must now, however, respectfully—not to say modestly—point out the few omissions Macdonald has been guilty of while "stuttering his wonderful tale." He has taken quite literally the view that Society is a *biological* organism. Spencer had shown quite a remarkable number of analogies between society and a biological organism and also an equal number of differences. He had never claimed more for this than some analogical resemblances, which he described as a "parallelism of principles of components" which refer only to structure, and not to *laws of change of structure*: but Macdonald out Spencers Spencer in this connexion. He insists—though without proof (as a matter of fact analogy is sufficient proof for him)—that Society is actually and literally a *biological organism* (p. 32) and while ignoring some of the differences quoted by Spencer, attempts to bridge over others, e.g. he states that the social organism need not have an external form, and further makes the remarkable claim that society is conscious, not only so, but keenly self-conscious. Surely this is biology run mad. We must, however, leave Macdonald to fight this matter out with eminent biological students like Prof. Lester Ward; the phase that we as Marxists shall join issue with him is where he states that "Biology alone was competent to give the clue . . . because it was the science which dealt with the modes of change followed by organisms." If this is true as applied to society, then Macdonald's criticism of Marx is to some extent justifiable; but if it is not true then he must revise his criticism in accordance with the facts.

Let us investigate. If we examine the lowest animal organism, the amæba, we find there are no structural differences between them. The organism is stomach, body, and limbs, all at the same time. They are unicellular (one celled) organisms, and there is no division of labour. The process of nutrition is the same throughout. If, however, we examine more highly developed organisms, say bees, we find a considerable division of labour and consequently proportionate differences in structure. Thus the queen bee is physiologically different from the worker, or the drone. These differences are due to the division of labour. Each order of bee has a different function to perform in bee economy, and the difference in function causes a difference in structure. The "law of change" is biological and Macdonald's statement is so far absolutely correct.

Let us now, however, leave animal, and come to human, societies. Physiologically there are no differences here. Different from bee society, the woman worker is physiologically identical with the queen, with a little training (on both sides) they might change places, and society remain unhurt; the human drone* the idle rich—might (also with some training) change places with the human worker, and the change might be advantageous. But is there no division of labour in human societies? Oh yes; a much more complicated division of labour than in any animal society. But why are there no physiological differences? What becomes of the biologic law of modes of change? The reply should startle Mr. Macdonald. It is, *The biologic law is arrested, and has practically ceased to operate in human societies!* The reason for this is quite simple and was pointed out in the first article of this series. When man invents a tool wherewith to unlock the storehouse of nature he interposes a barrier between his body and nature. In his food-getting, the tool it is that receives the actual contact of mother earth, and as a consequence the extended division of labour causes *changes in the tool*, i.e. man makes the changes. Difference of function does not mean difference of physiological structure, it only means difference of tools. The difference between a miner and a weaver is not shown by bodily difference as in bees, but only by the different tools used by them.

The change is no longer bodily, (biological) but tool constructional (economical). When man in society develops new functions, he does not develop new structures, e.g. to increase his powers of vision he does not develop the muscles of his eye, but accomplishes his object by the invention of telescopes and microscopes; to develop his powers of lifting weights, it is not so much by attending gymnasiums as by inventing cranes; he acquires power to fly, not by developing wings, but by inventing flying machines; and so on. Thus to paraphrase Macdonald, "the economical stage is beginning; the biological one is fading away into the accomplished past." It is the relation of society to the tool that must now be studied. *As the tool changes so does the form of society.* This is the discovery of the pre-Darwinian Marx. It is the private ownership of the tool by a few, and the absence of ownership by others that causes class divisions—not a biological but an economical category. As the tool develops from the spear and pottery, to agricultural and manufacturing implements, so does society emerge from savagery and barbarism through the various economical stages of civilization viz: Slave-ownership, Feudalism, and Capitalism. By a study of the changes of these tools, (economics) Karl Marx was able to describe the *law of motion* of society—without the aid of analogy. To arrive at this marvellous result was the work of forty years' study. To-day

*I am quite aware of the poverty of the analogy between human and bee drones, as the function of the latter is of considerable utility to bee society.

there is no one who occupies so commanding a position, so large an audience in social science, as Karl Marx. His analysis of the existing order of society was so successful as to pass the highest scientific test, viz. accurate prediction, and has won for him the admiration of most of that great world-army, who are engaged in preparing the way for social transformation. Of this man Macdonald writes "Neither Marx nor Engels saw deep enough to discover the possibilities of peaceful advance which lay hidden beneath the surface. Their analogies (?) misled them" (pp. 108-9). This from Macdonald—the superficial thinker, who tries to construct a social science by biological analogy!

And now a word as to the charge that Marx was pre-Darwinian. It is not true. Marx knew Darwinism well, so well that he could combine it with his own work, as the following instance shows.

"The manufacturing period simplifies, improves, and multiplies the instruments of labour, by adapting them to the exclusively special functions of each detail labourer. Darwin in his epoch-making work on the origin of species, remarks, with reference to the natural organs of plants and animals, 'So long as one and the same organ has different kinds of work to perform, a ground for its changeability may possibly be found in this, that natural selection preserves or suppresses each small variation of form less carefully than if that organ were destined for one special purpose alone.'" (p. 333 F. Vol. I. *Capital*.)

It would be folly to belittle the work of Darwin, but surely Darwin himself would object to the use Macdonald makes of him. According to him Darwinism is the universal science—A knowledge of the origin and development of species is sufficient for the whole philosophy of society! He would ignore the thousands of years of scientific work of past investigators—they were pre-Darwinians. For him Herakleitos, Aristotle, and Hegel, are in the Mendelsohn sense "dead dogs." A word also on the charge that Marx was intellectual heir to Hegel. Space will not allow adequate treatment of this point; but we quote a great authority—Dietzgen. "The theory of evolution which we will not say was solved, but was considerably stimulated and advanced by Hegel, received before all at the hands of Darwin an exceedingly valuable application or specification in relation to zoölogy. Still we must not lose sight of the fact that the specification was of no greater value than the generalization in which Hegel excels; the one cannot be without the other. The naturalist combines the two, and no philosopher who deserves the name will fail to do so either." (Some Philosophical Essays by Joseph Dietzgen, p. 316.)

To conclude. If Mr. Macdonald can appreciate what Marx has done—conducted an analysis of the existing order, thereby discovering the law of motion of society, he will not need to trust to superficial and dangerous—to himself—analogies. Incidentally he

will find out why the woman worker is not—contrary to biologic law—physiologically different from the queen, and what is infinitely more to the point, will understand the actual causes of the economic differences between them. He will not need to stand with his "key idea" "at the threshold of Socialist speculation," he will be altogether *over* it. It is now some hundreds of thousands of years since human societies arrested the law of biologic growth. Well, let us be generous—Macdonald's book is only a *few* centuries behind the times.

Next Month:—*Economic Rent.*

NOAH ABLETT.

Education and Progress

ADDRESS BY PROF. LESTER F. WARD

(Brown University, U.S.A.)

At the Annual Meet of the "PLEBS" LEAGUE, Aug. 2nd, 1909.

Ladies and Gentlemen:—

I PREFER to stand here (on the platform), not because I am so vain as to suppose that there are any members of this audience who care particularly to see me, but because I desire to stand where I can see all the members of this audience. I very well know, from the last two days' experience and observation, that you are all democrats. Of course you know that I am a democrat; you would naturally infer it from the fact that, if I do not represent, I hail from the greatest democracy on this globe. But I want to say more; that my democracy is not merely nominal, not merely political: it is a democracy which is ingrained in every fibre of my nature.

I am very much afraid that you have an exaggerated idea of the message I have to give you to-night. I have heard my remarks spoken of as an address. Certainly that is misleading. The only notes that I have are a few that I jotted down this morning, of which I only canvassed a single one: and I have not had time since, in the intervals of conversation and meeting new friends, to organize or even arrange them.

But even these few notes, were I to attempt to expand them, would occupy much more time than I shall occupy or ought to occupy. The only difficulty is where to begin and what to say. I have been impressed with one thought that is, probaby, the most forcible that I have experienced during my short stay in Oxford. I have frequently, or at least occasionally, dropped into or found myself in meetings of bodies of persons who were interested in great reformatory principles and issues, mainly, of course, those bodies which call themselves socialistic, or who represent some great aspect of socialism; and I

have always felt a certain thrill when listening to their enthusiastic remarks, and in seeing how intense their interest is in problems of social reform

But I have always observed this : that the aims that they were seeking were very present, near, close aims ; very close home to their own natures and wants and needs. They were demanding, often eloquently, higher wages, shorter hours, and many other great reforms that we know are so much needed in the world for the labouring man ; and my sympathies were always with him.

But this occasion differs fundamentally from any that I have ever experienced. You are not here demanding some higher wages or shorter hours ; you are not here demanding some immediate material advantages for your physical existence ; you are here with equal enthusiasm considering a great problem which you know to be one that involves years, perhaps decades, it may be centuries of investigation, of study, of thought. You are here on a great educational mission ; and in that respect this meeting, and this body, differ fundamentally from any which I have ever had the privilege or the pleasure to fall into, or to experience the sensations that their enthusiasm created in me. And I must confess that the very remoteness of your result—which is in harmony with my teachings ever since I commenced to try to influence mankind—has given me a feeling which is far deeper than any that I ever experienced under the other circumstances which I have described.

Now, what are some of the reasons for it ? I sometimes undertake to classify reformers. Primarily, we may classify mankind into reformers and non-reformers, because there are some who do not believe in reform for one reason or another ; perhaps because they think the world is the best that can be—the optimists, or because they believe the world is incapable of being made any better—the pessimists. But aside from that class, which we cannot now consider, there are the true reformers who do see that the world is not the best it can be, and is to be, and who are working in one direction or another to show how it may be made better. Now, even these reformers may be divided into still further classes ; and the first great class, which comprehends the larger number, is the class of which I have spoken who demand immediate results, who wish to see reforms inaugurated in social conditions around them which they can see to be imperfect and which they might, if they had sufficient power and influence, modify in their own interests and in the interests of man.

I have great respect for them ; but my observation has been that very small results have followed from that class of reformatory movement. I have tried with the sociologist to discover the reason for that, and I have endeavored to show what I regard as the reasons. That problem is too large for me to attempt to explain on this occasion, but I may express it in one single phrase and you can

supply the balance ; and that is that all such reforms are demands to modify social structure. Social structure has that intense stability which is the product of evolution, and there is no possibility of changing the great social structure in a very brief space of time by artificial appliances any more than there would be of changing the character of an animal, or a plant ; to change its tissues, its organs, its form. We readily recognize that organic nature cannot thus be suddenly changed ; it may be, and has been gradually modified through great periods of evolution. Those periods have been enormous and these changes do take place when we give time enough, but we must go far back through the long vista of the ages.

It is the same with social structures ; they have been the product of social development ; they are not to be criticized ; they have to be examined to see if they have outgrown their usefulness. Social structures have, to a greater or lesser extent, out grown their usefulness. It is very clear to all philosophers that many such institutions, many such structures, exist ; and they are social evils. But whatever they may be, they may all be summed up as cases in which the social structures are no longer perfectly adapted to the environment of society.

Therefore, we come now to the other great class of reformers—namely, those who see that immediate, sudden, artificial changes are impossible in the structure of society. But even that class may be further subdivided ; and that involves something of an explanation, and it seems necessary that I should give it as briefly as possible. The great form of improvement that is obvious to that class is that the mental condition of society should be improved. That is obvious to all reformers who see matters in the light that I have explained ; but that class may be still further subdivided, as I say ; and therefore there do exist to-day two classes of reformers who perceive that the mental condition of mankind should be improved where it is capable of improvement, but they look upon the subject from two different points of view.

One large class, which is most popular to-day, in the scientific world certainly, maintains that what we want in this world is more brains ; they maintain that the difficulties under which society labours, the evils under which the lower classes of mankind are suffering, are due to a want of an adequate supply of the qualities of the human brain : and therefore, they are, with Galton as their leader, advocating the process—it is not science, it is art—which they call Eugenics, and it has now become so popular that the London University has a chair and there are one or two chairs of Eugenics in America.

What do they demand ? They demand that the mind of man shall be improved by some process, which we may call artificial in exactly the sense that the various breeds of animals and various plants have been improved by human artificial methods. Now,

without stopping to develop that, with which you are all probably familiar, I will only say that I do not belong to that school; I belong to that smaller recognized branch of those reformers who see that the human mind needs improving, but who, at the same time, believe that the human brain is adequate to-day—and has always been adequate—for any purposes which it may be called upon to perform.

That is the subject that I have made a study for the last twenty years of my life; and I am so deeply impressed with it that I cannot, perhaps, speak of it with that calmness which it deserves. I will begin by drawing a distinction between the two things, capacity for knowledge, and knowledge itself; or rather, I will define the word intelligence which is not a simple idea, but consists of that capacity, for knowledge together with the knowledge added to it; and, therefore, I say that instead of the great demand being that of increasing the human intellect, the native capacity, the hereditary genius of mankind, the great demand of the world to-day should be the increase of human intelligence as thus defined.

If we admit, as I do and as I have endeavored to prove, that human intelligence is adequate for all practical purposes—and always has been—and always will be—then the question is limited down to that simple adjunct, not to the hereditary part which stands upon its own basis and is always incapable of being changed or modified; a limitation which involves all structures even the most delicate. We can leave that to itself, leave it to mankind, to the judgment and intelligence of the world, and restrict our investigations entirely to that second portion of the definition of intelligence—namely, the knowledge necessary to constitute intelligence.

It narrows down then to one point; that the great demand of the world is knowledge. Of course the question is altogether too large for me to attempt to expand it on this occasion, but you are familiar with my books; you know how I attack the problem, and I know some of you are satisfied that I have solved it from that point of view.

If I am right in that, then the great problem is to equalize intelligence; or, to simplify it still further, to put all knowledge in the possession of every human being. I call it the equalizing of intelligence because I maintain that the native capacity of mankind is equal in all classes of society. I have coined a new word in the English language, if I may be allowed to say so, and I have set it afloat and I hope it will be carried to the ends of the earth. I call this the principle of intellectual egalitarianism, the principle that—no matter what class of society you may select from—taking a corresponding number from each—the individuals from all classes of society will be equal in their native capacity for knowledge; that those from any one class will be equal in their capacity for knowledge to an equal number from any other class of society.

(To be continued).

The Railway Men's Parliament

Overwhelming Victory for Independence in Education

AT the Friday's (October 8th) Session of the Annual General Meeting of the Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants, the Delegates had under consideration the recent dispute at Ruskin College. The matter was brought forward in the form of a resolution from the Toton No. 1 Branch: viz.:

"That this A.G.M. regrets the recent changes made at Ruskin College, especially the deposition of Mr. Dennis Hird, the late Principal, who, by his fidelity to principle and loyalty to Labour, won for himself the confidence and esteem of the working-class movement.

"We further decide to withdraw all further support from the college, believing that it has forfeited the confidence of the Labour movement.

"We welcome the new Labour College in process of formation, and decide to give it our support on condition that it is under the control of the Labour movement, and instruct the E.C., if these conditions are fulfilled, to take up two annual scholarships in place of the present ones at Ruskin College."

Similar resolutions to the above had also been received from Hull No. 3, Heeley, Longsight, St. Helens Central, Accrington, Paddington, Walsall No. 1, Severn Tunnel, and Crewe No. 2 Branches.

Mr. Cramp, of Sheffield, moved the resolution in a strong speech, pointing out that in the past they had been strong supporters of Ruskin College, thinking it to be a genuine Labour College. They were mistaken. They now understood why it had taken the course it had. When any working-class movement was in its infancy it was ignored; when it commenced to grow it was regarded with suspicion; when it became dangerous it was necessary to crush it. The object of all the recent changes had been to bring this about by having a connexion with the University, so as to draw away young men from the teachings which would show them the correct way to throw off the burden upon their shoulders and lead them in the gentler paths of University teaching.

Mr. Elliston, of Preston, supported.

Mr. Richard Bell, M.P., defended Ruskin College in a long speech, which was notable only from the fact that none of the vital points in dispute were dealt with. In reply to a question he said he did not represent the A.S.R.S. on Ruskin College Council as the Society had never elected him.

After a long discussion the resolution was put to the meeting and was declared carried by 44 votes For to 5 Against. The result was received with loud and prolonged applause.

It may be interesting to analyse the position up to date of the various Trade Unions who have previously supported Ruskin College.

FOR RUSKIN COLLEGE :

Northern Counties Weavers' Amalgamation.

FOR CENTRAL LABOUR COLLEGE :

Monmouth Western Valleys District } South Wales Miners'
 Anthracite District } Federation.
 Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants.

SUPPORT DISCONTINUED TO RUSKIN COLLEGE :

Derbyshire Miners.
 Coachmakers' Society.
 Blastfurnacemen Union.

NOT YET DECIDED :

Scottish Miners (Lanarkshire and Fifeshire).
 Northumberland Miners.
 British Steel Smelters.
 Amalgamated Society of Engineers.
 Eastern Valleys District } South Wales Miners'
 Rhondda District } Federation.

The following have nominated men for scholarships at Central Labour College :

The Amalgamated Society of Carpenters and Joiners.
 The National Amalgamated Society of House and Ship Painters, &c.
 Scottish Miners (Lanarkshire).
 Notts Miners.

Oh, World's Oppressed !

⓪, WORLD'S oppressed of every name,
 Sustaining scorn, starvation, shame !
 Calling and calling : assuming control.
 Hark, to the summons saluting your soul !

Sending you forth to the quest of the world—
 Sending, that tyranny down may be hurled.

O, world's oppressed of every name—
 Mere pawns where monarchs play the game !
 Hark, how the masters are laughing at you—
 Laughing, that loafing and feasting, the few
 Live on your labour and lull you with lies—
 Promising plenty : suppressing your cries.

O, world's oppressed of every name,
 For all your ills assume the blame !
 True, there are chains—and your children are slaves !

True, you have title to nothing but graves !
 False—as their threats of a bottomless pit—
False, that enduring you need here to sit.

O, world's oppressed of every name,
 Arise, arise with souls aflame !
 See, there are centuries yet for the race !
 See, there is dawning the day of your grace !
 Dawning—and daring to deeds of the free—
 What shall the verdict of centuries be ?

O world's oppressed of every name,
 Behold to you this message came :
Ask, and the world shall be given to you ;
Seek, and the world shall surrender the clue ;
Knock, and the nobles of earth shall obey.
KNOCK : oh, the knocking that heralds your day !

EDWIN ARNOLD BRENHOLTZ

Ruskin College : The Last Phase

A CONFERENCE of the supporters of Ruskin College and those who had previously supported it, and had not yet decided what course to take in the present situation, was held in Oxford on the 30th October, to consider proposals "to force the Executive in a direction it would not be desirable to go," by adopting means to secure the original object of the "Plebs" League, viz. "to bring about a more satisfactory connexion between Ruskin College and the Labour Movement."

It is interesting in this connexion to read the inspired reports in the Press of the meeting. For example the *Daily News* announces "Executive vindicated." *How?* They failed to get a resolution through endorsing their action in dismissing Mr. Hird : they have had to "walk the plank" on the question of labour representation on the Council. And were it possible to secure an independent inquiry by the Trade Unions who supported them before the strike, it would mean that their action in dismissing Mr. Hird would be shown to have generated from their hostility to his views on the Labour Movement.

Even at the Conference they were emphasizing the expense they would be put to, if their proposals were carried, in obtaining legal powers for the alteration of their constitution. In short they have offered what they have because for them it was "neck or nothing."

The opening was promising. Professor Lees Smith, Liberal Parliamentary Candidate for Northampton, was in the chair. He is a well-known writer on Economic subjects and he has also

perpetrated a pamphlet on *Trade Unionism*. It may interest the Trade Unionists who were present to quote the following from an article by Professor Stanley Jevons which appeared in the *Contemporary Review*, July, 1909:—"In the course of my reading I have met with singularly few suggestions **that Trade Unions by forcing up wages might be responsible for producing unemployment**. The only two distinct suggestions of this view of which I am aware are in a paper by Professor Lees Smith (*Economic Journal*, 1907, p. 507,) and one by Professor Chapman."

This friend of the workers at once launched out into the well-worn statements about Mr. Hird being responsible for the trouble that had existed at Ruskin College. He had started the "Plebs" League: he had engineered the Revision Papers trouble: &c. He gave as an analogy of Mr. Hird's position that of a General Secretary who does not carry out his Executive's decisions. In the first place the Ruskin College people have tried to argue these charges out before Trade Union bodies *in Mr. Hird's presence*, the result has been that they have only succeeded in convincing the Union that Mr. Hird's position was unanswerable, and they have shown this by supporting the Central Labour College. In the second place a General Secretary of a Trade Union is allowed to have opinions of his own, and to take any reasonable steps he likes to secure support for those opinions among the rank and file. But the analogy is not a good one, for the rank and file elect the Executive in Trade Unions and in the last resort the former are the final court of appeal. For Ruskin College Executive the right of the rank and file to an expression of opinion did not exist: they were a law unto themselves.

Proceeding, the Professor said that the standard of the work among the students generally was lower than that in Balliol College where the gilded youth assembled. *How is this?* Where did the Professor get his information from? He was seldom at Ruskin College during the last two years and therefore he had no opportunities of studying the standard of the work done, either of the students' private work, or of the net result, which to a large extent would be incorporated in his essays. Where then did he get his information from? Mr. Sidney Buxton, the Vice-Principal? He was educated at Balliol College; whether they are proud of the net-product of their labour we know not, we do know he compares unfavourably in "the standard of his work," deducible from his lectures, to the majority of his pupils [!] Or was it from Mr. H. S. Furniss, Economics [!] Lecturer? Even the Committee of Enquiry were compelled to brand *him* as incompetent. Dear Professor, your information is scarcely good enough, you can only get tainted products from poisoned sources.

After the Professor was through, an attempt was made to get a resolution passed endorsing the action of the Council in discharging Mr. Hird. After some adverse criticism, Mr. Shackleton intervened

and asked that the resolution be not pressed as there was evidently a little [!] difference of opinion. The resolution was withdrawn.

The proposals of Executive Committee were then considered. An attempt was made to add the Labour Party to the organizations which are to nominate two representatives. *It was defeated by 27 votes Against, to 4 For.* The scheme was then carried, with a recommendation that it be put before the labour organizations of the country. The latter recommendation is presumably the scheme that was suggested at Ipswich as the policy Ruskin College would adopt; while the scheme of management in its present form is probably due to the action of the Railway Servants Society in repudiating Ruskin College. Whether this policy will be found to have been adopted too late remains to be seen, it certainly is the best testimony to the soundness of the policy of the "Plebs" League, that body of "irresponsible lads" with "narrow ideas." The Conference finished up by adjourning to Balliol College for lunch. Is this latter a prophesy?

Now we are treated to prayers of thanksgiving. Ruskin College is safe! So say its friends. Is it? We are reminded of a paragraph in one of Victor Hugo's works:—

Men in extreme peril are quick to believe in rescue; the slightest pause in the storm's threats is sufficient; they tell themselves that they are out of danger. After believing themselves buried, they declare their resurrection; they feverishly embrace what they do not yet possess; it is clear that the luck has turned; they declare themselves satisfied; they are saved; they cry quits with God. They should not be in so great a hurry to give receipts to the Unknown.

The attitude of the two parties towards Labour and the Education Question is typified by two things at each Conference—the "Plebs" Conference in August and the October one of Ruskin College—i.e. (1) the two chairmen, Mr. W. M. Watson, Political Agent for the Scottish Miners, on one side; Professor Lees Smith, Liberal Candidate on the other: (2) lunch of "Plebs" at Central Labour College, lunch of Ruskin College at Balliol College, provided by Sir William Markby, ex-Indian Judge. For the one **Labour** of itself is *all-sufficient*, for the other it is *dependent*.

Two points stand out clearly now: *First*, Ruskin College Council fear the holding of an inquiry by the Trade Unions into the reasons for Mr. Hird's dismissal. This substantiates our charge that Mr. Hird was dismissed because (a) of his antagonism to any University entanglements for Ruskin College; (b) for his advocacy of Labour control of Ruskin College. *Secondly*, *The present staff is to be retained.*

The University *may* be good,
Ruskin College *may* be good,
But the College for Labour is the Central Labour College.

Correspondence

To the Editor of the "PLEBS" Magazine

LOGIC OF DIRECT LABOUR REPRESENTATION

Dear Sir,—While perusing the article under the heading of "The Logic of Direct Labour Representation," in the last issue of the "Plebs," it occurred to my mind that the statement put forward by the writer, to the effect that "thinking man wants logic and not so much parade and bombast," was evidently not an expression of the guiding principle which actuated the irrepressible Whitehead when penning his remarkable contribution. Verily, James, thought I, "Much learning hath made thee mad." I should like to say at the onset that it is not my intention to answer the portentous query of the writer as to "what is really meant by the specious phrase representing the subject of this article":—it is beyond me.

Really as a practical politician (!!!) "I think" (?) it would be more in harmony with the best interests of this great and glorious Empire, if our energies were devoted to a solution of the problem expressed in the formula, "If a brick weighs 1 lb., how long is a piece of string?"

We are told that an argument which is good in a particular case is good throughout. "Strange logic that!"

As I meandered onward through the article, my attention was arrested by the announcement that if the "specious phrase" under discussion meant such and such a thing the "present Labour candidate for Reading" would be "shut out." Well, he might be "shut out," but until he gets "back to the land," that comrade will never "shut up."

The article winds up with a brilliant anticipation (might I warn J. S. W. that anticipations are the special preserve of H. G. Wells?). Friend Whitehead is afraid that it will be said he has been inspired to write by a particular animus. Those who *know* him, however, will dissociate themselves from such an erroneous conclusion. There is nothing particular about Mr. Whitehead. He is generalized—almost to nebulae. His intentions are always of the best I admit, and hail him as a jolly decent fellow. Mark well, not as a thoroughly good fellow, for it is written somewhere that to say a man is thoroughly good, is often only another way of saying he is thoroughly stupid. Although I have warned J. S. W. not to poach in the preserves of the puzzled politician, H. G. W., I have sufficient sauce to climb over the fence myself in order to anticipate.

It may be said by Mr. Whitehead that my unworthy "class bias" has forced me into a digression born of a "particular animus," and consequently arrogant, "incongruous," and "illogical."

I trust, dear readers, you will not think me pedantic—I plead "not guilty." Such an anticipation might have worked out correctly in the old days—in the dear delightful days of irresponsibility, but not so to-day. I am one of the spoilt darlings of industry, working under the beneficent regime of an 8 hours' day and now stand for cosmic unity.

My quarrel with Mr. W. is that he has fallen into the same snare as the supporters of this "so called" Labour Party. They, I suppose, mean to define "direct labour representation" in the narrow sense. They do not care

a hang about either "equivocation" nor "ambiguity." Neither are they concerned about "perponderance" nor "totality." They want representation of their own special interest. Selfish it is true, but it is true! It all turns on what we mean by labour. For the moment Mr. Whitehead and I, mean something wider than the supporters of the Labour Party—"so-called." Mr. Whitehead wants to know who is to represent such labourers as the Aveburys, the Brasseys, and the Marshalls of this democratic age. I go a step further and demand to know, who is to represent such labourers as the Charles Peace's and the Bill Sykes's of our time. As Mr. Whitehead points out, once you accept the broader view you must go on *ad infinitum*. But Mr. Whitehead did not go the "whole hog." Perhaps he felt he was treading on dangerous ground. After all, many of the Peaces and Sykes of our time are already sporting themselves at Westminster. They at least believe in "direct representation."

My last word is to the 10 *per cent.* of the organised workers who are at present unemployed. See that such labourers as Brasseys and Co. get fair representation—and no more. Mr. Whitehead has made an appeal on behalf of Professor Darwin for representation. If he means *the* Darwin, I suggest he should get his feet back upon the earth. Great Heavens! surely there are no politics in the "Great Beyond."

Be content, friend Whitehead! You have thrown a new light upon Direct Labour Representation, and, incidently, upon Logic!

EX-OXONIAN.

Reports

A "PLEBS" BRANCH FOR LONDON

London members have at last taken active steps towards the organization of their forces to promote the objects and aims of the League. On Thursday the 14th ultimo, a meeting of London members was held for the purposes of forming a branch of the League and taking active steps to further the interests of the Central Labour College in London. After a good discussion, during which many points were given on how each one could help the movement, the meeting was adjourned. Certain proposals are now under consideration and a further meeting is to be called at an early date. In view of this, it is advisable that members who were not present at the last meeting, should communicate with me so that a suitable date can be arranged.

ALEX. G. MOORMAN, Hon. Sec. (pro. tem.)
The Lodge, Victoria Park, E.

BOLTON ENGINEERS AND CENTRAL LABOUR COLLEGE

Mr. Joseph Leach, "Plebs" hon. organizer, attended the Bolton No. 7 Branch of Amalgamated Society of Engineers on the 13th September and gave an address on the Central Labour College. After an interesting discussion the following resolution was unanimously carried, viz:

"That the Executive Committee of the A. S. E. be asked to withdraw their support from Ruskin College, Oxford, and transfer all their levies and future support to Central Labour College, Oxford."

[We have received copies of many similar resolutions but regret space forbids our publishing them. ED.]

THE GOLD SICKLE,

OR

Hena, the Virgin of the Isle of Sen

A TALE OF DRUID GAUL

BY EUGENE SUE,

Translated from the Original French by DANIEL DE LEON.

CHAPTER VII.—*Continued.*

"**N**O, mother; they were lodged in jail at Vannes, all except two of their soldiers whom the magistrates charged to declare to the Roman general that no provisions whatever were to be furnished him, and that his officers were to be as hostages."

"It would have been better to give the officers a thorough caning and drive them in disgrace out of the town," replied Mamm' Margarid. "That is the way thieves are treated, and these Romans tried to rob us."

"You are right, Margarid," said Joel; "they came to rob us—to starve us! to carry away our harvests and our cattle!" And Joel, now in a towering rage added: "By the vengeance of Hesus! To think of their taking our fine turn-out of six young oxen with skins slick as wolves! Our four yokes of black bulls that have such a beautiful white star in the centre of their foreheads!"

"And our beautiful white heifers with yellow heads!" said Mamm' Margarid shrugging her shoulders and never quitting her distaff, "our sheep whose fleece is so nice and thick . . . Come, a good caning for these Romans!"

"And the powerful horses of the stock of your magnificent stallion Tom-Bras," put in the traveller. "They will, after all, have to draw your harvest to Touraine, and will then serve to replace the worn-out horses of the Roman cavalry . . . True, to them, the labour will not be excessive . . . because you will now probably discover that it is not far from Touraine to Brittany."

"Well may you mock, friend," said Joel. "You were right, and I confess myself to have been wrong. Oh! If only the provinces of Gaul had from the start confederated themselves against the first assault of the Romans! If united they had put forth but one-half the efforts that they put forth separately—we would not now be, exposed to the insolent demands and to the threats of these heathens! Well may you mock!"

"No, Joel, I will mock no longer," gravely answered the traveller. "The danger is near; the hostile camp lies only a twelve days' march from here; the refusal of the magistrates of Vannes and the imprisonment of the Roman officers—all that means speedy war—a merciless war, as only the Romans know how to wage! If we are vanquished it means to us death on the battle field, or slavery far away! The slave-merchants follow the tracts of the Roman army; they are greedy after prey. Whatever survives, whether whole or wounded—men, young women, girls, children—all are sold at auction like cattle for the benefit of the vanquisher, and are forthwith consigned by the thousands to Italy or to Southern Gaul where the Romans are settled! Arrived at the destination, the male slaves of robust frame are often forced to fight ferocious animals in the circus for the amusement of their masters; the young women and girls, even the children are subjected to monstrous debaucheries. Such is war with the Romans if vanquished!" cried the stranger. "Will you allow yourselves to be vanquished? Will you submit to such disgrace? Will you deliver to them your wives, your sisters, your daughters and children, ye Gauls of Brittany?"

Hardly had the traveller uttered these words when the whole family of Joel—men, women, young girls, children—all down to the dwarf Stumpy, rose to their feet and with their eyes shooting fire, their cheeks inflamed, cried tumultuously, waving their arms:

"War! War! War!"

Joel's large battle mastiff, fired by these cries, rose on his hind legs and laid his fore-paws on the breast of his master, who, while caressing his enormous head said:

"Yes, old Deber-Trud, like our tribe you will hunt the Romans . . . The quarry shall be for you . . . Your jaws shall be red with blood! . . . Wow! Wow, Deber-Trud! At the Romans! At the Romans!"

Hearing the well-known war-cry, the mastiff responded with furious barks, displaying fangs as redoubtable as a lion's. Hearing Deber-Trud, the outside watch-dogs, as well as those locked up in the kennels, answered him. Frightful was the war-cry raised by the pack.

"A good omen, friend Joel," observed the traveller. "Your dogs bark death to the enemy."

"Yes, yes; death to the enemy!" cried the brenn. "Thanks be to the gods, in our Breton Gaul, on the day of peril, the watch-dog becomes a war-dog! the draw-horse becomes a war-horse! the ox of the field a war-ox! the harvest carts chariots of war! the labourer a warrior! even our peaceful and fruitful earth turns to war and devours the stranger! at every step he finds a grave in our fathomless marshes, and his vessels vanish in the whirlpools of our bays which are more terrible in their calm than in the tempest of their fury!"

"Joel," now said Julyan, who had left the body of his friend, "I promised Armel to meet him to-morrow yonder—Such a death would be pleasant to me . . . To die fighting the Romans is a duty . . . What shall I do?"

"Ask to-morrow one of the druids of Karnak."

"And our sister Hena," said Albinik the mariner to his mother "It is nearly a year I have not seen her . . . , She is surely still the pearl of the Isle of Sen? My wife, Meroë charged me to remember her to Hena."

"You will see her to-morrow," answered Mamm' Margarid; and laying down her distaff she arose. It was the signal for the family to retire. Mamm' Margarid looked around and said: "Let us retire, my children, it is late; to-morrow at break of day we must begin our war preparations"; and turning to the traveller:

"May the gods grant you a good rest and pleasant dreams!"

CHAPTER VIII.—FAREWELL!

Agreeable to his promise, Joel pushed off his boat early the next morning, accompanied by his son Albinik the mariner, and took the unknown traveller to the island of Kellor, seeing he did not dare to land at the sacred precincts of the Isle of Sen. The breton's guest said a few words in a low voice to the ewagh who mounts perpetual guard in the island's house. He seemed to be struck with respect and answered that Talyessin, the oldest of the living druids, who then was at the Isle of Sen together with his wife Auria, expected a traveller since the previous evening.

Before leaving Joel, the stranger said to his host: "I hope neither you nor your family will forget your resolution of yesterday. This day a call to arms will resound from one end of Breton Gaul to the other."

You may rest assured that I and the rest of my tribe will be the first to respond to the call."

"I believe you. The issue now is whether Gaul shall fall into slavery or shall rise again to the height of her one-time power and glory."

"But should I not, at this moment when I am to leave you, know the name of the brave man who sat at my hearth? The name of the wise man who speaks with so much soundness and loves his country so warmly?"

"Joel, my name shall be 'Soldier' so long as Gaul is not free; and if we ever meet again, I shall call myself 'Your Friend,' seeing that I am that."

Saying these words the unknown traveller stepped into the ewagh's boat that was to take him from Kellor to the Isle of Sen. Before the boat which was under charge of the ewagh, put off, Joel asked the

latter whether he would be permitted to wait at the house for his daughter Hena, who was to come on that day to visit the family. The ewagh informed him that his daughter would not start for the shore until evening. Sorry at not being able to take Hena with him, the brenn re-entered his boat and returned alone with Albinik.

Towards noon, Julyan went to consult the druids of the forest of Karnak upon whether he should take the immediate and voluntary death which would be a pleasure to him, seeing he was to rejoin Armel, or seek death in battle against the Romans. The druids answered him that having sworn to Armel upon his brotherhood faith to die with him, he should be faithful to his promise, and that the ewaghs would bring the body of Armel with the usual ceremonies in order to place it upon the pyre where Julyan would find his place at moon-rise. Happy at being able so soon to join his friend, Julyan was about to leave Karnak, when he saw the stranger, who had been the guest of Joel and who now returned from the Isle of Sen, approaching through the forest in the company of Talyessin. The latter said a few words to the other druids, who forthwith surrounded the traveller with great eagerness and marks of respect. The younger ones of the druids received him as a brother, the elder ones as a son.

Recognizing Julyan, the traveller said to him :

"As you are to return to the brenn of the tribe, wait a little, I shall give you a letter for him."

Julyan yielded to the wish of the stranger, who withdrew accompanied by Talyessin and other druids. He returned shortly and handed to Julyan a little scroll of yellow tanned skin, saying :

"This is for Joel . . . This evening, Julyan, when the moon rises we shall see each other again . . . Hesus loves those who, like you, are brave and faithful in their friendship."

Upon arriving at the brenn's house, Julyan learned that the former was on the field gathering in the wheat. He went after him and delivered to Joel the writing sent by the stranger. It said :

"Friend Joel, in the name of Gaul now in danger, this is what the druids expect of you : Command all the members of your family who are at work on the fields to cry out to those of the tribe working not far from them : The mistletoe and the new year ! *Let every man, woman and child, all without exception, meet this evening in the forest of Karnak at the rise of the moon.* Let those of the tribe who will have heard these words in turn repeat them aloud to those of the other tribes who may also be at work on the fields, so that the call being repeated from mouth to mouth, from one to another, from village to village, from town to town, from Vannes to Auray, notify all the tribes to convene this evening at the forest of Karnak."

(To be continued)