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NOTES OF THE WEEK.

The Prison Warders Relief Bill, as many call Mr. Gladstone's latest measure, was read a third time on December 7. We expected not otherwise from a majority which represents the plutocracy at its ugliest. Mr. Lyell the Liberal and Sir F. Banbury the Tory erred in their pretensions of sympathy for the poor who were robbed. In comparison with these members and the class they represent, the fraction taken by those who are robbed is a mere bagatelle; it is, one is almost tempted to say, clean, honest, above-board stealing. One would think that Mr. Gladstone would have done more; but he has discredited one at that. The whole concept of scientific criminology is a gross superstitious sham. One professor spends his life-time in repudiating the pretensions of another. Ferri shows that Lombroso is mistaken; Kowalewsky that the others know not of what they are talking. Then comes Ingegnieros to tell us this is all as it should be; criminology is pursuing the natural path of evolution; and that with an increasing knowledge of heredity, we shall be able to treat criminals in some quite certain fashion. But only amateur scientists like Mr. J. M. Robertson can be induced to put faith in these boasts; only dilettantes like Mr. Robertson are led to believe that social legislation may now be based upon the laws of heredity. If we turn from the amateur to the workers in science we find them all at loggerheads. Thus Mr. Bateson, the Professor of Biology at Cambridge, quite recently told us that knowledge about heredity "will chiefly be accomplished by the application of experimental methods, especially those which Mendel's discovery has suggested." A few weeks later Professor Karl Pearson, of the Galton Eugenics Laboratory, writes: "It seems to me very dangerous in the present state of our knowledge to accept any sweeping application of Mendelism." Whilst then the priests are thus confounding one another, we, who, unlike the Member for Tyneside, have no pretensions to be scientific, demand human discipline; one which makes many prisoners submit to all kinds of brutality of warders, prison doctors, chaplains, governors, and the like rather than make a complaint. The prisoner who complains about his treatment will not have his period of detention reduced.

* * *

Mr. Bell, who ruthlessly criticised the Bill, had no difficulty in disposing of the scientific arguments advanced in its favour by some members. Lombroso, he said, was a charlatan, and he might have added a discredited one at that. The whole concept of scientific criminology is a gross superstitious sham. One professor spends his life-time in repudiating the pretensions of another. Ferri shows that Lombroso is mistaken; Kowalewsky that the others know not of what they are talking. Then comes Ingegnieros to tell us this is all as it should be; criminology is pursuing the natural path of evolution; and that with an increasing knowledge of heredity, we shall be able to treat criminals in some quite certain fashion. But only amateur scientists like Mr. J. M. Robertson can be induced to put faith in these boasts; only dilettantes like Mr. Robertson are led to believe that social legislation may now be based upon the laws of heredity. If we turn from the amateur to the workers in science we find them all at loggerheads. Thus Mr. Bateson, the Professor of Biology at Cambridge, quite recently told us that knowledge about heredity "will chiefly be accomplished by the application of experimental methods, especially those which Mendel's discovery has suggested." A few weeks later Professor Karl Pearson, of the Galton Eugenics Laboratory, writes: "It seems to me very dangerous in the present state of our knowledge to accept any sweeping application of Mendelism." Whilst then the priests are thus confounding one another, we, who, unlike the Member for Tyneside, have no pretensions to be scientific, demand human treatment of human beings, whether they are in prison or out of it. Mr. Gladstone's Bill is the most dastardly outrage upon the weak and the ignorant of which his Government has yet been guilty.

* * *

Mr. Asquith has spoken! O wicked House of Lords! But for you the Government would have solved the Un-
employment question. But for you there would be no Sweating to-day, no overcrowding, no slums. Were it not for the House of Lords there would be no Suffragettes, and there would not have been 721 English men and women imprisoned for political reasons. If it were not for the House of Lords, the workers would not have been suddenly thrown out of employment at Woolwich. If it were not for the House of Lords, the Small Holdings Act would have been enforced. We should have had no taxes on tea and coffee; there would have been a graduated income-tax; and the land would have been nationalised. We should have had a National Marine Service and a National Transport Service for the Interior. The Irish would have had Home Rule, and the Scotch and the Welsh. But for you, O wicked Lords, the wishes of the people of India had been respected; and we should have given them representative government. We should have followed the enlightened rule of the Sultan of Zanzibar. But for you, O wicked Lords, the land would have been nationalised. We should have had a National Marine Service and a National Transport Service for the Interior. The Irish would have had Home Rule, and the Scotch and the Welsh. But for you, O wicked Lords, the wishes of the people of India had been respected; and we should have given them representative government. We should have followed the enlightened rule of the Sultan of Zanzibar. But for you, O wicked Lords, the land would have been nationalised. We should have had a National Marine Service and a National Transport Service for the Interior. The Irish would have had Home Rule, and the Scotch and the Welsh. But for you, O wicked Lords, the wishes of the people of India had been respected; and we should have given them representative government. We should have followed the enlightened rule of the Sultan of Zanzibar. But for you, O wicked Lords, the land would have been nationalised. We should have had a National Marine Service and a National Transport Service for the Interior. The Irish would have had Home Rule, and the Scotch and the Welsh. But for you, O wicked Lords, the wishes of the people of India had been respected; and we should have given them representative government. We should have followed the enlightened rule of the Sultan of Zanzibar. But for you, O wicked Lords, the land would have been nationalised. We should have had a National Marine Service and a National Transport Service for the Interior. The Irish would have had Home Rule, and the Scotch and the Welsh. But for you, O wicked Lords, the wishes of the people of India had been respected; and we should have given them representative government. We should have followed the enlightened rule of the Sultan of Zanzibar.
cles say about the earnings of street beggars. Relieve your feelings by giving whatever you like to the pinched, cold, and hungry-looking beggars in the streets. Pause before renewing your aims to the Duke of Wellington and sturdy beggars like him.

In reference to our remarks about the L.C.C. Report on Underfed Children, we are asked why we consider it an impertinence for the investigators to even allude to "causes other than underfeeding of inability to profit by instruction. The investigators were asked to say how many children were necessitous in the sense of wanting food. They admit that they have seldom seen the children themselves," and that "to the purely physical side of the feeding question our inquiry has not been specially directed." In view of these admissions, which assuredly imply that they cannot tell us what the effect of feeding would be, what means have they now of knowing that: "when its (the child's) parents are drunkards and the home is filthy and its clothing insufficient, considerably more than the provision of meals is called for ere the teacher may begin to work on the child? They are asked if food will help; they reply in substance: We cannot say how far they want food, but in many cases the homes, etc., are dirty. Elsewhere we are informed that "out of the number of school children investigated 78.88 were necessitous in the sense of lacking sufficient food, and that school meals will be required until effective care committees are able to check the diseases attendant on partial employment, bad housing, and other evils." Diseases attendant on partial employment can only be remedied by law are told off by Mr. Jay's covering remarks: "The organisers' report seems to prove that with properly constituted care committees the feeding list should be reduced by nearly 50 per cent. . . . . The reference of the Sub-Committee on underfed children has always seemed to me to be too narrow and to have the effect of emphasising the feeding out of proportion to the other needs of the child." * * *

Here is a hint for the Chairman of the Sub-Committee on Underfed Children to the L.C.C. that the feeding is but of minor importance. Of course, we want all the conditions of the children's lives, their homes, their education changed. But this does not alter the necessity for prompt and proper feeding. As Mr. Blair, the Education Officer, writes: "It appears to me also that fatuous nonsense to suggest that care committees are going to find employment, proper houses, and the like. The evil of these uncalled-for suggestions is seen in Mr. Jay's covering remarks: The organisers' report seems to prove that with properly constituted care committees the feeding list should be reduced by nearly 50 per cent. . . . . The reference of the Sub-Committee on underfed children has always seemed to me to be too narrow and to have the effect of emphasising the feeding out of proportion to the other needs of the child." * * *

All who want to know where Socialism stands today, and that he was a party. (Laughter.) He should immediately convince himself. I said nothing about your first item on the programme would be the communication of bread. He meant by that, that in every place in the country there should be public stores of bread where every person might get as much as he liked for nothing. He believed it to be practical and necessary. These people did not get enough bread. They got it in a wasteful way. And the children were the people who went shortest. This is a complaint which we register against the undertakers, the feeders, the social workers. There was no difficulty about his proposition. By the communication of bread they would remove that particular incentive to action to get bread which led to almost all the crime and meanness in the world. (Some applause.) He was glad a few people saw that. Some people thought the desire to get bread was the incentive to the noblest deeds. It was the worst.

Everything that came from the weakness of a man's constitution they had to pay for in the long run. They were paying for it now. All that they would save, and they would have great relief to their own minds. But when he said it would be cheap, it would not be cheap the first day. But that day they would have to be prepared with bread enough to supply almost the whole world. People would come with pantechnicon vans to carry it away; they would come with bags and sacks; the poorest would borrow a perambulator. They could imagine the scene. After eat-
to have forced a Court of Appeal to stay the advance of the party by the device of legal restrictions, and in another we are assured that alliance with the trade unions is of no advantage to those who want to fight for Socialism. The Alliance has got to be a fight for Socialism from first to last lines.

Mr. Grayson repudiates as nonsensical and malicious any charge of "assailing the representatives of the Labour Party;" but if he can so well remember our own misdeeds as to enumerate them so often in print and on platform, he should not so readily forget what he himself did. The Labour Party may have been guilty, may have been guilty to the very last line; your playfulness, and that no harm is intended, but do not blame plain people for applying to your language the common meaning. Is no one, for example, assailed who when a Mr. Grayson says "the Labour Party offered various other candidates to Colne Valley" to keep him out, and that he had "had every reason in the world to protest against the shabby and petty treatment meted out to him by the Executive of the Labour Party"? For some years I have been connected with the Executive, and have missed few of its meetings. We do not offer candidates beyond printing approved names on a list, which is obtainable by all; but, indeed, insist upon compliance with the conditions and constitution. I can show you the bold type of "Vote for Grayson, THE WORKERS' CANDIDATE," used on leaflets in respect to the Colne Valley contest. The Jarrow victory a few months before an unemployment settlement; and generally, an utter failure to definitively assert the dignity of down-trodden Labour in the Commons, the Party, in our opinion, has gone from bad to worse.

You did not quote from your issue of June 13 that in considering our difficulties there "is no room for calling each other fools or traitors," nor did you remind us that Mr. Clynes is quite as likely to do either to the other. You did not quote your further statement in favour of discipline in our ranks, and that "whichever side is right, the minority must abide by an authoritative decision." Discipline and obedience to decision are impossible if one man is to settle, even without discussion with the rest, what the plan of a party should be and pursue some course individually chosen without any consultation with those who are estranged. You say that: "During the last few months, with Newcastle unemployed and the Licensing Bill allowed to go before an unemployment settlement; and generally, an utter failure to definitively assert the dignity of down-trodden Labour in the Commons, the Party, in our opinion, has gone from bad to worse." You are entitled to your opinion when it is honest, but you do not, in the same issue back up the opinion that the party "has gone from bad to worse" by telling us that you "have not the slightest hesitation in saying that this decision [Court of Appeal] is due to the success of the Labour Party in a thing which we expected to be a defeat. But we have not failed to demand treatment for the down-trodden, and by Bill, speeches, resolutions, and pressure of every form short of the hysterical clamour and red flag-flapping which you have warned us, we have demanded attention to and got something for the unemployed. As to some folks the job is so easy, we should perhaps apologise for not having got an "unemployment settlement," and I shrink from the punishment we deserve for having "allowed" a Licensing Bill to to be up any thing but a matter of concern; we knew better, it is only some time people would stupidly prefer to measure their means and prospects to keep one seat at Newcastle, and were driven to the conclusion that an effort to take two would mean losing both! Of course, as you say, our plan should not be to preserve any particular place, but to build up a party, and to that end we have tried to find the best site and have used our building material as far as it would go.

Every man cannot be his own party, and each man's judgment, if there is to be a Parliamentary Party at all, must be subject to test on independent lines. An Independent Socialist Party in Parliament, if more than one composed it, would reveal, no doubt, some differences on the method and plan to be followed. The alliance of Socialists and Trade Unions has not shown more than its share of bungle. The moral which we return from the utmost use of such opportunities and powers as we have.

[Just as he did, by his last article in these columns, so once more, by his present contribution, does Mr. Clynes convince us very forcibly that the selection of candidates is not in the hands of the members of the Alliance. We are arguing in argument with one who is aiming at the same goal which we ourselves have in view, and as determined as we are to go there by the democratic lines of such a candidate as local feeling prefers. The Labour Party Executive meted out no ill-treatment of any kind to Mr. Grayson, whose position in respect to the Colne Valley contest was never before it.]
The Case for the Scottish Graduates.
By Helen Douglas Irvine, M.A. (St. Andrews.)

The Suffragists have turned upon their critics. The policy of that section of them hitherto most prominent has been to actively declare themselves unbound by laws they regard as unconstitutional; and thus they have come to be judged and punished, actually though not professedly, for rebellion. Now some of their party have carried allegiance to the law so far that they have brought an action to its highest tribunal; and thus they have sought to transfer their needs from the realm of moral right or of policy into that of legal justice.

The Scottish women graduates who appeared before the law on Tuesday (the tenth) and on Thursday (the twelfth) of last month founded their case on three statutes. In 1868 a section of the Representation of the People (Scotland) Act conferred the vote on all persons whose names are on the roll of the General Councils of the four Scottish Universities and who are subject to no legal incapacity; and ruled further that membership of those councils should accrue to any on whom the Universities had conferred degrees. This law is unique among franchise Acts in that it contains no word denoting sex. In 1881 a second statute required the registrars of the Universities to send voting papers to all persons whose names are on the roll of the General Councils of the four Universities. This law was entered, automatically, on the registers of the General Councils. They were never, before 1906, considered legally incapable to exercise any of their privileges as members of those bodies. They voted for the Lord Chancellors and their assessors, even as, in their student days, they had a vote in rectorial elections. As they have graduated their names 'have been- to graduation in one or more faculties.

Women have been enabled accordingly to take degrees in arts, science, medicine, divinity, and law; and as they have graduated their names 'have been- to graduation in one or more faculties. The amended Municipal Franchise Act actually empowered the Universities to admit women to graduation in one or more faculties.

By an express resolution of that body. At the same time, however, they wished to hear their arguments left the appellants in little doubt that they had produced only a moral effect. Yet the verdict had unexpected interest. It is true that the Lord Chancellor had forgotten Miss Macmillan's statement that Scottish peers have been excluded from representation in the House of Commons by an express resolution of that body. At the same time, however, he gave a reason for his judgment: he refused to extend the franchise beyond the limits contemplated by the framers of the Act of 1868. Does he not credit those legislators with the possession of an inherent limited kind, or is he of opinion that bachelors of music should be deprived of their votes?

Socialism and the Drink Supply.
By Cecil Chesterton.

"There was rejoicing in the drinking hells of London last night," said the "Daily News" when the Lords rejected the Licensing Bill: "the purveyors of our national poisons were glad." I was in my favourite drinking hell which (I may so far advertise as to say that it is situated in the neighbourhood of Hammer- smith Broadway (on the night of the rejection) no unusual signs of exhilaration, nor did the lady who "purveyed" to me the particular "national poison" which I affect (a quite patently good and honourable woman who the Government people of the views on...)."
experience what such compromises mean. An agreement between the Moderate Men of both sides. This means always means in the long run an agreement between the Rich Men on both sides. The abortive compromise on the Education question would have been an agreement between Dr. Davidson and Sir Robert Perks, and a compromise on the Licensing question between Lord Burne and Mr. Cadbury on the basis that the brewers might be allowed to plunder the people provided the teetotallers were suffered to oppress them.

In making some suggestions as to the policy which might legitimately take the place of the extinct Bill, I may say at once that I shall leave on one side those who take the Mahomedan view of the drink problem, and regard all alcoholic liquors as "national poisons." I shall assume that my readers agree with me that the Drink Question is the problem of how to supply drink, not of how to prevent its being supplied. I shall assume that we wish to see drink supplied with the greatest possible social profit and the least possible social damage, and that we resent the existing monopoly just as we presented the monopoly of the water supply because we want the supply to be good and cheap, and believe that private monopoly makes it dear and bad. Our attack upon the water companies would have presented the same difficulties if they had been established on the support of persons who regarded water as a "national poison," and abused the companies, not for supplying it inadequately, but for supplying it at all!" Peace to all such!" But let me for a moment consider the position of those Socialists who, while quite free from Puritan leanings, honestly thought themselves bound to support the Bill as an attack upon monopoly. Now, I will grant that if the premises of these friends of ours are granted, their conclusions follow from them as the recovery of the monopoly value by the State, then we might well have supported that principle in spite of our dislike of its Puritan provisions. But I altogether deny that such was the first principle of the Bill. Even the time-limit was not its first principle. Its first principle was the reduction of the number of public-houses, and, in consequence, the concentration of the profits of monopoly in still fewer hands.

We were frequently told that the issue was whether the Puritan was or was not a freethinker. Of course it is not a freethinker: it is something, to the Socialist point of view at least, much more important than a freethinker. It is a permission given to a man to earn his living. I care very little for the Rights of Property, but I care a good deal for the Right to Work. The Famous Bill proposed to deprive the publican of the right to work at his trade. Nor is the publican the only or even the greatest sufferer by this sort of legislation. What about the workman who wants to supply his customers without receiving a penny of compensation, even during the twenty-one years of grace, for, as Mr. Belloc said in The New Age the other day, no one ever compassed the poor. Nor could they hope to find others, for the reduction of public-houses must mean the reduction of the numbers of men and women employed in them.

Anyone can see the true nature of the question at issue by taking some parallel case where the Puritan prejudice does not arise. An auctioneer has to take out a license. That license is not a freethinkers; and no one ever supposed for a moment that it was; yet anyone would see the injustice of telling a man who had built up by hard work a good auctioneers business that he should not be allowed to sell any more, not because he had committed any offence, but because the governing class thought that there were too many auctioneers in his neighbourhood.

Note that the licensing of auctioneers does not lead either to a monopoly of auctioneering or to exorbitantly swollen fortunes made by auctioneers or to the "tying" of goods to one another as land monopolists. This is because anyone who likes to pay for a license can get one. If the number of auctioneers was limited, and if all legislation aimed at still further reducing it, all these consequences would certainly follow. But, then, there is no sect which imposes a religious taboo upon auction sales, nor have I ever heard any alarm expressed at the demoralising "facilities" (utterly destructive of the virtue of thrift) offered to both buyers and sellers by those pernicious institutions. On the other hand, there are people who apprehend a public-house trust system, and there are still more who vaguely believe that the excessive number of such places is the cause of the evils connected with the drink trade. With this view (of which I have never yet heard any valid justification) I shall deal in another article. Meanwhile, I merely want to point out that the drink monopoly, the vast fortunes it produces, and the social evils which result from it, are the direct product of temperance legislation.

But I have devoted enough space to a Bill which is not only dead but damned. In vain has the Government apparently solicited the assistance of Mrs. Carrie Nation, the famous "saloon-smasher" of the United States. Even her vigorous aid cannot resurrect the Bill. The people have not the slightest intention of allowing Mr. Asquith and Mrs. Carrie Nation to dictate their mode of life, and will enthusiastically endorse the verdict of the House of Lords upon the joint policy of these two well-known abstainers.

I understand that the present intention is to separate what we may call the Puritan from what we may call the financial portions of the Bill. The former, including, I presume, the further plunging of England into gloom on Sunday to typify the regret which we feel for the fact of Our Lord's resurrection, the odious system of espionage in workmen's clubs, and perhaps the infamous proposal to throw thousands of honest girls upon the streets, will be embodied in a separate Bill which, since it only oppress the insignificant English people, it is hoped the Lords may pass. The place of the Bill is to form part of next year's Budget. Asquith and Mrs. Carrie Nation have decided upon this course, because all democrats can now concentrate in opposition to the new Puritan Coercion Bill without prejudice to their differences in regard to the financial part. But in regard to High License, I confess that I have doubts.

High License has a Collectivist air, and many Socialists have hastened to welcome it as a means of recovering the whole part at least of the unearned incomes, but do not by prohibition the public-house system or strike out of the hands of the comparatively poor man the weapon with which he is trying to defend himself against powerful rivals and oppressors.
At Random.

THEATRICAL NEWS.—The Liberal Women's Amateur Suffrage Society engaged a member of the Westminster Theatrical Company to amuse them at the Albert Hall. His fee was that the Liberals should turn out of the meeting every woman who had the scab and the pluck to demand real politics instead of oratorical humbug. * * *

The new melodrama, "Down with the Lords," is now in active rehearsal. The actor-manager, Mr. Aqith, in his National Liberal Club speech, said: "I invite the Liberal Party from to-night to treat the veto of the House of Lords as the dominating issue in politics." What a sleepy land of dreams some people inhabit, to be sure! * * *

Mr. John Burns informed the House of Commons last week that over 38,000 names were on the unemployment registers of the London Distress Committees, and work had been found for less than 8,000 of these. This is the way they play at government. Nobody seemed particularly shocked; of course it was very hard on the odd 30,000. If the odd men had sense they would make it hard on those play-acting politicians. * * *

The fourth Education Bill passed quietly away on Monday. We are glad to hear that no inquest will be held over the death of the Bill. It is, apparently, quite true that the "Spectator" is critical of much nonsense. * * *

It is, apparently, quite true that the "Spectator" is now edited by the Fabian Executive. At least, the rumour is strengthened by two sentences from the last issue containing these words: "The true principles of taxation must obviously be that each man shall contribute to the needs of the State in proportion to his ability"; and "We have always held that the holders of monopolies created by the State should pay a reasonable rent for the use of the monopoly, and that the State should not be tricked by such antiquated hypocrisy." * * *

It seems that, ever since its foundation by the great Duke of Wellington, in 1818, the London Mendicity Society has toiled and troubled to put an end to street begging. They have never succeeded, for the current Duke, who keeps the presidency of the Society in the family, writes to the "Times" that "with hardly any exceptions the giving of money to beggars in the street, far from being beneficial, is very harmful." It's quite interesting to note that this objection to almsgiving is the essential feature of much more modern societies called the I.L.P. and the S.D.P., etc. Only they say that the government has entered into a contract with a well-known Cremoniatory Company to do this annual funeral at special prices. The Chancellor of the Exchequer should move that the cost thereof be transferred to the permanent Consolidated Fund. What a very elderly Cabinet it must be, to waste so much time on educational questions. Will it propose a "right of entry" for the Inquisition? Will the Primitive Christians be allowed to contract out? Will this aged Cabinet please give up medieval fancies and attend to modern education? * * *

It seems that since its foundation the British Union of Suffrage Societies have placed in the ecclesiastical eye, was misunderstood. I came out as Peter Pan, for good or evil; my fierce struggles all in vain. It was the first tyranny of stupid age over the wisdom of youth. The lesson went home: I determined I would never become old and stupid; I was "the boy who would not grow up." * * *

And, with all respect to the "Sphere," I have not the slightest intention of ever growing up. I shall remain Peter Pan. I don't want to waste my time with grown-up people do. I want to attend to the serious business of life.—enjoying myself: I don't want to consider statistics and attend conferences. I want, instead, to get the work of the world done quickly, and not merely talked about in a dreamy way, as if I were a member of Parliament or a town clerk. Old people are so sentimental; only the young are really practical; after twelve one forgets wisdom for the folly of sober caution. A cautious man never does anything; he is always saving himself from doing the right thing. * * *

When Peter Pan understands the thoughts of grown-up people he will at least respect them; he will keep silent, he would not give them away. When they go about calling Licensing Bills and Education Bills (four politics), he will firmly refuse to waste his time with such elderly nonsense. When they say they are doing something for the Unemployed by expressing grey-haired sympathy, instead of voting money, he will decline to be tricked by such antiquated hypocrisy. He will turn to the young for mature wisdom, and when he wants stubborn folly he will turn to the old. That's how he came to be named "the boy who would not grow up." Peter Pan.

THE SCIENCE OF FOOD AND DIET.

The famous food expert and scientist, Eugene Christian, has just completed the formation of a company for the sale and manufacture of his food products, called Christian's Natural Food Company, Limited. For list of goods, see advt., page 167. Mr. Christian claims on the most convincing evidence that his foods provide a diet that maintains the body and mind in the highest health and vigour. [Adv.]
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A Letter to Wells.

MY DEAR WELLS,—I foolishly and rashly took your book upon First and Last Things with a promise to do what is called "reviewing" it. For this task I am not competent. I am not sure that anybody is, but I am quite sure that I am not. A review is either a summary, telling people what is in the book or a judgment of that book, or a mixture of both. Now your book upon the First and Last Things contains so much of a human being, and is so full and so free from repetition that I don't see how it would be possible to summarize it, except as one summarizes a character or an historical period by reading over and over again, and by leaving one's judgment to the process of time. As for judging, which is the second part of "reviewing," I again confess myself incapable. I can only measure by certain clear standards where generalities are concerned ; for instance, I can distinguish between what is known and what is guessed in physical science, and between the emotion produced by good verse compared with the emotion produced by any passionate pettiness in the way of good verse. But when it comes to the appreciation of something so organic as a personality and what that personality thinks, I can only express an opinion equally personal, and that would not be "reviewing." What I had better do, I think, is to tell you how the book strikes one in the literature of our time. What its place is and will be.

You will agree with me, I think, that the distinction between men today is the distinction between those who possess the power of the generaliser and to express the generalised, those not concerned in this matter. The former happen to be in modern England as we know it, a very small body indeed. It was but yesterday that I was analysing in that sense the want nature of the power which a man like old Rothschild could exercise over the financial Committee which we call the House of Lords. My constituents were delighted, but (will posterity believe it ?) the Press, that is, Harmsworth, which, I suppose, reports the want nature of things, reported everything in the speech except that capital passage. There is one example. And you may say in general that the world around us to-day in this island (not in Ireland) thinks the truth less important than the generalised the generalised means what one would say at any other period of our lives.

You know what the politicians are; the professional politicians; a clique of men all closely intermarried with a few dependents hanging on to them. The last thing about it is the connexion they have with the great texts and the great people. They have no text, but they are the faith of the great people. They are the faith of Bax, and Bax is so abnormal a voice, and discovered all the day down Victoria Street that when an ordinary Englishman says Catholic he means Catholic. On this account do I use that word, but if anyone prefers that in writing to you I use it in such a way that we know what is meant by the word. Well, then, to return. I say the word, but if anyone prefers that in writing to you I should use the word Papist or Romanist, or R.C., or even that to me meaningless word "Christianity," I should be delighted to use it so that we know what is meant by the word. Well, then, to return. I say the world is falling into these two bodies of thought, and falling rapidly, and the proof is, that the transcendental dogmas disproved and unproved of the anti-Catholic side in Europe are beginning to be accepted wholesale and in bulk, precisely as are accepted the dogmas of religion.

Now I confess the interest of your book to me is to guess upon which side of the sand-bank thought of your book's kind will fall. I say wisely "bodies" of thought. Not theories, but things, not conclusions but enthusiasms alive with passion; the salt of reason. You would never say (as Bax says only this week) that life is a "miracle." That is Hyde Park. A miracle is a highly unusual event: something out of the order. Life isn't.
You know that New York, Paris, and the rest are not a peasan'ty. You have met men; you know that the men who all over Europe and the world are saying that they have loved too late the unspeakable beauty are — worse luck for them — not peasants. You may even know men who have been brought up in your own town, and, on that occasion is a tag from Hippo. When you say that the "personality of Christ" does not appeal to you I naturally remain indifferent, because the phrase "personality of Christ" means whatever any reader chooses to make it mean. I am for the faked jargon of the Universities, "subjective," or to talk plain English, "made up out of one's head," and I can understand that you or any honest man would be repelled by any simulacrum made in their own line, by those who go about doing good in a quiet way. The root of the interest in your book lies surely not in your attitude towards such things, but in its hesitation between positive assertion and sympathy. Perpetually do I find in it marks of sympathetic or emotional attraction to that which has given all its life to the anti-catholic camp. On the question of immortality, for instance, you do not ask yourself whether men continue to live or do not continue to live after death, but rather whether you feel inclined to think that they should do so. Up that prime question whether things are a pyramid which grows from an apex or whether they are not rather a cube whose molecular structure is pyramidial; whether we should feel the dynamics of the universe to proceed from or towards an apex or whether there is a God —on this prime question (whereupon all true thought reposes) you tell me that you sometimes look at a view or at the night, you feel a mysterious communion with a great personality. In words far less admirable than your own, and with intelligences wholly inferior to yours, the very modernists say such things. But surely the problem with which the mind of man wrestles is not whether he likes it or feels that such a personality should be, but whether it is.

When you talk not of that with which you sympathise or of that which you feel, but of that which you intellectually accept (or as we Catholics should say, of your Faith), you give a certain number of postulates upon the one side, but you give also a certain number of postulates upon the other.

For instance, next to the prime question whether there is a God, comes the quarrel between nominalism and realism. That ancient quarrel, which after the Dark Ages fought out that quarrel, and the Church decided against nominalism. Now your book is nominalist, whereas we are realist. You are nominalist when you say that matter in its ultimate analysis is no longer a thing, and you are nominalist when you say that general terms lead men astray. In general, the intellectual framework of the book is of the school, or rather, the army, opposed to ours; but every now and then, like a man choosing things in a shop because he likes them, and therefore choosing divers things, you strike a strong note upon the one side, but you give also a certain number of postulates upon the other.

For instance, next to the prime question whether there is a God, comes the quarrel between nominalism and realism. That ancient quarrel, which after the Dark Ages fought out that quarrel, and the Church decided against nominalism. Now your book is nominalist, whereas we are realist. You are nominalist when you say that matter in its ultimate analysis is no longer a thing, and you are nominalist when you say that general terms lead men astray. In general, the intellectual framework of the book is of the school, or rather, the army, opposed to ours; but every now and then, like a man choosing things in a shop because he likes them, and therefore choosing divers things, you strike a strong note upon the one side, but you give also a certain number of postulates upon the other.
Life is not only short but urgent, so that one must write of these things in a kind of shorthand, but I think that will convey my point to Belloc anyhow.

H. G. Wells.

**The Single Tax and Socialism.**

Is there any good and sufficient reason why single taxers and Socialists should not work shoulder to shoulder in close alliance for that amelioration of social conditions for which they both have striven? And is it not true that the single taxer is merely the agent by which the common property was administered for the common benefit? It would become the administration of a great co-operative society. It would become the administration of the common property, and we would reach the ideal of the Socialist, but not by nationalising, through taxation, the land, and those things which are in their nature monopolies. But this difference ought to count for little in the face of the wrongs and abuses which Socialists and single taxers agree should be attacked here and now.

Two men who are travelling the same road, whereon enemies must be fought before progress can be made, would be foolish in refusing to join forces because one of them, after miles of the journey had been accomplished, intended to take a turning which the other believed would not lead to the objective which both had ultimately in view. Such travellers are the single taxer and the Socialist, and surely they should combine to fight their way along the first stages of their perilous economic journey.

In proof of our contention that their ultimate aim is practically indistinguishable, let us quote a portion of the passage from "Progress and Poverty," in which you will see that Henry George points to the changes he desires to accomplish as follows:

"There would be a great and increasing surplus revenue from the taxation of land values, for material progress, which would go on with greatly accelerated rapidity, would tend constantly to increase rent. This revenue arising from the common property could be applied to the common benefit, as were the revenues of Sparta. We might not establish public tables—they would be unnecessary; but we could establish public baths, museums, libraries, gardens, lecture rooms, music and dancing halls, theatres, universities, technical schools, shooting galleries, playgrounds, gymnasiums, etc. Heat, light, and motive power, as well as water might be conducted through our streets at public expense; our roads be lined with fruit trees; discoverers and inventors rewarded, scientific investigations supported; and in a thousand ways the public revenues made to foster efforts for the common benefit. We should reach the ideal of the Socialist, but not through government repression. Government would change its character, and become the administration of a great co-operative society. It would become the agency by which the common property was administered for the common benefit."

No Socialist, we take it, hopes, at least for a long time, to accomplish more than this. The question remains, is there anything in the present practical proposals of the single taxer which is either foreign to, or not directly tending towards, the Socialist's ideal? The single taxer wishes to tax land values. This would make rents cheaper, and would force land into use, in town and country, which otherwise would remain idle. The single taxer wishes to begin with an attack on land monopoly. Cannot the Socialist go with him there? No one has pointed out more forcibly than Karl Marx how potent an agent is land ownership in the enslavement of labour. Let us destroy such ownership, and take the next great step that may prove needful, when the ground is clear.

Private property in land cannot be abolished in a day, or in many years, without unwearied effort, but the time is propitious for striking a blow. Government is in need of another £1,000,000,000 to meet next year's demands on the revenue. A tax of 1d. on the capital value of land in the United Kingdom, which cannot be less than six thousand million pounds to-day, would supply the sum and about £5,000,000 to spare. Let wasteful expenditure be cut down, as it might and ought to be by many millions, and still social reformers would find plenty of use for the balance.

If space permitted, we could show how, besides raising revenue, this tax would do much greater things in forcing land into use, in town and country, which means employing men now unemployed, who in their turn would spend their wages in employing others. We could show how it would raise wages, by reducing the competition of men driven out of the country with the workers in the towns; it would reduce rents, by forcing owners of unoccupied land and houses to build and to secure tenants. These things, however, Socialists know. What we would urge upon them is to put a tax upon land values in the forefront of their programme, to make it their political battle cry for the coming years, and to ask the help of the hundreds and thousands of single taxers and land value taxers, who are scattered throughout the country. They would be surprised at the response. And if, when the first battle of the land is won, question arises whether Radical and Socialist forces can still advance together, at least they will understand one another's objectives better, after being comrades in arms.

H. CHOMLEY.

JOSEPH FELS.
Socialism and the Woman.

"The term Socialism," says the "Imperial Dictionary," is applied to any system which requires that the land and the instruments of production should be the property, not of individuals, but of communities, or of the Government.

This definition is accepted by the vast majority of Socialists. It is definite and concise. It sums up their ideals and aspirations in a nutshell. Yet I think we must pause before we lay it down as a final definition.

For Woman has spoken.

"Your definition may suit men," she says, "but to me it is not definite; it is vague and uncertain. Above all, it is male.

I think I am safe in asserting that while Socialism, with its humanitarian teaching and its sound economic principles, has made more converts among intelligent women of this country, it has found a much less hearty reception among intelligent women. Not only so; we find many advanced women who were formerly zealous adherents of the Socialist cause now openly steps that, while agreeing with the economic principles of Socialism, they fail to see in it any guarantee of justice for their sex; and that until sex equality is placed at the head of the programme they will take no part in forwarding the movement. Thousands of women—and the number is increasing by leaps and bounds—have taken up this strong position, and as this is tantamount to a vote of censure, let us see if the censure is deserved.

Women are sceptical of Socialism. Let us ask ourselves if there is any reason for their suspicions.

Sex under Socialism is often discussed, but seldom fairly. It seems to be an understood thing that when economic freedom arrives she will participate equally with the men in the happiness which under a perfect system should be experienced.

But the sex oppression which woman has suffered at the hands of man through the countless ages is absolute in its character, for it is absolutely unlimited in its essential, or rather, its only principle. It breaks down at one blow the iron doors of sex-disability through which men must pass. But the sex station is not to be decided. This great dominance, which is plainly evident in Socialist men as well as in men of the older parties, can never be destroyed by mere retranslation of the economic principles of the party.

It will never be annihilated until the political freedom of woman has been won, and even then the death will be slow. Undoubtedly, Mrs. Pankhurst is right. Sex freedom is the greatest and noblest agitation in the history of the world. I hesitate to give it, however, for if it be the true reason it discloses to the world a most humiliating example of human weakness in a quarter where the highest truth is most prize.

Undoubtedly, Mrs. Pankhurst is right. Sex freedom is the greatest and noblest agitation in the history of the world. I hesitate to give it, however, for if it be the true reason it discloses to the world a most humiliating example of human weakness in a quarter where the highest truth is most prize.

The woman's face wears a peculiar smile as she shakes her head and inquires the nearest way to No. 4, Clement's Inn.

Let us do a little heart-searching. Why do Socialists, as a body, oppose the agitation for Votes for Women? I (use the word "oppose" because official silence counts as opposition.) But the sex issue is not a vote—"only one explanation.

The Socialist (I speak in a general sense) fails utterly to grasp the situation. He has mapped out his route to glory. He leads the man through the course which he must follow in order to be a vote for women. The fact that the sex issue is not a vote can be demonstrated. This is not a case of women's rights, but alluding to it for purpose of illustration as an equivocal cases were referred to. I was surprised how few, and it is quite possible that just as great men in a locality were required to nominate and vote for University Members, so also women in a like position may have been called upon to do the same; or other anomalies may have been overlooked in a confused time. I say it may be so, though it has not been established. A few equivocal cases were referred to. I was surprised how few. And it is the same in regard to judicial precedents. Two passages may be found in which Judges are reported as saying that ancient records are explored, there is evidence of women having enjoyed this right, and no adequate ground for affirming a constitutional or common law disability on the score of sex. And, further, that the Representation of the People Act (Scotland, 1868, taken with the Universities (Scotland) Act, 1890, and the Ordinances made under the last-mentioned Act do upon their literal construction confer voting papers, and on tendering their votes to have their claim decided by the authority set up under the Universities Elections Amendment (Scotland) Act, 1891. I will take these contents in order.

In regard to the alleged right of voting, the appellants assert that if ancient records are explored, there is evidence of women having enjoyed this right, and no adequate ground for affirming a constitutional or common law disability on the score of sex. And, further, that the Representation of the People Act (Scotland, 1868, taken with the Universities (Scotland) Act, 1890, and the Ordinances made under the last-mentioned Act do upon their literal construction confer voting papers, and on tendering their votes to have their claim decided by the authority set up under the Universities Elections Amendment (Scotland) Act, 1891. I will take these contents in order.

My Lords, this appeal has been argued temperately with the evident knowledge that your lordships have to decide what the law in fact is, and nothing beyond that simple question.

Two points were raised by the appellants. The first and main point was that they were entitled to vote at an election of a member to serve in Parliament for the Universities of St. Andrews and Edinburgh. The second was that at all events they were entitled to receive voting papers, and on tendering their votes to have their claim decided by the authority set up under the Universities Elections Amendment (Scotland) Act, 1891. I will take these contents in order.

Now, my lords, it may be that in the vast number of venerable documents buried in our public repositories—some of authority, others of none—there will be found traces of women having taken part in Parliamentary elections. No authentic and plain case of a woman giving a vote was brought before your lordships. But students of history know that at various periods members of the House of Commons were summoned in a very irregular way, and it is quite possible that just as great men in a locality were required to nominate members, so also women in a like position may have been called upon to do the same; or other anomalies may have been overlooked in a confused time. I say it may be so, though it has not been established. A few equivocal cases were referred to. I was surprised how few. And it is the same in regard to judicial precedents. Two passages may be found in which Judges are reported as saying that women may vote at Parliamentary elections, and these are digested in the manuscript of no weight. Old authorities are almost silent on the subject, except that Lord Coke at one place incidentally alludes to women as being under a common law disability on the score of sex. And, if the case is equivocal, then I am safe in asserting that while Socialism, with its humanitarian teaching and its sound economic principles, has made more converts among intelligent women of this country, it has found a much less hearty reception among intelligent women. Not only so; we find many advanced women who were formerly zealous adherents of the Socialist cause now openly steps that, while agreeing with the economic principles of Socialism, they fail to see in it any guarantee of justice for their sex; and that until sex equality is placed at the head of the programme they will take no part in forwarding the movement. Thousands of women—and the number is increasing by leaps and bounds—have taken up this strong position, and as this is tantamount to a vote of censure, let us see if the censure is deserved.

Women are sceptical of Socialism. Let us ask ourselves if there is any reason for their suspicions.

Sex under Socialism is often discussed, but seldom fairly. It seems to be an understood thing that when economic freedom arrives she will participate equally with the men in the happiness which under a perfect system should be experienced.

But the sex oppression which woman has suffered at the hands of man through the countless ages is absolute in its character, for it is absolutely unlimited in its essential, or rather, its only principle. It breaks down at one blow the iron doors of sex-disability through which men must pass. But the sex station is not to be decided. This is not a case of women's rights, but alluding to it for purpose of illustration as a bit of history.

The Socialist (I speak in a general sense) fails utterly to grasp the situation. He has mapped out his route to glory. He leads the man through the course which he must follow in order to be a vote for women. The fact that the sex issue is not a vote can be demonstrated. This is not a case of women's rights, but alluding to it for purpose of illustration as an example of human weakness in a quarter where the highest truth is most prize.
prevailed in ancient times could be entertained by a court of law in proving the origin of so inerterate a usage. I need not remind your lordships that numberless rights rest upon a similar basis. Indeed, the whole body of law is founded upon the same principle.

I will not linger upon this subject, which, indeed, was fully discussed in Chorlton v. Ling. If this legal disability is to be removed, it must be done by Act of Parliament. Accordingly, the appellants maintain that it has in fact been done by Act of Parliament. They say that the Act of 1868, while confining to men the franchise described in other sections, adopts different language in Section 27, using in that section the words "persons." I agree that the word "persons" would, prima facie, include women. If the word "persons" is not wide enough to include women, then there is nothing in any Act of Parliament that gives the smallest foothold for the appellants' contention.

I will only add this much as to the whole case of the appellants. It proceeded upon the supposition that the word "person" in the Act of 1888 did include women, though not then giving them the vote, so that at some later date an Act purporting to deal only with education might enable Commissioners to admit them to the degree, and thereby indirectly confer upon them the franchise. It would require a convincing demonstration to satisfy me that Parliament intended to effect a constitutional change so momentous and far-reaching by so furtive a process. It is a dangerous assumption to suppose that the Legislature has thereby for the first time written "on this single subject. It is not, in my opinion, perfectly accurate that you can pick out from various acts the language in Section 27, using in that section the words "persons." I agree that the word "persons" would, prima facie, include women. But in speaking of "persons" in Section 27 of the Act of 1868, in speaking of "persons" in Section 27, using in that section the words "persons." I agree that the word "persons" would, prima facie, include women. But in speaking of "persons" in Section 27 of the Act of 1868, if the word "persons" is not wide enough to include women, then there is nothing in any Act of Parliament that gives the smallest foothold for the appellants' contention.

In regard to the second point made by the appellants, namely, that they are entitled to receive voting papers, in my opinion they are not so entitled, because the Act only says that voters shall receive them. They are not voters.

For these reasons I respectfully advise your lordships to dismissing this appeal with costs.

Lord ASHBOURNE:

My Lords, the claim of the appellants is founded on their status as graduates of one of the two Universities named in the Ordinance. The common law has never given to "persons" in the Act of 1889 the Commissioners thereby appointed were empowered to make Ordinances "in enable each University to admit women to graduation in one or more faculties," and to provide for their instruction. By the Ordinance of 1889 this power was exercised, and it was declared "to be in the power of the University Court of each University to admit women to graduation in such faculty or faculties as the Court shall think fit."

The point which at once attracts attention is that neither the Act nor the Ordinance gives the slightest hint that the franchise was at all in contemplation, and there is no allusion to the Register of the General Council.

The appellants, therefore, must look elsewhere to support their claim, and they accordingly in their careful arguments rely on the Representation Act of 1868 and the Universities Election Act of 1881.

By Section 27 of the Representation Act of 1868, a vote is given to "every person whose name is for the time being on the register, if of full age and not subject to any legal incapacity," and the appellants claim that they come within the description—that they are persons whose names are on the register. The case turns mainly on the meaning of the word "person." In that Act. It is an ambiguous word, and must be examined and construed in the light of surrounding circumstances and constitutional principle and practice. Holding the view I do, it is not necessary I should discuss the words "legal incapacity."

In 1869, the Legislature could only have had male persons in contemplation, as women could not then be graduates, and also because the Parliamentary franchise was by constitutional principle and practice confined to men. The appellants strongly relied on the use of the word "man" in some earlier sections dealing with counties or boroughs. It proceeds upon the supposition that the franchise themselves to a perfectly new class, or by innovation, it guards in a saving clause, subject to the provisions of the Act, all existing "laws, customs, and enactments."

But here the Act of 1889 and the Ordinance are absolutely silent on the subject, and only refer to graduation and academic arrangements. The Act of Parliament itself does not confer the right of graduation, and only delegates that authority to Commissioners, who did not directly exercise the power, but ordained that it should be exercised by Commissioner. It does not say that voting papers should be sent to voters; but if they were not voters, where was the right and where was the damage?

In my opinion, the judgments of the Lord Ordinary and of the Lords of the Extra Division were quite correct, and this appeal should be dismissed with costs.

Lord ROBERTSON:

My Lords, the central fact in the present appeal is that from time immemorial men only have voted in Parliamentary elections. What the appeal seeks to establish is, that in the single case of the Scottish Universities Parliament has departed from this distinction, and has conferred the franchise on women. Clear expression of this intention must be found before it is
Inferred that so exceptional a privilege has been granted.

We had not the assistance of counsel; but fortunately the question is not difficult. In truth, the case of the appellants rests on a very narrow and slender basis, and that is the word "person" in the first and second sub-sections of Section 27 of the Representation of the People (Scotland) Act, 1868. It is said that, while in the clauses relating to counties and boroughs, the persons enfranchised are described as "male persons," the neutral term "person" is used in describing the University elector, and the suggested inference is that this was done deliberately so as to admit women.

I am afraid, however, that a much more superficial reasoning pervades the various arguments. If we turn to the Universities (Scotland) Act, 1858, which set up the University Councils (the bodies which constitute the constituencies), we find that the word used is "person." Now this is exactly what Parliament would naturally do; minded to give votes to the members of the General Councils, it turns to the description of them in the Act which established those Councils and adopts the term there used.

This is the genesis of the enfranchising section. What is its effect? Now the "persons" so described were, in fact, solely men; for in 1858 and in 1868 the Universities did not receive women as students, and did not confer on them degrees. It is obvious, therefore, that the persons contemplated in the enfranchisement of the Scotch graduates were men.

As the case of the appellants is entirely one of words, it may be added that in 1858, as in 1868, the avail of the words "male persons" as distinguished from "persons" had been greatly reduced by Lord Brougham's Act, so that the choice of the word "person" had of itself the smaller significance in the direction of including women. The one expression, like the other, needs to be read in the light of the subject matter.

The case of the appellants has, as I have said, the word "person" (in the Act of 1868) for its basis, but it is necessary to remember that it is only by virtue of an Ordinance of the University Commissioners under an Act of 1889 (dealing purely with academic, as distinguished from political matters), that women were made eligible for graduation, and thus were introduced into the University Councils. Now it must be allowed that if Parliament has, by this means, conferred the franchise on women, it has taken the most roundabout way to do it. Whichever view be taken of the merits of the franchise for women, it is at least a grave and important question for Parliament to decide. This question, according to the theory of this appeal, Parliament declared to be one of words.

I do not consider the argument on them to be legitimate. As the case of the appellants is entirely one of words, the words "male persons" as distinguished from "persons" were, in fact, solely men; for in 1858 and in 1868 the Universities did not receive women as students, and did not confer on them degrees. It is obvious, therefore, that the persons contemplated in the enfranchisement of the Scotch graduates were men.

As the case of the appellants is entirely one of words, it may be added that in 1858, as in 1868, the avail of the words "male persons" as distinguished from "persons" had been greatly reduced by Lord Brougham's Act, so that the choice of the word "person" had of itself the smaller significance in the direction of including women. The one expression, like the other, needs to be read in the light of the subject matter.

The case of the appellants has, as I have said, the word "person" (in the Act of 1868) for its basis, but it is necessary to remember that it is only by virtue of an Ordinance of the University Commissioners under an Act of 1889 (dealing purely with academic, as distinguished from political matters), that women were made eligible for graduation, and thus were introduced into the University Councils. Now it must be allowed that if Parliament has, by this means, conferred the franchise on women, it has taken the most roundabout way to do it. Whichever view be taken of the merits of the franchise for women, it is at least a grave and important question for Parliament to decide. This question, according to the theory of this appeal, Parliament declared to be one of words.

I do not consider the argument on them to be legitimate. As the case of the appellants is entirely one of words, the words "male persons" as distinguished from "persons" were, in fact, solely men; for in 1858 and in 1868 the Universities did not receive women as students, and did not confer on them degrees. It is obvious, therefore, that the persons contemplated in the enfranchisement of the Scotch graduates were men.

As the case of the appellants is entirely one of words, it may be added that in 1858, as in 1868, the avail of the words "male persons" as distinguished from "persons" had been greatly reduced by Lord Brougham's Act, so that the choice of the word "person" had of itself the smaller significance in the direction of including women. The one expression, like the other, needs to be read in the light of the subject matter.

The case of the appellants has, as I have said, the word "person" (in the Act of 1868) for its basis, but it is necessary to remember that it is only by virtue of an Ordinance of the University Commissioners under an Act of 1889 (dealing purely with academic, as distinguished from political matters), that women were made eligible for graduation, and thus were introduced into the University Councils. Now it must be allowed that if Parliament has, by this means, conferred the franchise on women, it has taken the most roundabout way to do it. Whichever view be taken of the merits of the franchise for women, it is at least a grave and important question for Parliament to decide. This question, according to the theory of this appeal, Parliament declared to be one of words.

I do not consider the argument on them to be legitimate. As the case of the appellants is entirely one of words, the words "male persons" as distinguished from "persons" were, in fact, solely men; for in 1858 and in 1868 the Universities did not receive women as students, and did not confer on them degrees. It is obvious, therefore, that the persons contemplated in the enfranchisement of the Scotch graduates were men.

As the case of the appellants is entirely one of words, it may be added that in 1858, as in 1868, the avail of the words "male persons" as distinguished from "persons" had been greatly reduced by Lord Brougham's Act, so that the choice of the word "person" had of itself the smaller significance in the direction of including women. The one expression, like the other, needs to be read in the light of the subject matter.
only knew that they were Somewhere, and that for one month they were his Property. It would be hopelessly inadequate merely to say that he felt pleasure in their possession. They were the joy and pride of his life. Every morning, he bought the "Financial News" and marked the fluctuating value of his copper. In the evening he clutched the "Star" with feverish hands, and "Copper 59s. Lead 13s. Tin 38s. Cotton 5.03." rubbed over one another in his brain. When the Stock Exchange belched forth its turbid stream each afternoon he gazed upon the faces of its members with newly-awakened awe. Were these not the custodians of his copper, his lead, his cotton, and (I have no desire to be frivolous) his tin?

The thought became an obsession. From early morning until late at night he gave up every spare moment to reflection upon his purchases. Sometimes he had an irresistible craving to see them, touch them, handle them. . . . He saw in imagination the red glistening mass of the mass of copper, the dull bars of lead, the snowy whiteness of mounted cotton. . . . And that was the origin of the Hideous Dream.

It happened in this way. One night, scarcely three weeks after the opening of the transaction, Mr. Bodlett fell asleep dully by his wife's side, after listening patiently to her complaints as to the behaviour of Aunt Elizabeth. He had only slept a few moments when three knocks sounded at the hall door. In amazement, he lit a candle and looked at his watch. Midnight. The knocks were repeated, and he descended hastily. After unbolting the door, he peered out cautiously, and perceived a man in the uniform of Carter, Paterson and Co. standing upon the doorstep.

"What do you want?" demanded Mr. Bodlett. "Just brought your copper, sir," was the reply. "Sign, please." Mr. Bodlett took the paper with trembling hands. There it was written, "B. Bodlett, Esq., 30 tons copper. Carriage paid." He shivered, and his nightshirt fluttered in the cold wind. "What do you mean?" he asked. "Where is this copper?" The man pointed to the roadway, and there, to his horror, Mr. Bodlett perceived five vans drawn up in line. "Six tons in each," the carter continued, remarkably. "Unload, Jim."

For one instant Mr. Bodlett was speechless. Then he recovered himself. "Stop, stop!" he shouted. "Don't want it. Take it away!" "Want it or not, you've 'ave to 'ave it! You're the consignee, ain't ye?" was the callous reply. "Now, Jim!"

Mr. Bodlett shuddered and stood aside. Bar by bar thirty tons of copper were carried in and piled in the hall. After what seemed hours of labour, the last bar was stacked, and the carman turned to go. Mr. Bodlett, still shivering, made an attempt at cheerfulness. "Good-night," he called. "Don't you be in no 'urry to go to bed," was the reply. "The cotton's got to come in yet." Mr. Bodlett was petrifed. "Cotton?" he managed to gasp out. "I should think it was cotton," answered the carman. "Six tons of it. Twenty bales in each."

Mr. Bodlett peered out into the misty night, and lo, it was so. He told himself, he should be firm. He would refuse to receive his cotton. But the carman was inexorable, and vast white bulks were tumbled out until they almost reached the ceiling. After what seemed hours of labour, the last bar was stacked, and the carman turned to go. Mr. Bodlett, still shivering, made an attempt at cheerfulness. "Good-night," he called. "Don't you be in no 'urry to go to bed," was the reply. "But they're not what I wanted," he stuttered out. "A bale of cotton is like this." With a trembling hand he described a circle in the air indicative of some object the size, perhaps, of a Gladstone bag, or a Gladstone bag. They overflowed into the dining-room, the kitchen, the scullery. Even the sacred precincts of the drawing-room were invaded. The residue were conveyed by a narrow doorway. They filled the hall in a moment. . . . And that was the origin of the Hideous Dream.

Next morning, on opening his newspaper, Mr. Bodlett read the following headlines:

**Next Day:**

** heads several dozens.**

**News:**

"There goes my money," he said to himself, half aloud. But the memory of the night was with him, and his grief was tinged with a certain secret satisfaction. At all events, no tons of copper or bales of cotton could be delivered now.

The Two Hundred Pounds is now One Hundred and Thirty. The sum has been invested in Consols, and Mr. Bodlett frequently refers with contempt to the "scaremongers who talk of a German war."

Mrs. Bodlett is unaware of the diminished value of Uncle Joseph's legacy. There are a number of subjects on which Mr. Bodlett does not honour her with his confidence, and one of these is Finance. On the rare occasions when he refers to this topic he does so with an air of extreme gravity and importance. In his opinion the subject is only comprehensible to the superior, or male, intelligence.
Books and Persons.

The Mrs. Humphry Ward of France, M. René Bazin, has visited these shores, and has been interviewed. In comparing him to Mrs. Humphry Ward, I am unfair to the lady in one sense, and too generous in another. M. Bazin writes, I think, slightly better than Mrs. Humphry Ward, but not much. Per contra, he is a finished master of the art of self-advertisement, whereas the public demeanour of Mrs. Humphry Ward is entirely beyond reproach. M. Bazin did not get through his interview without giving some precise statistical information as to the vast sale of his novel, the highest editions of which are already out of print. I suppose that M. Bazin, Academician and apostle of literary correctness, is just the type of official mediocrity that the "Alliance Française" was fated to invite to London as representative of French letters. My only objection to the activities of M. Bazin is that, not content with a golden popularity, he cannot refrain from sneering at genuine artists. Thus, to the interviewer, he referred to Stéphane Mallarmé as a "fumiste." No English word will render exactly this French slang; it may be roughly translated as a practical joker with a trace of fraud. There may be, and there are, two opinions as to the permanent value of Mallarmé's work, but there is no doubt that to this aim he sacrificed everything else in his career. A charming spectacle, this nuncio to London to assert that a distinguished writer like Wilde in the same vein as those printed in last week's "Age of Shakspere" is packed full of criticism and to a very old man. "A Man of Kent" ("British Weekly"), in commenting on the article, regrets its timidity, and refers to Swinburne as the "howling dervish" of criticism. This is the kind of lapse from decorum which causes the judicious not to grieve but to shrug their shoulders. Probably "A Man of Kent" would wish to withdraw it. I trust he is aware that the "Age of Shakspere" is packed full of criticism whose insight and sensitiveness no other English critic could equal.

By the way, the case of Jacob Tonon v. Claudius Cear is the "British Weekly" is proceeding. Claudius Cear would not put five guineas on his opinion, but he offered, if I would write the essay on "Work and Worry," to pay me for the right to print it in the "British Weekly." Lest I might be mistaken for Hackenschmidt, I accepted this suggestion. The essay is now written and in the hands of Claudius Cear, and will, I presume, appear in due course. Claudius Cear will take nobody's opinion but his own as to whether I have succeeded in doing what he defied anybody to do. But he has said that he shall not be in the least surprised if he does succeed. I may be allowed to recall the terms of his challenge. After defending the platitudes of Mr. Arthur Christopher Benson and quoting some extremely platitudinous sentences from Bulwer Lytton, he wrote: "We have made every young man of letters grow with an eye for what are called Tupperisms... but I defy any of them to write an essay, say, on 'Work and Worry,' which shall be readable, intelligent, and plain-spoken, and yet not a word is misplaced or indelicate."—The Pioneer.

Mr. Bazin did not get through his interview without giving some precise statistical information as to the vast sale of his novel, the highest editions of which are already out of print. I suppose that M. Bazin, Academician and apostle of literary correctness, is just the type of official mediocrity that the "Alliance Française" was fated to invite to London as representative of French letters. My only objection to the activities of M. Bazin is that, not content with a golden popularity, he cannot refrain from sneering at genuine artists. Thus, to the interviewer, he referred to Stéphane Mallarmé as a "fumiste." No English word will render exactly this French slang; it may be roughly translated as a practical joker with a trace of fraud. There may be, and there are, two opinions as to the permanent value of Mallarmé's work, but there is no doubt that to this aim he sacrificed everything else in his career. A charming spectacle, this nuncio to London to assert that a distinguished writer like Wilde in the same vein as those printed in last week's "Age of Shakspere" is packed full of criticism and to a very old man. "A Man of Kent" ("British Weekly"), in commenting on the article, regrets its timidity, and refers to Swinburne as the "howling dervish" of criticism. This is the kind of lapse from decorum which causes the judicious not to grieve but to shrug their shoulders. Probably "A Man of Kent" would wish to withdraw it. I trust he is aware that the "Age of Shakspere" is packed full of criticism whose insight and sensitiveness no other English critic could equal.

By the way, the case of Jacob Tonon v. Claudius Cear is the "British Weekly" is proceeding. Claudius Cear would not put five guineas on his opinion, but he offered, if I would write the essay on "Work and Worry," to pay me for the right to print it in the "British Weekly." Lest I might be mistaken for Hackenschmidt, I accepted this suggestion. The essay is now written and in the hands of Claudius Cear, and will, I presume, appear in due course. Claudius Cear will take nobody's opinion but his own as to whether I have succeeded in doing what he defied anybody to do. But he has said that he shall not be in the least surprised if he does succeed. I may be allowed to recall the terms of his challenge. After defending the platitudes of Mr. Arthur Christopher Benson and quoting some extremely platitudinous sentences from Bulwer Lytton, he wrote: "We have made every young man of letters grow with an eye for what are called Tupperisms... but I defy any of them to write an essay, say, on 'Work and Worry,' which shall be readable, intelligent, and plain-spoken, and yet not a word is misplaced or indelicate."—The Pioneer.
helpful without putting in some sentences as bad in themselves as any of Bulwer Lytton's. I shall expect Claudius Clear, if he thinks I have failed, to state exactly how and where.

Referring to Lord Alfred Douglas as a poet, I said recently: "I have an early and unprocurable volume of his that, to speak mildly, is not for sale." Lord Alfred Douglas has filled nearly a page of the "Academy" with the details of this statement. He says that in stating that I possess an unprocurable volume of his I made a "serious blunder." Of course, in one sense, no book is unprocurable. A first folio Shakespeare is not unprocurable. I naturally meant that the book was unprocurable through ordinary channels. It is. Lord Alfred Douglas admits that it is for the present out of print. He says, further, that in stating that my volume is not for sale I made a "further blunder of an even more serious nature," and he tells of solicitors. I know a great deal more about solicitors than Lord Alfred does. Still, I venture to repeat that my volume is not for sale. I suppose I ought to know. Though I was once one of the most regular contributors to the "Academy," that fact does not give the present editor and proprietor any right to dictate to me as to what books I must sell and what books I may keep. My statement was intended as a high compliment to the poet in Lord Alfred Douglas. It of course meant that nothing would induce me to part with the volume. It has caused pain instead of pleasure. I regret this. I also regret that Lord Alfred Douglas could not express his pain with more dignity. And he himself should beware of solicitors. To describe the Christmas plate of The New Age as "horrible" before he had seen it was an act which could not possibly be defended in a liberal action as fair criticism.  

JACOB TONSON.

REVIEWS.

The "Londons" of the British Fleet. By Edward Fraser. (John Lane.)

In the beginning, Lucretius said, fear created the gods. The gods created the British Navy. It is characteristic of the South English to build temples of fear, and has been since Caesar, Hengist, and William crossed the Channel and left us a conquered people with the spirit of the conquered. Hence our taste for war, strengthened by three things—hard drinking, mistaken emotion, and devotional duties. We only go to war under the influence of liquor and the religious instinct. Parliament makes war, and Parliament has always drunk more than is good for it—as an examination of its liquor statistics and members will show—and this probably because liquor has the delightful characteristic of the South English to build temples of fear, and has been since Caesar, Hengist, and William crossed the Channel and left us a conquered people with the spirit of the conquered. Hence our taste for war, strengthened by three things—hard drinking, mistaken emotion, and devotional duties. We only go to war under the influence of liquor and the religious instinct. Parliament makes war, and Parliament has always drunk more than is good for it—as an examination of its liquor statistics and members will show—and this probably because liquor has the delightful property of making men mistake fear for courage. This book aims to perpetuate the glories of the "Londons" of the British Fleet and thereby to awaken in the minds of all its readers a sense of the dignity and worth of our Navy and to give them an impulse towards a closer investigation of its stirring annals. This book aims to perpetuate the glories of the "Londons" of the British Fleet and thereby to awaken in the minds of all its readers a sense of the dignity and worth of our Navy and to give them an impulse towards a closer investigation of its stirring annals. This book aims to perpetuate the glories of the "Londons" of the British Fleet and thereby to awaken in the minds of all its readers a sense of the dignity and worth of our Navy and to give them an impulse towards a closer investigation of its stirring annals. This book aims to perpetuate the glories of the "Londons" of the British Fleet and thereby to awaken in the minds of all its readers a sense of the dignity and worth of our Navy and to give them an impulse towards a closer investigation of its stirring annals.

Cults, Customs, and Superstitions of India. By John Campbell Oman. (T. Fisher Unwin.)

Mr. Campbell Oman, formerly a professor in the Government College at Lahore, has compiled a handbook of facts about certain aspects of Indian life, mainly religious. We do not altogether admire his method. It consists in putting together a large number of chapters on separate subjects, each occupied almost entirely by the length of an ordinary newspaper article and not much more satisfactory in treatment. Thus, the few pages devoted to Buddhism show little real acquaintance with the subject and the account of Bodh-Gaya (Mr. Oman prefers to call it Buddh-Gaya) will give an altogether wrong impression to anyone unacquainted with the intricacies of the current dispute respecting that famous shrine. Mr. Oman thinks that Ram Mohun Roy was the only Indian religious reformer to discourage sutra—a curious misleading of history. Mr. Oman must be strangely ignorant of life in the West if he imagines that certain of the instant quotes of sexual irregularities and the position of the wife are in any sense peculiar to India. And why call the custom of Niyoga "repulsive," unless all marriage customs unsanctioned by our peculiarly scrupulous society are to be dismissed in the same fashion? It would be a poor compliment to Mr. Oman to say that his attitude in relation to Indian thoughts and ways is less contemptuous than that of the average Anglo-Indian. We have not noted a single instance in which to Mr. Oman an Indian is other than a "native." The fact is significant.

Modern English Poetry. Edited by Andrea de Zwaan. (Nutt. 35. 6d.)

This book is intended primarily to give the Dutch an adequate survey of modern English poetry; but it has no right whatever to the title of a modern anthology. There are too many omissions of important names; Dowson, Francis Thompson, A. E. Housman, Laurence Binyon, Crowley, John Davidson—these are a few names taken at random which seem to have some claim for consideration before Edward Carpenter or Wilfrid Gibson. All the Irish poets are excluded too, because, forsooth, Mr. W. B. Yeats has already edited an Irish Anthology. This is making too great a claim for consideration for Mr. de Zwaan's compilation, and is a falling between two stools with a vengeance. Either there is room in England for the book or there is not. We conclude that there is not. Then why leave out Irish poets, since the main purpose is to inform our Dutch friends? The book is of no use to Englishmen as an anthology of modern English verse because it is incomplete, and tantalising to Dutch readers because they are told that in order to read "the beautiful work of the Irish school" they must buy another book. Really, Mr. de Zwaan should have thought of his countrymen first, and then obtained a competent survey of modern English (and Irish) poetry to guide him in his compilation.

SPECIALS! HELP YOURSELVES.

Arrangements have been made that HALF THE PROFITS resulting from the sales of the undermentioned goods through this advertisement will be handed to: THE New Age Press for disposal at their discretion, in aid of SOCIALIST PROPAGANDA WORK.

TEA. China and Ceylon Tea, in 1 lb. packets, at 5/- per lb. (Carriage paid on 20 lbs.)

China, Ceylon, and Indian Blends, 1/3, 1/4, 1/6, 1/8 per lb. Finest Darjeeling (Hill Grown) 2/6 per lb.

Pure China, recommended by the faculty. 1/6, 1/8, 1/10. Special China and Darjeeling Blend. 2 1/2 per lb. in 1, 1 lb. packets, and in 1, 10, and 20 lb. boxes.

COFFEE. Pure, 1/8 per lb. in 1, 10, & 1 lb. Tins.

Pure Whole, or Ground, 1/2, 1/2, 1/4, 1/6, 1/8, and 1/10 per lb.

GOOCHA ESSENCE. Pure, 1/8 per lb. in 1, 10, & 1 lb. Tins.

Arrangements paid in London or 1 lb. assorted parcels and in the Country on 20 lbs. assorted parcels.

Select your Xmas Presents from the above. Terms: Cash with Order. Samples with Orders. Special Terms to large buyers (Secretaries please note)

THE REFORM TEA ASSOCIATION, 10, INGATE PLACE, BATTERSEA, LONDON, S.W.

THE FREETHINKER.

Lively, Original, Uncompromising.

Weekly - - - - - - - TOWPENCE.

PIONEER PRESS, 2, NEWCASTLE STREET, E.C.
CORRESPONDENCE.

For the opinions expressed by correspondents, the Editor does not hold himself responsible for any argument.

The Editor.

THE LAST OF THE MIRACLE-MONGERS.

To the Editor of "The New Age."

Mr. Belfort Bax can, I am sure, take good care of himself, and I would like to venture to reply to Mr. Chesterton.—indeed, I do so with great reluctance—were it not that I fear he will not be replied to.

Not that he deserves a reply; he does not. But these claimed and pseudo arguments of his have too often passed muster, simply because the men who could answer them have allowed them to stand uncontradicted out of sheer amusement and sheer weariness, treatment which simply encourages Mr. Chesterton in his wild career of unsupported assertion.

It is a very funny business, after all, isn't it now? Here Mr. Bax impeaches Mr. G.K.C. as a spoof; whereas G.K.C. comes out to repudiate the charge, and does so by firing another volley of spoof, behind the smoke of which—for he does not use smokeless powder, not he!—he retires in triumph, vindicated.

Just think of the two weapons he wields. An uncontrolled output of paradox, on the one hand; and on the other a blundering nineteenth-century attack on religion has broken down. He has used the latter on previous occasions, always with effect. And yet, fancy anyone seriously entertaining any belief that the Church is—a very different organisation from the Church of Christ, as G.K.C. himself might say—has approved and accepted against it! Why, its very ministers—save those who are Catholics, i.e., those who in religion are third-century-minded—are (some of them) giving up bit by bit doctrines and beliefs which were integral portions of the Christian religion a hundred years ago, and are adopting with discreet modifications views, the expression of which would, at no distant period of the last century, have ensured their being devoted to eternal damnation.

Mr. Chesterton has accurately imitated the procedure of the Church in regard to destructive criticism. For what has the Church always done? Simply ignored the unanswerable disproofs of its theory and denunciations of its practice; gone on in the sweet old way, as if its critics did not exist. This it could safely do, because its beliefs are based upon, and supported by, ignorance; and ignorant people, intellectually indolent people, form the bulk of its adherents.

People like G.K.C., who are by no means indolent, have to vary their tactics in order to belong with some appearance of consistency to the Christian Church. And so they affect the tricks of scientific writers; and if these wits or their successors do not keep up a perpetual stream or repetition and rejoinder, lo! the attack has broken down.

One gets tired of refuting, and explaining, and protracting. The initial criticisms await even a candid reply from these Church champions. But instead of replying it is cheaper, of course, to sneer about "Hall of Science"输出 of paradox, on the one hand; and on the other a "rejoinder, lo!" the attack has broken down, possibly a survival of schooldays, possibly the effect of the Nietzsche-Ibsen-Shaw bogey.

To the Editor of "The New Age."

Mr. Chesterton deigns to make, he refrains from an easy parody of the Fall and Atonement, and to assert his belief in Hell and the Devil: if he does this—it will be a miracle. Eric Dexter.

A DOCTOR'S DILEMMA.

To the Editor of "The New Age."

So long as I believed that he wrote (as a wise man should) merely to amuse, I heartily admired Mr. Chesterton; but now he remarks, that admiration would still remain unqualified had not ardent disciples broken in upon my illusion, clambering that he is a teacher sent from God. Is it not cruel to have one's friends published for one in this fashion? For I hold teachers in the utmost horror. There is within me—possibly a survival of schooldays, possibly the effect of editing an edition of Carlyle for the Pagantologies—a deep, unreasoning hatred of all teachers and all teaching. For my own part I had as lief cut my throat as attempt to teach anything to anyone.

And, in my reading of Shaw, I had never suspected (such was my innocence) that there lurks in his writings any of this cursed, egotistical, intolerant, teaching, preaching, missionary spirit. Nor, by the gods, do I believe it still—nevertheless, I begin to have doubts.

Where is the happiness I knew When first I read my Shaw.

Whence comes this mischievous itch to teach? Sugar-coat it as you will, 'tis but a bullying, highwayman-like method of approaching the minds of one's fellows. Better to write bad books—something that makes one fear some fellow-being's peace of mind, or of venting one's own ill-humour in the luxury of three hundred octavo pages.

For myself, I give notice that I shall refuse to learn anything from novels and plays. In this matter of Shaw my practice shall be old Khayam's, "Aye, take the play, my lad, and leave the rest." I never induced any mortal by offering to teach—well equipped with pseudos, some fellow-being's peace of mind, or of venting one's own ill-humour in the luxury of three hundred octavo pages. For myself, I give notice that I shall refuse to learn anything from novels and plays. In this matter of Shaw my practice shall be old Khayam's, "Aye, take the play, my lad, and leave the rest." I never induced any mortal by offering to teach—well equipped with pseudos—some fellow-being's peace of mind, or of venting one's own ill-humour in the luxury of three hundred octavo pages.

For myself, I give notice that I shall refuse to learn anything from novels and plays. In this matter of Shaw my practice shall be old Khayam's, "Aye, take the play, my lad, and leave the rest." I never induced any mortal by offering to teach—well equipped with pseudos—some fellow-being's peace of mind, or of venting one's own ill-humour in the luxury of three hundred octavo pages.

For myself, I give notice that I shall refuse to learn anything from novels and plays. In this matter of Shaw my practice shall be old Khayam's, "Aye, take the play, my lad, and leave the rest." I never induced any mortal by offering to teach—well equipped with pseudos—some fellow-being's peace of mind, or of venting one's own ill-humour in the luxury of three hundred octavo pages.

For myself, I give notice that I shall refuse to learn anything from novels and plays. In this matter of Shaw my practice shall be old Khayam's, "Aye, take the play, my lad, and leave the rest." I never induced any mortal by offering to teach—well equipped with pseudos—some fellow-being's peace of mind, or of venting one's own ill-humour in the luxury of three hundred octavo pages.

For myself, I give notice that I shall refuse to learn anything from novels and plays. In this matter of Shaw my practice shall be old Khayam's, "Aye, take the play, my lad, and leave the rest." I never induced any mortal by offering to teach—well equipped with pseudos—some fellow-being's peace of mind, or of venting one's own ill-humour in the luxury of three hundred octavo pages.

For myself, I give notice that I shall refuse to learn anything from novels and plays. In this matter of Shaw my practice shall be old Khayam's, "Aye, take the play, my lad, and leave the rest." I never induced any mortal by offering to teach—well equipped with pseudos—some fellow-being's peace of mind, or of venting one's own ill-humour in the luxury of three hundred octavo pages.

For myself, I give notice that I shall refuse to learn anything from novels and plays. In this matter of Shaw my practice shall be old Khayam's, "Aye, take the play, my lad, and leave the rest." I never induced any mortal by offering to teach—well equipped with pseudos—some fellow-being's peace of mind, or of venting one's own ill-humour in the luxury of three hundred octavo pages.

For myself, I give notice that I shall refuse to learn anything from novels and plays. In this matter of Shaw my practice shall be old Khayam's, "Aye, take the play, my lad, and leave the rest." I never induced any mortal by offering to teach—well equipped with pseudos—some fellow-being's peace of mind, or of venting one's own ill-humour in the luxury of three hundred octavo pages.

For myself, I give notice that I shall refuse to learn anything from novels and plays. In this matter of Shaw my practice shall be old Khayam's, "Aye, take the play, my lad, and leave the rest." I never induced any mortal by offering to teach—well equipped with pseudos—some fellow-being's peace of mind, or of venting one's own ill-humour in the luxury of three hundred octavo pages.

For myself, I give notice that I shall refuse to learn anything from novels and plays. In this matter of Shaw my practice shall be old Khayam's, "Aye, take the play, my lad, and leave the rest." I never induced any mortal by offering to teach—well equipped with pseudos—some fellow-being's peace of mind, or of venting one's own ill-humour in the luxury of three hundred octavo pages.

HARRISON AMBLER.
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THE INDETERMINATE SENTENCE.

To the Editor of "The New Age."

Your leader of the 30th ult. on the indeterminate sentence confuses the issues. Why should your indignation at the general iniquity of Herbert Gladstone blind you to the rights of the principle underlying the indeterminate sentence, which will surely be the rule when we are socially regressive again?

Which do you think would be the most effective deterrent of crime: The knowledge that we may be kept in for years, "it may be for ever," or that a few weeks or months will suffice for the social revenge and we are free again to repeat our offences?

Increase your indignation at our prisons and their criminal, their stupid, their useless, their, if anything, punishing but not rehabilitating them. Purify them, and get trained saviours of souls —and there is a good dozen of James's novels still to read.

Eric Dexter.
free by keeping apart those who have abused its privileges, as forbid their return until we are sure they have worked out; but that is the root principle, not vindictive punishment (which are we that we should punish?) but deterrent.

Humanise the prison regulations; get understanding humanitarians for their control; have no work therein that is not useful and helpful and suitable; have no sort of punishment for the recalcitrant that of deprivations of food; no work, no food till it is done, bad behaviour, no food till repentant; there is no cruelty or degradation to seek in a prison, as in a punishment house.

Make it possible for those leaving to at once take a respected place in the world's work; no more to be regarded as criminals driven perforce to a re-commission of crime; and thus realise that the principle of the indeterminate sentence is the only one that makes real reformation possible. And I insist that it is useless to protest when he goes he goes out as a purified, respected man. At present he goes out absolutely hopeless, knowing that his punishment is never ending, because it has been merely vindictive, not remedial; and that he is a Cain with every man's hand against him.

FREDERICK EVANS.

P.S.—Indeterminate does not necessarily imply lengthy!

WORKERS' EDUCATIONAL ASSOCIATION.

To the Editor of "The New Age."

May I, as a Socialist and a constant reader of your valuable paper, offer a humble protest against the note which appeared in your issue of last week advising "all Socialists and friends to disapprove the scheme now being proposed by some amiable gentlemen" for making Oxford more serviceable to the community as a whole?

I heartily agree with your statement that "we want a broader culture, a more richly educated than is served out at these institutions for the training of young gentlemen: indeed, the Report just published by the Clarendon Press on behalf of the Joint Committee of Labour Representatives and University men has for one of its objects to convert this pious wish into a working reality. But I may venture to point out (i) that the "amiable gentlemen" who published that report include Mr. Shackleton, M.P., Mr. Bowden, M.P., Mr. Macatavish, I.P., and Mr. Mansbridge, secretary of the Workers' Educational Association? As an acquaintance of most of these gentle- men, I can certify that they are "amiable." But they are not unrepresentative, or ineffective, or likely to be outmanoeuvred by Oxford (supposing it wished to outmanoeuvre them) into betraying the cause of Labour. (ii) that they, and us, must protest against the cowardly brutality of some of the Liberal stewards at the Albert Hall meeting. She was completely overpowered and surrounded by some half-dozen or more stewards. The other stewards on the steps seemed to have drawn back to allow the procession to pass, when a steward, clenching his fist, rushed out at her and struck her a terrible blow—hostile, and to all appearance worked out; but that is the root principle, not vindictive punishment (which are we that we should punish?) but deterrent.

His action was brutal and unnecessary, yet no steward protested.

I refer to the order paper issued by the Women's 1 Liberal Federation Executive I read the words: "Do no violence to any person. We have cast aside physical defences."

If Liberal stewards can treat any woman in this way after these orders, what are we to believe them capable when no such restraining influence is exercised? We Liberals have been complaining of the Tories at Chelmsford. Had we been better set our own house in order?

Women ought not to allow men to help them who cannot govern themselves, and whom they are unable to restrain.

I cannot take the moral responsibility which would be mine were I to continue to belong to any association which countenanced such treatment of any man or woman, and I have, in company with my sister, resigned from the Liberal associations to which I belonged. Such action cannot be called unwomanly or unconstitutional. Yet I venture to think it may not be without effect.

ALEXANDRA WRIGHT.

(Former member of the executive committee of the North Kensington Liberal Association.)

OSCAR WILDE IN DIEPPE.

To the Editor of "The New Age."

Probably more myths and legends have grown up around the birth, life, and death of Oscar Wilde, nearly nineteen hundred years. I will not say that Wilde did not meet and dine with Fritz Thauum at Dieppe on a certain day in 1897 subsequent to June 21. But from the
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fact that I can disprove at least one of the statements attributed to him by Mr. Christian Krogh, and that the story of his asking a favour at a garden party from the Prince of Wales is, to say the least, antecedently improbable, I think it may fairly be held that the whole episode is more or less founded on fiction.

Monsieur André Gide visited Wilde at Berneval, near Dieppe, on October 25th, and his reception of the news of the time of his visit, Wilde was still living in the hotel, and that the Jubilee entertainment to the children had already ended, he also moved into the villa, Chalet Bourget, some time in July.

I will, Sir, with your permission, provide you weekly in consummation " Saeculi Novi " with any quantity of bouche for your penultimate number. STUART MASON.

I cannot believe that the "rank and file" of the I.L.P. are prepared to endorse this exhibition of petty vindictiveness. Socialists ought to be above doing anything mean. To prove that most I.L.P'ers will disapprove of this action, I may mention the fact that Mr. Grayson has been besieged for disruption this is about the worst. It has not even the placency of the Labour Party.

It is impossible for me to reply personally to the correspondence, confirmatory, incredulous, and abusive. Whether the actual facts shall be made public or no is a question for the victims themselves to decide. The free-masonry among women, ancient as the days of Electra, rather makes for a secretive sort of vengeance; and, surprising though it may seem to some minds, an age-long masonry among women, ancient as the days of Electra, rather makes for a secretive sort of vengeance; and, surprising though it may seem to some minds, an age-long masonry among women, ancient as the days of Electra, rather makes for a secretive sort of vengeance; and, surprising though it may seem to some minds, an age-long masonry among women, ancient as the days of Electra, rather makes for a secretive sort of vengeance; and, surprising though it may seem to some minds, an age-long masonry among women, ancient as the days of Electra, rather makes for a secretive sort of vengeance; and, surprising though it may seem to some minds, an age-long masonry among women, ancient as the days of Electra, rather makes for a secretive sort of vengeance; and, surprising though it may seem to some minds, an age-long masonry among women, ancient as the days of Electra, rather makes for a secretive sort of vengeance; and, surprising though it may seem to some minds, an age-long masonry among women, ancient as the days of Electra, rather makes for a secretive sort of vengeance; and, surprising though it may seem to some minds, an age-long masonry among women, ancient as the days of Electra, rather makes for a secretive sort of vengeance; and, surprising though it may seem to some minds, an age-long masonry among women. Without dwelling on the mental confusion involved in charging Barrie with "peeping and botanising," when the real issue, I may fathom Mr. James's meaning, in spite of what he says, is that Barrie thought and wrote of his mother, I would ask Mr. James why Barrie ought not to have done that considering that St. Augustine did the same thing, and Carlyle and Ruskin, and anyone who writes a picture of his mother?

W. R. TITTERTON.

EDITOR OF "THE NEW AGE."

I wish to apologise to Mr. W. B. Yeats and Mrs. Patrick Campbell for an absurd misprint in last week's New Age, by which I am made to quote and endorse Mr. Yeats's opinion that the action of Mrs. Campbell is cynical. What he said, and what I wrote, was "lyrical."
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The reflection of the "intellectual eminence" of Mr. J. M. Barrie, who delights to peep and botanise upon his mother's grave, is original to an extent, and reveals a state of mind in its author, Mr. Arthur James, which has aroused my interest. Without dwelling on the mental confusion involved in charging Barrie with "peeping and botanising," when the real issue, I may fathom Mr. James's meaning, in spite of what he says, is that Barrie thought and wrote of his mother, I would ask Mr. James why Barrie ought not to have done that considering that St. Augustine did the same thing, and Carlyle and Ruskin, and anyone who writes a picture of his mother?
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I wish to apologise to Mr. W. B. Yeats and Mrs. Patrick Campbell for an absurd misprint in last week's New Age, by which I am made to quote and endorse Mr. Yeats's opinion that the action of Mrs. Campbell is cynical. What he said, and what I wrote, was "lyrical."
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