

# THE "Plebs" Magazine

---

Vol. IV.

October, 1912.

No. 9.

---

Copyright Entered at Stationer's Hall.

---

[The following article is reprinted from our lively contemporary, *The Daily Herald*, London. Most of our readers, we hope, are also readers of that Daily, and therefore the article is not new, yet it is worthy of putting in a more permanent form, and it will in time possess some historic interest—as a reminder that only one daily newspaper in the early days of our struggle was sufficiently interested or favourable to our movement to offer us the "glad hand": may its circulation increase!—ED.]

## REFLECTIONS

By G. R. S. T.

THE workers of England have done some generous turns for their masters during the course of history, but it is probable that the most generous of all their deeds was when they took such care that their masters should be well educated. They built universities for them, and devoted them almost entirely to the needs of the rich class. They have built great public schools, also engaged in the work of strengthening the position of the rich, turning out, term by term, the sort of boy who will get almost all the public appointments in the Army and Navy and Civil Service, at home and in the Colonies. Then there are innumerable smaller schools built and endowed with funds also devoted almost entirely to the service of the money-possessing class. In short, except for a trivial and inefficient elementary education, and a few scholarships here and there, our educational system, public and private, is mainly at the disposal of that part of the community which lives at the expense of the workers. Education has been the monopoly of the capitalist class and its dependants.



But that is only stating the case mildly. For the worst of the matter is that even when the workers have had the sense to keep

a small share in the schools and universities for themselves, by public grant or by frightening their masters into giving private endowments, even then they have thrown away practically all the advantage by allowing the masters to choose the teachers and decide the manner of study. What has been the result? Scarcely a whisper of unorthodoxy of any kind has slipped through the bars of the cage which is set round the disinherited classes. They have been taught just the kind of lessons that will keep them nice and good. Popular education has been somewhat of the same kind of process as feeding the animals inside the cages at the Zoological Gardens. And the chief trouble, so far, has been that they are tame animals who rarely give their keepers any trouble. It is the rarest thing in the world for any of the caged creatures to shake the bars of their cage.



That has been the chief trouble, I repeat; the masters have chosen the teachers and decided the lessons. That has made all the difference. Now, one does not suggest that one could write a book on Capitalist Geology; or that it is necessary to write one on Arithmetic for Proletarians, or Grammar for Dock Workers. There is only one set of true geological laws; only one way of adding up two and two; and only one (or two) ways of correct English. Still, in stating these aforesaid laws, it might be mentioned, purely as an after thought, that since Sir So-and-So did not make the coal during the Carboniferous Age, he did not seem to have any right to get royalties on it to-day. Or it might be suggested that the chief use of arithmetic was to enable wealthy men to keep their banking accounts. While the grammar lesson might be based on the construction of such simple sentences as: "Property is theft, more often than not." All this kind of thing would give an atmosphere to the class rooms.



The present educational system through and through is impregnated with the tone of the master class. The normal teacher is an orthodox person: he and she believe in law and order, and they regard the world as an institution which must be taught its lesson and made to obey it. This is not altogether their fault. It is a survival of the idea that schoolboy is something to be thwacked at frequent intervals. There is no class which is so ready as the schoolmasters to accept the capitalist philosophy of life; for they are compelled to apply a certain amount of reasonable coercion to their pupils. Therefore, they unconsciously grow

to think of coercion as the essential element of life. And the capitalists who control education, and guard it with the utmost care, see to it that not even by chance shall any revolutionary doctrines slip into the school or college rooms. Just imagine what would happen if the revolutionaries captured the teaching profession. In a generation there would be only a few orthodox people left surviving—the few dunces who were not able to learn.



It is the business of the capitalists school to turn out two sorts of men and women to supply the two sides of their system: Masters and Servants. We shall not get much further in social reconstruction until we have schools which very deliberately set themselves to the business of turning out Revolutionaries—the real thing, not the academic article who talks about it. For instance, if they start their careers by raiding their school or college, burning all their old school books, and putting in a fresh lot of teachers, it will be a sign that they have learned their lessons well. The capitalists want to keep things as they are: and they have succeeded so well because it has only just dawned on the workers that they must get some control over the schools. One of the most systematic attempts to found a school for Revolutionaries is the Central Labour College in Penywern Road, Earl's Court, London, which is the result of the revolution at Ruskin College, Oxford. It is the best thing Ruskin College has yet done!



For those who want to know the details of this Central Labour College, there is an article in *The Freewoman* of September 19th. (By the way, there are many other good things, as usual, in that brilliant weekly paper. It is now engaged, editorially and otherwise, in propounding a new philosophy of society, which it is ready to defend against all-comers—and it is quite clear that the all-comers will have to keep their wits about them if they mean to get through). *The Freewoman* is specially interested, because to this College there is about to be added a newer department for women students, which is already rousing much discussion both in England and abroad. Here, at last, the Trade Unions have an opportunity for making educational grants which will give them a real return for their money. It is a childish thing to go supporting education which is in the clutches of their masters. The South Wales Miners and the Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants have already shown their wisdom.

*Daily Herald*, 25-ix-12.

## Report of *Plebs* Meet

**I**N the absence of the proposed Chairman—Mrs. Bridges Adams—Mr. Sims presided. In opening the meeting the Chairman said that he had been asked as a "last resource" to occupy the chair. What had seemed improbable last year had come to pass—another *Plebs* Meet and himself present at it. So far as the League and Magazine were concerned, "history had repeated itself" during the last year—we were still an impossible organization financially; although the Magazine sales had continued to show a progressive tendency it was not sufficiently marked to enable us to say that it was paying its way. Partly this was due to a falling off of membership fees, an income that we relied upon to cover some of the incidental expenses of the League which were apart from the running of the Magazine. The greatest increase of the League's work had been in the inquiry department, and on matters relating to all sorts of subjects, from theoretical educational views to publishers of books in all parts of the world. While this realization of the value of the League centre to readers of the Magazine was encouraging, there had been no corresponding "intelligent anticipation" of our financial requirements. So that some time would have to be devoted at the meeting to the subject of Ways and Means. Before calling on Mr. Reynolds the acting Secretary-Treasurer to give his report, he should like to emphasize the valuable work Mr. Reynolds had done for the movement during his (Sims's) absence through illness. Not only had he conducted the work of the League, in addition to shouldering a great deal of the inquiry work relating to the Central Labour College, but he had also spent some of his own money in the payment of correspondence postage, a fact that he (Sims) had gleaned by a study of the Balance Sheet, to be presented later, and as a result of his own experience of the correspondence work of the League and his knowledge of its growth. Our thanks are also due to Mr. Craik, for his admirable editorials contributed at no little sacrifice of his scanty leisure from the C.L.C. work, to Mr. Pratley for his valuable services in superintending the technical side of the League's publications, and to Mr. C. Watkins and other contributors of articles in the Magazine.

### Report

Mr. Reynolds then presented his report. He said they might congratulate themselves that they were still alive, and, however depressed the financial condition of the League ought to have made them, very much alive, as the struggle for independence in workers' education had shown friend and foe alike. Yet with all their optimism they were now and then forced to consider their material well-being, to come down from the heights of idealism and face the sober facts of this very earthly life—and sordid financial considerations. And that side of the shield did not appear very satisfactory. During

the year a great amount of work had been done by the League in propaganda effort in furtherance of its educational ideals and support for the Central Labour College. In the Provinces this had been done mainly by the individual efforts of our members and readers assisted by advice and printed matter from the centre. In London our members had united with the College authorities and formed a Committee for systematic propaganda. Addresses, debates, and public lectures had been given, thousands of circulars and many letters sent out to Trade Unions and Socialist bodies. Towards the expenses of this campaign the C.L.C. authorities had promised a grant of £10, the balance had been made up by subscriptions and collections at the public lectures. The League was wanted more than ever before and a little more financial support would enable other necessary work to be undertaken.

In the October number of the *Magazine* last year it was estimated that we required a paying monthly circulation of the *Magazine* numbering 1,000, and a membership of the League totaling 400, to cover the total cost of the League's yearly work. Since that time the sale of the *Magazine* had gone up to about 900 monthly, but the membership of the League was only about 60—this latter number might yet be increased as some of the old members were rather dilatory about paying their subs. Still we should undoubtedly be a long way short of the 400 members aimed at to enable us to carry on our work without the worry attendant on financial difficulties.

The total indebtedness of the League had increased by about £17 since the last Meet, or about the actual amount by which the *Magazine* sales and membership fees fell short of the estimate previously mentioned. The total indebtedness to the printers had been slightly reduced since last year, this result having been achieved by an advance from the Treasurer, and he (Reynolds) was given to understand that if the balance due to the printers could be met there need be no difficulty about the other account owing. He hoped they would earnestly consider the financial situation and that some means would be adopted towards clearing off the printers' account.

In reply to questions, Mr. Reynolds stated (1) that the total circulation of the *Magazine* averaged during the past year 1,000, free copies and unpaid dues accounted for the 100 per month over the 900 mentioned in his report. (2) On a rough estimate, about £20 would be realizable from the book-debts of the League, leaving a balance of £30 to be met to clear off the printing debt.

The Report was adopted.

### Auditors' Report and Statement of Accounts

Mr. Tom Rees said he had carefully examined the books, vouchers, &c., of the League and *Magazine*, and had found everything in order. He congratulated Mr. Reynolds on the excellent

way in which the accounts were kept. Mr. Clatworthy endorsed Mr. Rees' report and remarks *re* the keeping of the League accounts. After questions had been answered the Auditors' Report was adopted.

**Plebs League and Magazine Statement, Sept. 11th, 1911,  
to Aug. 3rd, 1912**

INCOME		£ s. d.	£ s. d.
To Cash in hand, Sept. 12th, 1911 ... ..	1 0 0		
„ Magazine and Membership Fees... ..	73 3 10½		
		74	3 10½
„ I.O.U's., August Meet, 1911			
Redeemed Sept. 11th, 1911, to Aug. 3rd, 1912 :—			
F. Burgess ... ..	2 0 0		
G. Davison ... ..	2 0 0		
E. Gill ... ..	1 10 0		
Jack Evans ... ..	1 0 0		
T. P. Keating ... ..	1 0 0		
Rhondda Plebs (per W. H. Mainwaring)	1 0 0		
Tom Rees 8/-, W. Savage 10/-, Cymro, Peckham, 2/-, per Tom Rees ... ..	1 0 0		
H. Slack ... ..	15 0		
J. A. Jones ... ..	10 0		
H. Kershaw... ..	10 0		
Ll. Bowen ... ..	5 0		
Miss Hacking ... ..	5 0		
S. Jones ... ..	5 0		
Ben. Lee ... ..	5 0		
P. Shawyer ... ..	5 0		
E. Brandt ... ..	4 0		
		12	14 0
„ Deficit Fund :—			
Geo. Davison ... ..	1 1 0		
Pontardawe Plebs (per S. G. Mathias) ...	17 0		
E. Edwards (Wolverhampton) ... ..	10 0		
Mrs. E. M. Cape, U.S.A. ... ..	9 6		
J. Murgatroyd ... ..	5 0		
D. Mason ... ..	5 0		
J. H. Pratt ... ..	5 0		
L. Taylor ... ..	5 0		
F. Biddulph... ..	2 6		
W. Hewlett... ..	2 6		
A. McGillivray ... ..	2 0		
A. Jobling ... ..	2 0		
A. Fleming ... ..	1 6		
M. Roberts ... ..	1 6		
R. H. Purser ... ..	1 6		
C. T. Cramp ... ..	1 0		
Miss I. Howse ... ..	1 0		
Miss R. Howse ... ..	1 0		

THE "PLEBS"

199

F. G. Rowe ...	...	...	...	1	0		
W. R. Stewart	...	...	...	1	0		
W. Stenton ...	...	...	...	1	0		
				<hr/>			
„ Loan from Treasurer	...	...	...	30	0	0	4 17 0
„ Balance down August 3rd, 1912	...	...	...				30 0 0
							80 19 10
							<hr/>
							202 14 8½

EXPENDITURE

	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
By Printing:—Balance due Sept. 11th, 1911 ...	53	6	2			
„ „ Magazines Sept. 11th, 1911, to						
„ Aug. 3rd, 1912 ...	44	1	6			
„ Office Materials ...				97	7	8
„ Postage: Magazines and Receipts ...	13	6	4½		4	7
„ „ Parcels, &c. ...	1	2	11			
„ Repayment of Loan to Treasurer ...				14	9	3½
„ Cash in hand: Mr. Reynolds Aug. 3rd, 1912				6	13	3
„ Liabilities due to Messrs. Fox, Jones & Co.,				3	0	1
„ Aug. 3rd, 1912 ...						
„ Liabilities due to Treasurer, Sept. 11th, 1911	9	16	0	47	17	1
„ „ „ „ Aug. 3rd, 1912	30	0	0			
	39	16	0			
Less repaid ...	6	13	3			
				33	2	9
				<hr/>		
				202	14	8½

Audited and found correct, { TOM REES,  
J. CLATWORTHY.

August 4th, 1912.

The Financial Position

A long and spirited discussion took place on the financial position of the League. Two of the members present expressed the opinion that the work of the League had been accomplished with the establishment of the Central Labour College on a firm basis. The rest of the speakers were all of the opinion that the usefulness of the League and the Magazine was but begun. It was pointed out time and again that a vast field yet remained to be cultivated in the interests of a workers' independent educational movement, that the Magazine and League, beside fulfilling the function of a voice and centre for the propaganda work, would be more and more needed as a means of solidifying the teaching and developing the movement with a sense of freedom and with such enthusiasm as the C.L.C. with its more circumscribed area, and possibly growing stolidity could not hope to do—the League would not only be the propagandist body of the movement, but also its watchful critic.

It was decided to try and obtain advertisements of an approved educational character for the cover of the Magazine to assist finances.

The question of reducing the price of the Magazine to 1d. was discussed, but it was pointed out by the Secretary that a circulation to 3,000 would be needed to get the present financial results, and in the present state of the finances such an attempt might be disastrous. It was finally decided to continue the Magazine at its present price for another year.

The following resolution was unanimously passed:—That a collection be taken at this meeting to help to clear off the Magazine debt; also that members present be invited to give I.O.U.'s, redeemable on December 1st, 1912; and the Secretary be instructed to extend this appeal to all the members of the League and the readers of the Magazine. Further that a general appeal be made to readers and members to extend Magazine sales and League Membership, so that the movement may be put on a sound financial basis.

A collection was then taken, amounting to £2 4s. 3d. I.O.U.'s were given by the following members:—

	£	s.	d.		£	s.	d.		
F. Hodges ...	...	1	1	0	W. Peake ...	...	1	0	0
G. W. Brown ...	...	1	0	0	A. H. M. Robertson ...	...	1	0	0
*J. Clatworthy ...	...	1	0	0	Tom Rees ...	...	1	0	0
Jack Evans ...	...	1	0	0	T. D. Hawkins ...	...	10	0	0
F. Fox ...	...	1	0	0	E. Archbold ...	...	5	0	0
T. P. Keating ...	...	1	0	0	H. Kershaw ...	...	5	0	0
*J. H. Pratt ...	...	1	0	0	A. Pell ...	...	2	6	0

\* Since Redeemed.

## Policy of the League and Magazine

It was unanimously resolved that:—

This Annual Meeting of the "Plebs" League endorse the Object of the League and the policy advocated in the editorials of the Magazine.

During the discussion which took place on this resolution it was suggested that a little more space be devoted in the magazine to family affairs, e.g. matters relating to the College work, educational propaganda among the Labour bodies, organizers reports, and Provincial C.L.C. classes. The Editor will therefore be glad to receive copy for magazine relating to the work being done in the interests of our movement, especially newspaper cutting and references in Labour journals. The Editor will also be pleased to receive suitable articles for publication, name and address should accompany MS. which should be marked for division if exceeding 2,000 words. MS. not considered suitable will be returned.



It was also decided that when necessary the magazine should devote some space to answering inquiries on matters of fact and theory relating to our work, and if necessary articles should be written on matters of interest and importance, raised by correspondents. In this way it was felt an incentive would be given to group organization and activity by our members and supporters.

### Election of Officers

The Secretary was unanimously re-elected. It was felt advisable to have a majority of the Executive residents in London, hence the change in the personnel of the Committee.

Mr. Craik was nominated but withdrew his name. This left the list as it appears on the back cover of the magazine, and there being no opposition the names were put to the meeting and were unanimously adopted.

The meeting closed at 6 p.m.

---

## The Central Labour College Provincial Classes

THE CENTRAL LABOUR COLLEGE EXTENSION MOVEMENT was no afterthought on the part of the founders of the College. It was part of its scheme of things from the first day of its existence. More than that, it was recognized at the outset to be the essential part of the College's work. For that reason was it named the *Central Labour College*.

It was an ambitious ideal. Our enemies scoffed, our friends in some quarters were sceptical. That was three years ago. To-day the sceptical friends are much fewer. And our enemies—"even the devils believe and tremble." In 1909 we could only say to those who would not work—wait and see. "The greatest economic expert that Oxford has ever produced" notwithstanding, we have found that the reward of working, although it has not come in the shape of the consecrating metal, is much more matter of fact than the reward of waiting. In the winter of 1909 the College established in Rochdale,—the cradle of many pioneering movements although not in all cases progressive—its first three classes, the total membership of which numbered about sixty students. In the following winter, new classes were opened at Bury, Waterfoot, St. Helens and Preston, and the total number of students advanced to about one hundred and fifty. In the 1910-11 Session just double the number of classes were established and double the number of students recorded. All this in Lancashire, in which county there should be something moving presently.

The rate of progress will in no way be diminished in the 1912-13 Session. New classes have been opened up at Burnley, Colne, Accrington, Nelson, and Padiham, by some very enterprising and zealous C.L.C'ers. These classes form the North East Lancashire District for which Mr. Edward Archbold has been appointed lecturer. The Rochdale District has added Heywood and Manchester to its conquests, for which Mr. C. L. Gibbons is the lecturer, with Mr. Will Jones as assistant lecturer. A new district is being opened in the Rhondda Valley with Mr. W. F. Hay, who last winter had charge of the Rochdale District, as lecturer. The classes in this district have the official backing of the Rhondda No. 1 District South Wales Miners' Federation.

Classes have been established in the Garw Valley with Mr. Frank Hodges, the youngest miners' agent in this country, as lecturer. At Abertillery and in the Tredegar District of the S.W.M.F., classes have been established with Mr. Sidney Jones as lecturer. At Bradford, Mr. Meredith Titterington will take charge of some local classes. Classes are also being established at Hull, Brighton, Reading, Watford, Birmingham, and various parts of London. In the Newcastle District active forces are at work preparing to raise our educational standard there.

Who shall say that this is not progress? Progress it is, beyond even the most optimistic anticipations of the pioneers of the extension policy. The total number of students embraced by these classes during the coming winter should be well approaching one thousand. One thousand members of working-class organizations, conscious of the snares and pitfalls that beset the road, men and women for whom the mists of the morning have risen upon the field of battle and shown the enemy as he really is, must surely bring the day of final triumph nearer to realization.

W. W. C.

---

## The Plebs Art Gallery

---

We have a few sets left of the plaster-cast busts, 6½ inches high, of Dennis Hird, Darwin, Huxley, Spencer and Ruskin—to clear stock we will supply them at 1/3 each, or 5/- the set, carriage paid. Address:—

Editor, 13 Penywern Road,

Earls Court, London, S.W.

## "Syndicalism"

"**S**YNDICAT" is the French word for the English "Union." From that it would seem that "Syndicalism" must mean "Unionism." Due to one of those unaccountable freaks of language, "Syndicalism" has come to be understood in many places as meaning a particular sort of "Unionism," to wit, a theory of economic organization with the revolutionary purpose of overthrowing capitalism by the specialized means of physical force.

Everybody, whose information is not below par, knows that, in order to understand an institution, a movement, or a document, the history of the country and of the times in the country of its birth must first be known. No play of Aristophanes can be properly appreciated without knowing the history of Greece; Don Quixote is a closed book, at any rate, merely a funny book, to those who don't know Spain; or, who could weigh the Civic Federation who knew nothing of American conditions? "Syndicalism," a word of French origin, reflects a thing of French birth. If these facts were kept in mind, then, on the one hand, the non-French Europeans, who denounce "Syndicalism" sweepingly, would curb their pens, and, on the other hand, the American would-be imitators of "Syndicalism" would realize that they but play the rôle of monkeys at the North Pole, or Polar bears under the tropics.

The point can be best understood by turning the telescope upon two typical representatives of the two seemingly opposed currents of the Movement in France—Guesde, the Anti-Syndicalist, and Lagardelle, or Herve, Pro-Syndicalists.

At Nancy, in 1907, Guesde expressed his estimate of the economic organization as a place whither men were attracted in search of immediate material and individually selfish (not therefore improper, or unnecessary) gain. The economic organization, according to him, was not and could not be a body animated with any high ideal, least of all with that loftiest of ideals, the Socialist Republic. That ideal could be pursued only by the political movement. Yet, before closing, Guesde completed his speech by saying he by no means meant to deny that the hour for physical force would arrive. That hour was certain to arrive. Then the men of the party would seize the gun, and fall to.—Stick a pin there.

Lagardelle, in his scholastic style, Herve, in his hammer and tongs way, interspersed with wit and satire, ridiculed the excessive expectations their opponents entertained from the political move-

ment. That neither Lagardelle nor Herve repudiates political action appeared substantially from their being delegates to the convention of a political party. The burden of their song was, however, that the economic organization had the pre-eminent mission, and was pre-eminently called upon to gather within its fold the insurrectory elements that would furnish the requisite physical force wherewith to knock down capitalist rule.—Stick a pin there, too.

At first blush, it would seem that the two tendencies are irrevocable; that they are not off-shoots from a common trunk; that, consequently, one or other must be a freak affair. Not so. At this stage of maturity in the International Movement, there is no freak manifestation that does not, besides betraying intellectual weakness, generally betray also intellectual uncleanliness. The Guesde and the Lagardelle-Herve forces are too intellectually powerful and intellectually clean for either to be a freak-fraud affair, or to be even remotely tainted therewith. They are children of identical parentage; their principles will be found to resolve themselves into the identical practice.

A knowledge of French conditions makes this clear.

Herve stated in Stuttgart to the writer of this article that the factor that acts as the most powerful deterrent upon the ruling classes to push the proletariat to extremes, is the knowledge that "on the Continent everyone knows how to handle a gun." The observation is pregnant with most pregnant conclusions, that bear directly upon "Syndicalism," and, not very much less directly upon the course that events dictate in other countries:—

First.—In a country where compulsory military service has not only made the people skilful in the handling of a gun, but has familiarized them with military tactics, an insurrectionary call to arms can not be imagined to gather 50,000 men without the vast majority of them are readily organizable. From the militarily-schooled mass the requisite military chiefs and lieutenants will spontaneously spring up, and be spontaneously acknowledged. The organized insurrectionary force would be on foot.

Second.—In a country like France, where as yet there is no large capitalism to rank the proletariat into the battalions of an industrial insurrectionary organization, and thereby to furnish the Revolution, as an equivalent for a military force, with a mighty non-military engine of physical force, but where, on the other hand, compulsory military service has amply prepared the soil for military organized insurrection, and in which, moreover, national traditions lightly turn

the thought to just such methods,—in such a country the only real difference between the Guesde forces and the Lagardelle-Herve forces is that the latter utter the still unconscious sentiments of the former. It is a difference of importance, salutary to both. It rescues present Anti-Syndicalism from the possible danger of losing itself in the mystic mazes of what Marx called the "cretinism" (idiocy) of bourgeois parliamentarism, and it holds Syndicalism in check, lest it rush headlong, driven by premature impetuosity. It is a difference that marks the one somewhat unripe, the other somewhat too ripe. In fine, it is a difference that proves identity—the spot where both currents will and are bound eventually to merge.

Third.—In all the other European countries, where, as in France, compulsory military service prepares the soil for military organized insurrection; but where, differently from France, temperament and traditions are other, thoughts of "Syndicalism" naturally seem wild—at present; and as naturally, will seem rational and be adopted in the ripeness of time. Present condemnation, provided the condemnation be not too sweeping, of "Syndicalism" from such quarters is imperative, even to those who may see beyond the present. Any other policy on their part would have no effect other than the harmful one of furnishing grist to the crack-brained mill of Anarchy.

Fourth.—In a country like the United States, where, differently from France and other European countries, there is no compulsory military service to prepare the soil for military organized insurrection, but where, on the other hand and differently from everywhere else, large capitalism is in such bloom as to have ranked the proletariat into the battalions for an industrial insurrection, and thereby to have furnished the Revolution, as an equivalent for a military force, with a mighty non-military engine of physical force,—in such a country Syndicalism has no place. In such a country, whosoever struts in the phraseology of Syndicalism is as ridiculous as a monkey would be in the frozen North, or a Polar bear in the wilds of the torrid zone. The social-political atmosphere makes them freak-frauds.

Fifth.—Stripped of some casual expressions, "Syndicalism" is not "Industrial Unionism." Syndicalism lays hardly any stress—it can not choose but fail to lay stress: the capitalist development in the land of its birth does not furnish it with a foundation for laying such stress—upon the STRUCTURE, its main stress is laid upon the FUNCTION of the economic organization,—that function being, according to "Syndicalism," physical

force. Industrial Unionism, on the contrary, being the product of American highly-developed capitalism, lays main stress upon the STRUCTURE of the economic organization; the FUNCTION of the same—the overthrow of the Political State and the seizing of the reins of Government as the Socialist or Industrial State—flowing, as a matter of course, from its structure.

D. DE LEON.

---

## Where Wright's Wrong

[A woman doctor in *The Weekly People* says enough to make Sir Alm wroth].

**S**IR Almworth Wright, the noted English physician, is one of the latest to raise the voice of pseudo-science in support of a dwindling prejudice—the idea that women should not vote.

Sir Almworth finds (*New York Times*, March 31, 1912) the reason for the progress of the suffrage movement in "the half-million of our excess female population" left behind in the emigration of males. Its demand for the vote, he alleges, is the demand for the control of those compulsive forces on which the state rests and which women are disabled by nature from exercising. He expresses doubt whether the institution of marriage itself can endure in the absence of "some willing subordination on the part of the wife," and he refers severely to the contrary ideas which are "being imparted to young women in colleges and schools whose staff are made up of unmarried suffragettes."

The learned physician climaxes his argument as follows:

"It would be well, I often think, that every woman should clearly be told—and the woman of the world will immediately understand—that when man sets his face against the proposal to bring in an epicene world he does so because he can do his best work only in surroundings where he is perfectly free from suggestion and from restraint and from the onus which all differential treatment imposes, and, I may add, in connexion with my own profession, that when the medical man asks that he should not be the yoke-fellow of the medical woman, he does so also because he would wish to keep up as between men and women, even when they are doctors, some of the modesties and reticences upon which our civilization has been built. Up to now the medical woman is, of course, never on the side of modesty or in favour of any reticences. Her desire for knowledge does not allow of these."

Sir Almworth has let out of the bag a large-sized cat! Our legislators, on this side at least, have been telling us that in withholding suffrage from women, they are really acting in a thoroughly

unselfish way; that they do not care a rap, as far as they themselves are concerned, whether women vote or not, but, "in the interests of Home and Motherhood" (suddenly become sacrosanct) they feel bound to protect women against this whim which the childless among them have evolved out of their sad need of "interests."

But no Seven Veils of hypocrisy for Sir Almworth! Note his frank statement: "Every woman should be clearly told . . . that, when man sets his face against the proposal to bring in an epicene world he does so because he can do his best work only in surroundings where he is perfectly free from suggestion and from restraint and from the onus which all differential treatment imposes." Here is one man, then, who leaving aside the flim-flam of "the best interests of women," says that he opposes an "epicene world" (as he pedantically chooses to call one in which there is sex discrimination between man and women in the matter of work and privilege) on the ground that it interfered with him and his work. But a man of such acumen as Sir Almworth must have observed long ago that the machine and the capitalist have already made the world "epicene" as far as the "right" of the proletarian woman to work is concerned. He makes no mention of the fact that he shudders when taking a fee from the noble masters and owners of such women's labour, nor does he say that he regards their labour as a menace to the integrity of his intellectual efforts. Apparently then it is not to these women he is speaking, though he distinctly says he wishes "every woman" might be told his message. But in fact it is not easy to see how the giving of the women the ballot will make working by her side in the factory more suggestive, or place the man under greater "restraint," or lay on him a greater "onus" of differential treatment. So it is evident that Sir Almworth's wrath is not directed against women in general, nor against their work in general.

No, the women whose emancipation is causing him discomfort are the women who, not content only to spin his cotton and woollens for him, actually make so bold as to break into his own and every other intellectual field. And we must not be misled by the objections he sets down against them on the score of "suggestion," "restraint" and "onus of differential treatment," for a glance exposes those reasons as too silly to be put forward seriously by an earnest man, and that Sir Almworth is earnest is manifest in every phrase. Any man finding it suggestive to work by a woman colleague in medicine, law or teaching, is too susceptible a man to be allowed to ride on trains and street cars, and should be locked up for his own and society's protection rather than that women should abandon the above-named professions. Similarly, any student of medicine, say, who feels himself hampered in his "best work" because the presence of women restrains him from making the laboratory flow with tobacco juice and adds such an "onus of differential treatment" that he greets a woman with "good morning" instead of feeling free to "whack her one" on

the shoulder—such a student has too slender an intellect to make his "best work" of sufficient importance to warrant keeping women out of the field of medicine. Since Sir Almwroth is far too eminent in his profession to be suspected of jealousy, I am inclined to think that he gives the above silly reasons for resisting an "epicene" world solely because of his sense of "the modesties and reticences upon which our civilization has been built" (modesties and reticences, by the way, that have been preserved to our children through the ages those fairy grandmothers, the transmitted venereal diseases). But if he does not feel free to call his reticence by its true name, I, being a "medical woman," and therefore, "of course, never on the side of modesty or in favour of any reticences," will name it for him, and for all other men who like him are beating the devil around the bush with high-sounding phrases.

That which makes men of the so-called cultured class so nervous in the face of the "Woman's Movement" is the danger they see threatening their comfort in general, and their free and easy sex standards in particular. People are eternally selfish with one another, men with women and women with men. But taking it all in all, it is easier on the whole for the men of the leisure class to exploit their wives on the personal side than it is the other way round. Most women entertain some absurd superstition about the possibility and wisdom of making a sustained effort to "retain their husband's affections." What a weighty phrase it is! The very fact that it is for ever being repeated around us shows that men have a great advantage over their wives.

And they have. The advantage is that they give their wives support, something which no other male is clamouring very loudly to give her. She, on the other hand, gives him what in spite of my lack of modesty I blush to call "love," but such is the name given to it. It may be added that sometimes she gives a certain amount of work, but remember it is the women and men of the leisure class we are discussing, so that the work is a negligible quantity. Anyway it is the "love" that interests the man and about which he is fastidious—so fastidious, in fact, that he may not infrequently be caught gazing over the matrimonial fence at his neighbour's wife to see if he likes that brand of "love" better than the one with which he is established. Since the market of the world is glutted with women who are clamouring to duplicate the "love" that his wife is furnishing him, and since variety has great charm for him as one of his biological heritages, it follows that the said wife is at a great disadvantage.

Well then, out of this position of disadvantage in which the man holds the woman, he squeezes an enormous amount of bodily comfort and satisfaction for his appetites. He knows that as long as the woman's chief interest centres around matters of sex, just so long will this comfort and satisfaction of appetite be retained for him. But if, woman is "emancipated," that means that her interests will expand



beyond him to the uttermost limits of knowledge ; sex life will recede to its place as merely one of her functions, though her most important function, but will no longer be her sole justification for existence. By the same token, her main solicitude in life will not be the personal pleasure of a man. She will learn to look on him in a dispassionate way, and from being the centre of the universe, he will find himself in a world of women that will show small patience with his childish selfishness and egotism.

These women will be so hard to befuddle, that they will be remorseless in wrecking his genius even, if it has to flower at the expense of their liberty as individuals. Now since few men will be able to grasp the idea that a woman's personal liberty may become as valuable to her, as his is to him, it naturally follows that the majority of men, and Sir Almroth with them, are going to see in the effort of women to emancipate themselves, nothing but pathology, an abnormal desire fostered by "sexually embittered women"; and it is equally natural, too, that these men should fight to keep the world in a condition that will afford them a maximum of sex liberty. And it is this sex liberty which I maintain Sir Almroth sees in jeopardy, but is too full of "modesties" and "reticences" to go further than a delicate hint at, a hint that the "women of the world will immediately understand," and upon receiving will retire from the cause, to take up again the boudoir, there to prepare legitimate "suggestions" for the mighty intellectual worker when, his "best work" done, he is free to turn to woman, his amusement.

But she who is not "of the world," but of the clouds, if you will, goes stubbornly on, drawing down the odium of man in her tactless pursuit of her silly ideal: the Humanizing of Women.

CARY F. de ANGULO.

---

## Remarks of a Rambling Nature

**A**NOTHER Meet has come and gone, and when one looks back there is trail of hopes realized and hopes deferred, something attempted, something done. Yet whatever has been done there is yet a great fight before the C.L.C. and its adherents of The Plebs League. The Meet of the C.L.C. and Plebs may be conveniently described as very successful, but when one returns to the work-a-day world one cannot fail to be almost staggered by the comparative indifference of one's fellow in matters effecting their interest. And *there* is the work. A journey of 400 miles and the losing of two nights' sleep is a deterrent to writing articles and now it is highly probable that the official reports of the Meet are in the hands of our readers. Anyhow, my personal recollections of these gatherings are happy, and somewhat in addition to other things, there are confused

impressions of mural decorations where Shaw is depicted breaking stones, Morris in a studied disorder of tapestries, linoleums, and antiquated looms, whilst opposite one sees Marx apparently fulfilling the rôle of a Labour Exchange official.† What of Lassalle? And this is the age of Pre-Raphaelites, Impressionists, Cubists, and Picarsoism. Oh! for the days of Karnak, or the glory that was Greece!

\* \* \* \* \*

At the moment of writing one hears that General Booth is dead. One has to recognize him as one of the foremost of charity organizers. The Salvation Army as a social means fails to solve the Working-Class Problem. Of that there can be no doubt; yet coupled with the exercising of charitable functions there has been the inculcation of religious theories, a casual survey of which will bring home to the most sceptical, some sense of proportion of the task imposed upon us in our activities as Labour Educationists. Whilst some of us are wallowing in Dietzgen, Marx, Ward, and their respective theories, we suffer from the illusions of the near, form an inadequate appreciation of the social situation, and the death of a man like William Booth, resolves in an event, crystalizes in a word, the tendencies of the age and pulls us up with startling suddenness and compels us to admit, in spite of ourselves and fondest desire, that "where the vanguard camps to-day, the rearguard camps to-morrow" is only a truism when the necessary conditions of organizations and solidarity are attained. Social charity must give way to a social clarity, emotions must bow to the sway of intellect. "We have but to will and we set our faces towards Civilization."

\* \* \* \* \*

Which all goes to say and prove by influence that restraint is a necessary feature of a human being and the same time gives me the opportunity of appending some remarks upon *Broken Earthenware* by Mr. Harold Begbie. After reading this book my feelings were something akin to those that one experiences after having read an exciting introduction to a somewhat lengthy article and then to find that it concludes with a miraculous cure by Stood and Blomach Pills.

The book is called a footnote to the one by Prof. James on Religious Experiences. The graphic portrayals of type lives are extremely interesting, not to say exciting, whilst the advent of the Salvation Army and the resulting conversion is the element miraculous. The result of the conversions of the varying individuals portrayed, is shown to be a fairly permanent advance on their previous existences and yet whilst it may be said to be the true cause in an individual case, yet in social matters there is a danger of extolling that organization to such an extent that the argument will savour of what Ruskin students would call *post hoc ergo propter hoc*.

† A reference to the wall decoration at Chandos Hall, where the evening meeting was held.—ED.

The kernel of the whole argument is change—the moral nature of man and all will be well. The reverse argument being, morality is a product of material conditions and the method of production in Society. Not the crude materialism of ponderable matter, but the advanced philosophic monistic materialism of the 20th century.

\* \* \* \* \*

That is and must be the creed of the workers. Creedlessness is detrimental. Chesterton in the *Daily Herald* some time ago saw that. Does he yet subscribe to the C.L.C.? We know too much of those *sans* creed who wave the flag of Impartiality, Non-Sectarianism and Synopticism. Our creed is the concept of Evolution; the Eternal Flux and the Divinity of Demons. The Class Creed of the Workers.

\* \* \* \* \*

There is a little book on Botany by Mr. Scott: *The Evolution of Plants*, in The University Series, 1/- Whilst it is distinctly on an evolutionary basis, and, we are told, of an elementary character, yet the technical nature of the treatment makes it a fairly stiff book for one desiring such information.

\* \* \* \* \*

Some little time ago we read Lowerison's diatribe in *The Daily Herald* on *How he lied to her husband* and *The Man of Destiny*. Many moons have passed since I read them, and I attended their presentation at the theatre last night. Shaw appears to have done a mental "double" in this burlesque of *Candida* and apparently leaves one in one's original position, or perhaps it may be a flagrant case of Fabian permeation of the body politic by means of a mustard plaster and a whiskey hot. Whilst *The Man of Destiny* was anything but a "Trifle," yet I am sure Napoleon would never have uttered that peroration on the Englishmen to an audience of one. It would have sounded much better in Hyde Park, Trafalgar Square or on Tower Hill. But that is the fault of History and Shaw.

And now Adieu, my masters.—MEREDITH F. TITTERINGTON.

---

## Syndicalism—A Romance ?

**W**E are always anxious to learn, therefore when we saw a book in a shop window with an announcement on the paper wrapper in this wise: "This book explains the meaning of Syndicalism; sets forth its Programme, defines its Aims, states its Principles, criticizes its Actions, and compares its Relations with both Trade Unionists and Socialists," we gladly parted with our last piece of the precious metal in exchange for the commodity which promised such enlightenment. Alas for the vanity of human hopes!

The expected enlightenment turned out to be Stygian darkness, *but* to slightly paraphrase the author, it proved "refreshingly delectable in its simple innocence and its charming revelation of the Macdonald mind under the influence of a bogey"—the bogey being the author's evident belief that he knows all about the subject of Syndicalism.

Syndicalism, we are told, has in France two components, revolutionists and reformist sections, and that the reformist section is numerically the stronger, though, owing to the fact that each union has equality in voting power without regard to numbers represented, the revolutionary section dominate the policy of the federated unions. The C.G.T. is said to represent 400,000 workers, of whom 250,000 disagree with the policy of that body. This leaves us in a rather doubtful frame of mind with regard to the accuracy of the author's statements on the subject, more especially as we are informed that on a delegate vote being taken on the question of proportional voting at the deliberations of the C.G.T., the figures were 388 for, 822 against. Moreover, it seem peculiar, to say the least of it, that a majority of the members of the C.G.T. should be in opposition to the policy of the federation—politically and industrially, and our author should certainly have tried to account for the fact of their continued membership. There is another point Mr. Macdonald might have explained, viz., why he should describe French Syndicalism as *nothing more than a revolutionary* form of "British Trade Unionism." What greater *contrast* could one have? Our author is apt to treat us to many biological illustrations and is no doubt aware that in biological structure there is a close resemblance between the anthropoid ape and man, would he therefore say that the former is "nothing more than a revolutionary form" of the latter? We are tempted to ask this as Mr. Macdonald poses as a model for clarity of expression.

The investigation into the form of ownership (control?) proposed by Syndicalism is then dealt with and our author quotes the Syndicalist as saying, "I do not want the State, but the organized workers themselves to own it," and Mr. Macdonald says—

How the national interest in production is to be enforced he does not say, though on the whole he leaves one to assume that the controlling unions of workmen will be inspired by *moral* considerations—a very uncertain basis on which to found revolutionary action.

Whether this assumption is correct or not, it is upon this same "uncertain basis" of "moral considerations" that Mr. Macdonald bases his own doctrine of how organized Labour should, nay, *must* act, as witness the following later on in the book :—

A miner's, a railwaymen's, a docker's strike has at length to be settled by the House of Commons as representative of the common interests of consumers and as guardian of social order and peace. This is a fellowship of action born not merely of industrial change, *but of moral desire, and it is to remain* as a characteristic of our society.

Well, we have long since learned that we must not expect consistency from our author, so we pass on.

From the first four chapters of the book we glean that Syndicalism in France is a form of craft unionism, aims at the improvement of the wage-workers' lot by means of "increases of wages, reduction in hours, improvements in conditions." It refuses to traffic in politics, confines its membership to wage-workers. The weapon it wields is "nothing but" the ancient weapon of British Trade Unionism—the strike. (Mr. Macdonald forgets the law of science, viz.: that merely quantitative differences beyond a certain point pass into qualitative changes. That point is reached in industrial organization when, in place of sectional movements, mass movements by industries become the rule). The point of divergence of Trade Unionism and Socialism is then shown to be applicable to Syndicalism for they say: "while the producers control the means of production they cannot be free." The points of divergence between Socialism and Syndicalism are twofold: (1) ownership of the tools of production by the workers engaged in the industry; (2) opposition to political action. As a matter of fact Mr. Macdonald admits that the first point is not essential to Syndicalism. In an analysis of the differences between Socialism and Syndicalism Mr. Macdonald says, "method counts for everything in the process of social change." This statement would be true enough *if* the objective is the same, but this is not so either in the case of Syndicalism and Socialism, or in the cases of the political-state Socialists and the industrial-commonwealth Socialists, to say nothing of the Socialists who believe in a Socialist industrial form of society to be attained *via* the capture, control, and administration of the political state pending their legislating in the industrial order. Mr. Macdonald makes a mistake in belittling his antagonist's opinions and over-rating his own. Take, for instance, this book, in it he is quite unable, if we are to give him credit for honest intentions, to separate the theories of Syndicalism and industrial unionism: he makes this mistake by inference in Chap. I, that dealing with the French movement, and more blatantly when he asserts in Chap. V that Syndicalism takes its rise in America with the first convention of the Industrial Workers of the World, held in Chicago in 1905. *The* distinguishing features of Syndicalism, says Mr. Macdonald, are its anti-political posture and its advocacy of The General Strike—we would add also (1) that it has no definite policy of industrial organization, either (A) for the waging of the industrial conflict here and now, (B) or for the taking and controlling of the productive forces of the future, which might be held to come into its hands as a result of the victory of the industrial proletariat over the capitalist class. (2) This being the case the craft system of industrial organization is not necessarily abolished by the growth (?) of Syndicalist theories.

Industrial Unionism takes its rise as a definite theory of industrial organization from the Chicago Convention of 1905 aforementioned—and we might say in passing that it in turn grew out of the Socialist Trades and Labour Alliance founded about 1895, which in turn grew out of the Knights of Labour founded in 1869, to unite every section of skilled and unskilled labour, its methods included the sympathetic strike and the boycott, its motto: "An injury to one is an injury to all." This is the geneology of industrial unionism and a study of Justus Ebert's pamphlet, *American Industrial Evolution*, published by the New York Labour News Co., would have better equipped Mr. Macdonald for an understanding of the Industrial Workers of the World movement. The Chicago Convention of 1905 laid it down, in the I.W.W. Preamble, that :

The working class and the employing class have nothing in common. There can be no peace so long as hunger and want are found among millions of working people and the few, who make up the employing class, have all the good things of life.

Between these two classes a struggle must go on until all the toilers come together on the political, as well as on the industrial field, and take and hold that which they produce by their labour through an economic organization of the working class without affiliation to any political party.

This quotation shows that (A) the I.W.W. was in favour of political action—true, not through an outside political body, but as a part of its own activities; (B) in favour of the ultimate emancipation of Labour from wage-slavery; and the establishment of an industrial form of society; (C) through an economic organization of the working class, formed in such a way as to carry on the class struggle here and now, and also to prepare to take and hold the means of production when the conditions for such action were favourable. The suggested form of organization was laid down in a pamphlet issued by the I.W.W. and called: *The Handbook of Industrial Unionism*.

Industrial Unionism, which Mr. Macdonald has incontinently mixed up with Syndicalism in his book, is therefore not anti-political, is not without "organic formative influences," "has [not] to fall back upon force, either the passive force of social paralysis or the active force of riots," or "catastrophic revolutions." It is in line with the theories of scientific Socialism, which Mr. Macdonald has apparently not studied sufficiently to understand, but from which he is quite astute enough to "lift" phrases so as to give an appearance of scientific truth to the confused notions which he labels Socialism. We recommended two sentences from this book for his careful consideration: "Most people would say: 'Sit down and think things out,'" for "Like every one who loses grip of reality, he has to find refuge in high-sounding phrases."

How far Mr. Macdonald has lost "grip of reality" is seen in his reference to the *Plebs*. He says the *Plebs* paved the way for Syndicalism; also,

This movement always seemed to me the inevitable product of an attempt to send to breathe the atmosphere of Oxford a body of young workmen, able and ambitious, but not sufficiently prepared for the work given them to do. When those who are to lead the working-class movements, either from their practical or their cultured side, fall under the glamour of Oxford as it now is, an intellectual Eurasianism is created, which, finding no hospitable welcome either in the world of culture or in that of democracy, must brood over revolution and be attracted by superficial and grandiloquent theorising. Some of the men were strong enough to keep their heads, but Syndicalism became for others a pleasant path to fame and notoriety. They were not happy in themselves and in their prospects. They would declare war upon the world.

There it is! the oracle hath spoken! and his knowledge of the *Plebs* is in keeping with his knowledge of Syndicalism and Socialism. The Plebs were deceivers ever; however skilfully they have endeavoured to hide their real attitude to Oxford culture, Ramsey has seen beneath the surface of the written and spoken word—"he knoweth our frame, he remembereth that we are dust," and being an authority on "intellectual Eurasianism" and "superficial and grandiloquent theorising," he salutes us in the name of the Brotherhood. Selah!

Still we are not surprised that Mr. Macdonald has failed to justify the statements made about his book on the covers; first, because even where theories are set out clearly and where definite forms of organization arise to propagate them, he has before now failed to master the subject, e.g., the Marxian theories; and Industrial Unionism: secondly, as regards Syndicalist Science there is no such system in existence, while its organization in this country, and it was of Syndicalism in this local sense that he set out to analyze, is a negligible quantity. Theoretical analysis is not Mr. Macdonald's forte. The book has little value apart from its possible power to attract precious metal into the coffers of Messrs. Constable, the publishers, and the popular journalist who is its author. The Syndicalist and Mr. Macdonald have much in common apart from mutual estrangement from social science. Moliere had the type in mind when he wrote:—

Here is a man indeed! He goes from white to black,  
He condemns in the morning his sentiments of the evening,  
Troublesome to everybody, troublesome even to himself,  
He changes at every moment the mind like the fashion.

BRUMAIRE.

---

There is nothing men take such pains to keep as life; and nothing they take so little pains to keep well.—LUBBOCK.

On politics the world will disagree,  
But all mankind's concern is £ s. d.—D. McClymont.

## The Material Basis

**N**EVER was a situation more clearly defined or more decisive than that of 1660. Never had a course of conduct been more plainly indicated to a well-ordered mind. England was out of Cromwell's grasp. Under the Republic many irregularities had been committed. British preponderance had been created. With the aid of the Thirty Years' War, Germany had been overcome; with the aid of the Fronde, France had been humiliated; with the aid of the Duke of Braganza, the power of Spain had been lessened. Cromwell had tamed Mazarin; in signing treaties the Protector of England wrote his name above that of the King of France. The United Provinces had been put under a fine of eight millions; Algiers and Tunis had been attacked; Jamaica conquered; Lisbon humbled; French rivalry encouraged in Barcelona, and Masaniello in Naples; Portugal had been made fast to England; the seas had been swept of Barbary pirates from Gibraltar to Crete; maritime domination had been founded under two forms, Victory and Commerce. On the 10th of August, 1653, the man of thirty-three victories, the old admiral who called himself the sailors' grandfather, Martin Happertz van Tromp, who had beaten the Spanish, had been destroyed by the English fleet. The Atlantic had been cleared of the Spanish navy, the Pacific of the Dutch, the Mediterranean of the Venetian, and by the patent of navigation, England had taken possession of the sea-coast of the world. By the ocean she commanded the world; at sea the Dutch flag humbly saluted the British flag. France, in the person of the Ambassador Mancini, bent the knee to Oliver Cromwell; and Cromwell played with Calais and Dunkirk as with two shuttlecocks on a battledore. The Continent had been taught to tremble, peace had been dictated, war declared, the British Ensign raised on every pinnacle. By itself the Protector's regiment of Ironsides weighed in the fears of Europe against an army. Cromwell used to say, "*I wish the Republic of England to be respected, as was respected the Republic of Rome.*" No longer were delusions held sacred; speech was free, the press was free. In the public street men said what they listed; they printed what they pleased without control or censorship. The equilibrium of thrones had been destroyed. The whole order of European monarchy, in which the Stuarts formed a link, had been overturned. But at last England had emerged from this odious order of things, and had won its pardon.

VICTOR HUGO.