NOTES OF THE WEEK.

Rain has been known to damp a revolution, and Easter this year has mitigated the Naval panic. Meanwhile facts are beginning to filter into the papers, with the result that our debauchees are beginning to look a little pale and foolish. There is no declaration of war, and no intention of warfare on either side. With every new Dreadnought and every new Zeppelin the chances of war diminish, not increase; and we look forward to the time when warfare will be confined to the inventors of respective countries. We are inclined to believe that the world has seen the last great European war.

The proposed union of forces of civil servants and trade unionists in Paris is good news, if only because the anxiety of the bourgeoisie will be thereby maintained. To keep the ruling classes perpetually apprehensive is first post Monday the same week's issue. The proposed union of forces of civil servants and trade unionists in Paris is good news, if only because the anxiety of the bourgeoisie will be thereby maintained. To keep the ruling classes perpetually apprehensive is first post Monday the same week's issue.

The proposed union of forces of civil servants and trade unionists in Paris is good news, if only because the anxiety of the bourgeoisie will be thereby maintained. To keep the ruling classes perpetually apprehensive is first post Monday the same week's issue.

The second and third readings of the Army Annual Bill were rushed through on Tuesday, though the House had to sit until six in the morning to do it. We cannot understand why more indignation was not aroused by this successful attempt of the Government to Burke discussion. And where, we should like to ask, were the Socialist advocates of the Citizen Army? Everybody knows that the Army Annual Bill fixes the conditions of the soldiers for a period of twelve months, and that it contains anomalies surviving from feudal times completely destructive of democracy under arms. Yet year by year the Bill is allowed to be hurried through without more than spasmodic protest. Mr. J. Ward played Horatius very well, but Herminius Thorne and Spurius Lartius Grayson were absent. The worst of it is that none of the Democrats seems to have realised the possibly sinister meaning of the Army Council, with its seven members, of whom three can form a quorum and any two can sign a document. It may be all right, but we share Sir Charles Dilke's anxiety; and in any case a little light on the subject would be welcome.
On the motion for Adjournment two subjects were discussed. By the exercise of commendable patience, Mr. Barnes found the opportunity of pleading for the abolition of the pauper disqualification for Old Age Pensions. Such a measure would increase the number of pensioners by over 200,000 and the cost by some three or four millions per annum. This, however, is nothing to the cost we are prepared to face, once granted the free use of the national Rent and Interest. Out of that 600 millions we should be willing to provide Old Age Pensions for everybody after the age of 60, and without turning a fiscal hair. Mr. Burns' reply to Mr. Barnes was sympathetic after the official manner.

The other discussion was on the recent Declaration of London, the first instance in the world's history of the establishment of an International Arbitration Court. Mr. Bowles maintained that the advantages we derived as neutrals from the Declaration were more than counterbalanced by the disadvantages imposed on us as belligerents. Sir Charles Dilke, however, completely disposed of this objection by observing that we are neutrals for the major part of our time, and even in war our neutral interests outweigh our belligerent interests. The most striking contribution to the discussion was not in the House of Commons, but in the "Times." Sir John Brunner declared that, as a trader, he preferred the protection of recognised international law to the protection afforded by our Navy.

It is significant that the motion for the complete rejection of the Railway Amalgamation Bill was lost by only 14 votes, and the Second Reading carried by only 25. These figures prove our contention that the Companies have over-reached themselves in over-reaching Mr. Churchill. We are glad to see that Mr. Churchill appeared, on this occasion, in a more chastened mood, and with less of the manner of the special pleader on behalf of the Companies. Faute de mieux, there is nothing but amalgamation possible if the Railways are to continue their private sponging operations on the nation; and we confess we see no power in the present Parliament to stop them. On the other hand, we insist upon dispensing with cant. The Companies want to reduce their expenses (including wages) in order to increase their profits; and they bring in a Bill for the purpose. Very well, then it is the business of the Commons either to drive a good bargain with the Companies, or to force them into bankruptcy. We ourselves should not hesitate to take the second course; but we do not admire Mr. Churchill for refusing to take either course wholeheartedly.

Both the I.L.P. and the S.D.P. have been holding their annual Congresses this Easter, the former at Edinburgh and the latter at Bristol. In the absence of detailed reports, we refrain from judgment. One outstanding contrast strikes us, that while the S.D.P. were repudiating the proposal to affiliate with the Labour Party, on the grounds that the Labour Party was not a Socialist body, the I.L.P. was enthusiastically renewing its affiliation on precisely contrary grounds. One other feature of the I.L.P. Conference may be noted: though Mr. Keir Hardie appears to have done his best to introduce bitter personal elements, the "rebel" opposition in the I.L.P. mustered a fourth of the Conference on some questions, and on others as much as a half. We are quite satisfied with this as a start.

According to the "Labour Leader," The New Age must have undergone such a transformation as St. Paul spoke of, so sudden it was, as if in the twinkling of an eye. In the "Labour Leader" of April 2, The New Age was complimented on its notes on the Naval question, which for insight, etc., contrasted favourably, etc., etc. (the usual clichés of incompetent praise). By April 9, however, The New Age had "achieved the very bottom depth of journalistic degradation." Whence this desecrus averno? The "Labour Leader" thoughtfully attributes it to the "general collapse" of the editor, the knowledge of which, however, we have been mercifully spared. We hazard another explanation: our Letter to Mr. Keir Hardie, in which we convicted him out of his own words of attempting to lower the status of the I.L.P. from a political Party to a propagandist society. If that is disputed, why does not the "Labour Leader," argue the point with evidence instead of abuse? It should know by this time how to fight a losing battle on a bad case.

Would it be believed that the "Labour Leader," which so virulently attacks us for a perfectly legitimate criticism of Mr. Keir Hardie, in its previous issue deliberately charged Mr. Hyndman with fomenting the war panic because he is or was interested in the manufacture of guns? Mr. Hyndman is neither directly nor indirectly interested in or concerned with the manufacture of guns. The "Labour Leader" is therefore guilty of a gross libel on a veteran Socialist of world-wide repute. Oddly enough, the matter referred to is, in fact, all to Mr. Hyndman's credit. At the time of the Boer war he was engaged on the financial side of a great gun factory. War and plenty of it would have financially suited Mr. Hyndman's interests. Yet who more vigorously attacked that infamous war? We have our differences with Mr. Hyndman, but shall always recognize in him the faithful soldier who has never turned his back upon the enemy nor diverged from the straight path. By the way, can nothing induce Mr. Hyndman to write his reminiscences?

We hope all Socialists will see to it that because Easter is past the Children's Care Committees shall not consider their responsibility at an end. In the "voluntary feeding" days all our out-of-work parents were supposed suddenly to drop into work at Easter, careless and drunken parents were imagined to be reformed, presumably by the influence of Holy Week. There was, at any rate, no feeding of children after that sacred festival. It is more than time that the L.C.C. took the matter seriously in hand. It has some dozen "assistants and care committees" watching to see that "non necessitous" children shall not be fed. There is far greater need to see that the necessitous children shall be fed, and for this there seems no machinery provided —the responsibility is lightly laid upon the already overburdened shoulders of the teachers. The L.C.C. has a large staff of attendance officers, whose duties take them daily amongst the families who may be in need. Why cannot these officers be instructed to report all cases of necessity which come within their ken? Why cannot they do the visiting for the Care Committees, as they do in Bradford? As it is the business of these officers to get the children to school, are not they likely to be more successful if they can offer a good square meal in addition to the regular course of lessons? Is there any other way by which we can be sure of getting the 120,000 underfed children (Dr. Eicholz's computation) provided with the food they need?
Women v. Prehistoric Men.

It is time that the leaders of the Women's Suffragists surveyed the battle-field; for the situation needs the greatest care. For the moment the movement is stopped by a solid wall. The women have made out their case by such conclusive logic that, with the exception of a few intellectual freaks, every impartial mind is convinced. The women are in the same position as Galileo when he had conclusively proved that the earth went round the sun. Like Galileo, they have convinced all properly educated persons; and yet find in front a vast, conglomerate host of prehistoric people who omitted to get born a few odd centuries before. There is no accounting for some people's stupidity in choosing the wrong century. But there they are; a mass of stolid, geological human beings who would have joined the Carlton Club clique in the Ark. And, at the head of the host, stand Mrs. Humphry Ward, the Lords Cromer and Curzon, and Mr. Austen Chamberlain, with their bows and arrows and other instruments of marital argument which would do credit to cave-dwellers.

But what need the Suffragists fear from this ante-diluvian army? Granted that the men of flint arrow-heads are not for matches with women use Maxim-guns, nevertheless, there are elements of strength in the opposing position; and careful generals will analyse them in order to attack in the most effective manner. First, the anti-Suffragists are entrenched behind the privilege of sole power in the Constitution: they alone have the votes which can change the law. Like Mr. Asquith, they can refuse to argue the matter; they can sit tight. It is not a heroic policy, but it is effective.

Another element of strength is that the "anti's" are very numerous. Every thoughtless person is on their side. It is a doubtful distinction. But the women must not attach undue importance to convincing the dull witted. They never really count: and, besides, there must be a limit to patient argument. Are we bound to stay all reform until we have converted the village idiot? And if Lord Cromer collects all these behind him, does he expect the Suffragists to go through the whole case with each of his protégés? The Suffragists have its finest fighters in the movement are wasted because of its mass of thoughtless stupidity. There are the men who fear that the feminine vote will upset their political supremacy. Half of them seem to imagine that the women will vote Tory, and half that they will vote Liberal: men have always had a rather muddle-headed knowledge of politics. Thus, we find Mr. Asquith and Mr. Balfour and the members of the House of Commons hiding behind policemen rather than risk any definite decision on the question. Most of these valiant gentlemen said they were in favour of a Suffrage Bill; but discretion is the better part of political honour. The women will do well to recognise them as their worst enemies; and, in any case, cowards make poor friends. If Mr. Asquith and Mr. Balfour haven't the nerve to come into the firing-line with Mrs. Humphry Ward, then, of course, they will stay behind with the camp followers. One point is worth noting: The appearance of Mr. Austen Chamberlain on the anti-Suffrage platforms is fairly good evidence that it is not the intention of the next Conservative Government to bring in a Suffrage Bill.

Then comes the main body of Mrs. Ward's effective fighters. She has enlisted every man who dreads lest their women be the beginning of a wider movement towards their economic independence. The Anti-Suffrage Society has therefore with it every sweater in the kingdom. Every one who wants cheap labour and cheap harlots, married or unmarried, is against the vote for women. Beside these stand all the men who are afraid lest women will come into commercial competition with them on equal terms. In this group of men who are determined that women shall not have economic freedom, we have the core of the anti-Suffrage cause: shorn of its verbiage, it comes to a determination that the female sex shall remain at the disposal of men, to be used as underpaid workers or toys, according to pleasure.

Such are the varied persons who have placed their causes in the hands of Mrs. Ward, the Lords Cromer and Curzon, and other lesser lighters. These, after all, are merely inclined ducks, who never think of the weird collection behind them: the senators, the intellectuals, the crafty politicians, the dull and stupid people. One hopes the leaders are proud of their followers.

The practical problem before the Suffragists, without the political weapon of the vote, is how to scare one of the political parties into conceding a vote to the voteless. It is an appalling problem, in all truth. I use the word "scares" deliberately, for it is evident that the men in charge of Liberal and Tory Cabinets are not capable of being moved by a logical appeal. Mr. Asquith's idle statesmanship makes him too mystic, but probably he does not look beyond the effect on his voting strength at the next election. Let the Suffragists think of some way of drawing away his supporters at the polls, and Mr. Asquith will become wonderfully agreeable. But he must stop. They have had their effect, and have made the movement a subject of general conversation. The advertisement is no longer necessary. If the raiders continue, Mr. Asquith will grow conceited; he will think that the Suffragists really want to argue the matter with him. For myself, I would as soon raid the House in order to argue with the Mace. The women have got with infinite courage all they intended by the raids; the advertisement is now enough; and can now go on with the more direct work of undermining Mr. Asquith's and Mr. Balfour's voting strength until one of them gives way. How can this be done? They must decide.

At present their policy is woefully disjointed. At Croydon, half asked the electors to return the Liberal, and the others asked them to return the Tory. Now that may supply an admirable argument against the stock objections that if women get the vote they will all unite (against men); but it is not their main business to supply their opponents with means of defeating their own movements. Their great business is to settle on an effective and united election policy which will "scares" the Cabinet in power.

There is another very important point. Some of the finest fighters in the movement are wasted because of the attitude of the leading societies is not with the Suffrage. I venture to say that the reception of the Howard Adult Suffrage Bill was, to say the least, indiscreet. It is going a little too far to say that the people who wanted to enfranchise ten million women, instead of two million, are traitors to the cause. Even the suggestion to amend the limited Bill, by removing the marriage disqualification, has received a scornful reception. There is no use burdening the fact that the limited Bill will give the "fine ladies" a share of the state's purse; and it is probable that their class bias will prevent their further help in extending the Bill later on. Whereas, if the leaders insist on a wider Bill the fine ladies will have to drag their democratic sisters into the political Paradise along with them. Perhaps they will have to withdraw their support altogether; in which case, in return for their loss the Suffrage movement will possess an amount of democratic support which it has deliberately thrown away by advocating the limited Bill. It is very possible that here we have the secret of the women's failure so far: they have not chosen a wide enough base. Why not unite the movement and the people in this demand? The support they will lose is not worth keeping.
A Note of Discernment to Mr. Arthur Henderson, M.P.

SIR,—We offer you our congratulations upon the position you have attained as Chairman of the Labour Party. Unlike Mr. Redmond, who is a titular chief only, you possess power as well as position. Your grip upon the organisation is firm and secure. More showy men pass before the Westminster footlights—pseudo-intellectuals and others—but they cannot supplant you. The reason is not far to seek. They do not conform to type; you do. Et voilà tout! Unkind critics say of you that in the kingdom of the blind, the one-eyed man is king. The remark is ill-natured and not in the least appropriate. Professor Gardiner ascribed Cromwell's hold upon the minds and imagination of his countrymen to the fact that he was "the typical Englishman." Without the least desire to flatter, we believe that you occupy your present eminence (such as it is) because you are the typical Labour politician.

The story of Trade Unionism is one of the romances of modern English history. The memories of the older generation can run to a time when Trade Unionism was prima facie an illegal conspiracy. To-day it is the sign-manual of the skilled artisan. Indeed, it is no exaggeration to say that skill and Trade Unionism are almost interchangeable terms. So called "unskilled" labour is really unorganised labour. If anyone doubts it, let him try hedging and ditching, or even street scavenging. To cut a long story short, the British proletariat owes an incalculable debt to Trade Unionism. Now there are about 2,500,000 Trade Unionists in this country, of whom 1,500,000 are affiliated to the Labour Party. We are told that they represent the cream of the working classes. But there are 13,000,000 manual workers in Great Britain. Probably the majority of these non-unionists will always remain unorganised. They are not therefore necessarily untruc to their class interests; the nature of their occupation or their local circumstances may preclude effective regmentation. There are 1,200 different industries carried on in the British Isles, and a moment's reflection will show that literally hundreds of these trades are not susceptible of Trade Union organisation. We do not, therefore, depreciate your task as Chairman of the Labour Party, if we tell you frankly that we, as Socialists, appeal to a vastly greater constituency than do you.

We have, however, to consider the real function of Trade Unionism. Undoubtedly, primarily, you must wage your warfare in the industrial sphere. You must do nothing in politics that would weaken your organisation, numerically or financially, as a fighting force in the unceasing class-struggle in factory and workshop. Yours, therefore, is the responsibility of so guiding your party that nothing shall be done to antagonise or exclude any eligible member of a Union. Thus, you must not outrage the convictions of Liberals, Tories, Socialists, or even of non-politicians. An independent line in Parliament is safe; but you must not commit your party to any definite political creed to which others may reasonably object.

The industrial struggle by no means excludes Parliametary representation. Every Session a mass of legislation has to be considered that directly affects wages and wage conditions, and the Unions would be criminally negligent if they did not send you and your colleagues to guard their interests in Parliament. We beg you, however, always to remember that capital fights hardest in the market-place, its power being greatest there. Just consider: the Unions as a whole put more than £4,000,000 if any combined attack were made against them by combined capital, which in its turn could command untold millions. Organised capital could crush you in a month.

When, therefore, we argue that politically, Socialism and Labour can never amalgamate, we argue as much in your interests as our own.

We entertain a suspicion that you regard us as a cantankerous crowd of impractical dreamers. Harboring no such delusion. We understand politics quite as thoroughly as do you or your I.L.P. colleagues. And we are deeply concerned that the Labour Party shall succeed. We are your friends and well-wishers. We desire to cooperate with you in securing all industrial legislation that strengthens your grip upon the industrial machine. But Socialists cannot do this if they are cabined, cribbed, and confined by subscription to a party constitution that compels them to fight with one hand tied behind them. We ask you to believe that mutual freedom would give us mutual strength.

No doubt, you are pondering upon your line of action should the Lords confirm the judgment of the Court of Appeal in the matter of the Appeal of the Society of Railway Servants. You had better prepare for an adverse verdict. Lawyers are generally agreed that the Appeal Court's decision is good law. Personally, we think it was based upon sound public policy. It would be futile to expect Parliament to rectify the law in your favour. What, then, are you to do? You may seek to evade the law by giving sinecure appointments to every member of the party. The Courts should have been secured long since. We have not forgiven Mr. Keir Hardie for a certain article in the "North American Review." No sooner were he and his I.L.P. associates entrenched in your financial citadel than he arrogantly proclaimed that one thing Labour did not ask for payment of members; that, in fact, it was better to maintain the voluntary system because it would exclude middle-class adventurers, lawyers, and other cattle. Mr. Keir Hardie, in meeting Nemesis in many shapes just now: one of them will be the dissolution of the Alliance as at present constituted, should the Lords confirm the Court of Appeal. Doubtless this will stimulate his languid interest in payment of members. You will hardly be surprised if we tell you that we should welcome any breach in the Alliance that restored to Socialists full freedom of political action.

For Socialism has been paralysed to a tragic degree in recent years. Every proposed advance has been countered by the I.L.P. junta with one unfailling formula: "It would be contrary to the terms of the Alliance." It has always acted as an instant sedative; the oracle spoke, and we were submissively dumb. But we shall be silent no longer. Socialism is a new scheme of life; Trade Unionism is but a palliative of life as it is lived to-day. The old and the new are fast coming to death grips. The workers' Armageddon will be fought, not in the narrow confines of trade combination, but in the wider area of the whole community. The battle will be between the possessing classes and Socialism, and not only between industrial capitalists and Trade Unions. For these and many other reasons we genuinely desire to be your paid servants.

Faithfully yours,

THE NEW AGE.
“The C.O.S. and Fair-play.”

There are many hard things said and written about the Charity Organisation Society (known as the C.O.S.), but many of these harsh accusations owe their origin to the imperfect knowledge of the speaker or writer. With a view to mitigating, and perhaps removing, the prejudice existing in the minds of many against it and its work, as a lover of fair-play and justice I write this article.

Let me begin by defending myself from an accusation of partisanship. I am a strong supporter of, and believer in, the Minority Report of the Poor Law Commissioners, and I trust that before I have concluded, the verdict will be that these reports on distress, on old age, and on the administration of the Poor Law are naturally very limited. The reason for the difficulty is obvious: an employer of labour gets rid as soon as he can of the old men, and takes on in their place more active and younger men, generally between the ages of 25 and 45.

Further, I am in favour of the State providing employment on productive or reproductive work for the bona fide working man who is unable to get work, and who is out of work through no fault of his own. The Society is strongly opposed to this, on the ground that such a measure would undermine the working man’s independence and energy and render him lethargic and dependent. To this I reply that if a man be out of work, for any substantial period of time both moral and physical deterioration are not unlikely to set in; he is apt to lose both physical and moral energy, to become more or less hopeless and despondent, and he may in his condition of enforced inactivity sink from the first class into the second or third class worker. (2) That the important and essential thing to do is, before any such mischief occurs, to find the man work of the character I have specified. (3) Much of the relief given by the Society is calculated to produce the mischief the Society apprehends as arising from State employment than any such measure of State employment is likely to give rise to. The Society, when such a man as I have described as a first-class man is out of work through no fault of his own, whose record is good, and who is not incapacitated, but who is out of work through no fault of his own and cannot get work, in the hope or in the expectation of the man getting employment within a month or two, gives the man, if he be single, or his family if he be married, relief in the shape of an adequate weekly allowance, called interim relief. I have known cases in which relief of this kind has been given by the Society for as long as three months. Is the effect of this sort of relief upon the man better or worse than that of the State finding productive work for him promptly at the current rate of wages? I believe that the Society has shown in the case of the insured the physical and moral energy unimpaired by eating his heart out in enforced inactivity and at the same time receiving a charitable subsidy, or by being employed on remunerative work? It will thus be seen that on three very important matters— namely, (1) the respective merits of the Majority and Minority Poor Law Reports, (2) Old Age Pensions and the necessity for a considerable reduction in the standard of age, and (3) State employment for the bona fide working man who is unable to get work, I am distinctly opposed to the attitude the Society holds. Having thus, as I hope, placed myself on good terms with the Society, I now proceed to examine some of the multifarious work which is being daily done by the Society.

Let me commence with the work the Society does as an enquiry agent, not in regard to applications made to it, but for residents in London and elsewhere all over the kingdom, to whom appeals for help are made. Very many of these appeals are sent on to the District Committee within whose district the patron appeal, for help, resides. Careful and searching enquiries are then made by the District Committees from employers, landlords, relatives of the applicant, and others, for information respecting any of these enquiries is in due course reported to the householder, with a recommendation either to assist or not to assist. In many instances it is found that the applicant is a well-known begging-letter writer, and that the address which he or she has given is what is known as an accommodation address. But the Society’s functions as an enquiry agent do not stop here. The various Distress Committees have in a very large number of cases employed these District Committees of the Society to enquire into the history of applicants upon whom they have applied for help to the Distress Committees.

The District Committees have also been made considerable use of in the same way by the Personal Service (Infants’ Aid League, the Infant Care Society, (commonly known as the I.C.A.A.), and by many other philanthropic and charitable societies. Thus the Society’s work as an enquiry agent covers a much wider field than is generally supposed to be the case.

In addition to these there are cases where applicants applications for some assistance of some sort or another made to the Society itself, applications for interim relief while the husband, or mother, if she be a widow, is ill, incapacitated, or out of work, for the purpose of finding work, help to find work, help with rent, admission to Homes, surgical appliances, training for boys and girls who have left school, clothes to enable a girl to go into service or for a boy to go into employment, grants to the blind, etc. All these applications, again, necessitate careful and searching enquiries, and if the results are satisfactory to the District Committee, and it has either sufficient funds at its disposal or can raise sufficient funds for the purpose, the application is granted. To this I reply that the Society has, as far as I know, no relief is to be given unless there be a reasonable prospect of effecting some substantial and permanent good,
The Economic Test of Unemployed Policy.*

II.

If the hypothesis of under-consumption or over-saving as the chief cause of cyclical unemployment be rejected, how can it be contended that to take money from taxpayers in order to relieve undue saving, and waste for unemployed workmen has any other effect than merely to shift the personnel of unemployment? If the money taken in taxation must either have been spent upon commodities or have been saved and invested, i.e., spent upon new forms of capital, the amount that would have been expended in making these commodities or these forms of capital will now be unemployed. There will be no addition whatever to the volume of employment as a whole. Instead of a number of men being employed in the ordinary course of trade to make goods for consumption, or to make more mills and machines, a number of other men will be employed by public departments to make a road or an artificial lake; the aggregate amount of employment will be just the same, though the product will be a good deal smaller.

The plausibility of this argument, a vice in one in which the giving of it would serve a number of citizens, in the husband or wife, as, for instance, in those cases in which the man or his wife drinks, or in which the man has lost his employment, not on one occasion only, by laziness or unpunctuality. It is adhesion to this principle, which reflection will show is a sound one, that is the real cause of the charges leveled against the Society of being hard and unfailing.

Another important branch of the Society's work is that known as the Mutual Registration of Relief. This object of this is to prevent the overlapping of charity or relief, and to suppress concealment or misrepresentation on the part of applicants. The scheme is a simple one. The various and often numerous relieving agencies in the district send in such a statement as once in some time more often, a list to the C.O.S. District Committee which contains the names and addresses of the various persons or families in the district relieved by each relieving agency, and also a short statement of the nature of the relief given. A careful, tabulated statement is then made by the C.O.S. District Committee of the information thus given, and if relief is being given to the same family or person by two or more agencies, or by the C.O.S. and any other agency, the relieving agencies concerned are at once notified. The District Committees have also a sub-committee called "Friendly Visiting Sub-Committee," whose function it is to advise and give a helping hand to many families to whom the District Committees have been unable to give the assistance for which application has been made. This is a good deal of other valuable work done by these District Committees which time and the consideration of space will not permit me to enumerate.

It is hardly necessary to state that all this multifarious work, of which I have given but a short and imperfect sketch, is a great chain upon the funds of the Society, and that there are many cases in which the Society is reluctantly compelled to withhold assistance on the ground of want of funds. The critic, so often made on the Society's work, that it is slow is no doubt to a certain extent true, but it is better to proceed carefully and surely, even if this involves some delay, than by well-meaning but precipitate action to do what may prove to be merely mischievous. In conclusion, I desire to pay a just and emphatic tribute to the self-sacrificing men and women who cheerfully and willingly spend day after day of each week in assisting to carry out what all mankind must admit is a noble, valuable, and good work.

HARTLEY WILLIAMS.

* From a forthcoming work: "The Industrial System: An Enquiry into Earned and Unearned Income." By John A. Hobson. (Longmans.)
of a market already congested. Therefore, there is a reasonable presumption that a taxing process which intercepts such savings and converts them into immediate employment of unemployed labour will have the effect of increasing the aggregate volume of employment within a given time, and not merely of changing the personnel of the unemployed.

J. A. Hobson.

A Shriek of Warning.

Part I.

By G. K. Chesterton.

I have occasionally made in these columns the fantastic suggestion that the possessive pronoun, still admitted in grammars, has some meaning attached to it; that when you say "his house" or "my hat" you may possibly not be uttering gibberish like "poor house" or "punk hat." This paradox, which some call mystical, some call mystical, some call friends not only distress, but some mental disorder. When I speak of "a wish to own," the Socialists, in reply, divide their time and argument between two main positions. First, they say that there is no such wish. Secondly, they say that Socialists feel it keenly, and will satisfy it to repletion. My friend Mr. Jepson, for instance, says there is no desire to own in a human being. But then Mr. Jepson (if I remember right) says there is no such thing as a human presented Bello speaking of "the fact, Man:" it seems there is no such fact. What can one say of such vapours? That mankind is not a fact is bad news for all the decent Socialists who have made human solidarity the pivot of their just anger and pity. It is good news for all the tyrants who have tried to divide men and rule them, to split them into slaves and freemen, into fit and unfit. A sweater would be glad to believe that Man is not a fact. A Socialist would be sorry to believe it. But fortunately no sweater or Socialist could be such a madman as to believe it seriously at all.

Mr. Jepson has used one most unlucky argument.

He has told me that I am quite happy in my Battersea flat, at the very moment when I am leaving it. I never liked a Battersea flat, except in so far that I liked living in Battersea. And even now, when my boxes are almost labelled, if Mr. Jepson will give me a small house of my own in Battersea, I will die there, blessing his name. Of course, I can eat, sleep, and praise God in a flat. I can eat, sleep, and praise God in a railway carriage. But a railway carriage is not a house because it is a house on wheels. A flat is not a house because it is a house on stilts. If Mr. Jepson says he feels no such differences, I accord him my credulity and my compassion. But when he says that I don't, I give him the lie, with my love.

As to the general denial of a possessive passion, it is as sweeping and simple and incredible as the denial of any other passion. If Mr. Jepson said that men did not desire women, I don't know what I could reply—except as sweeping and simple and incredible as the denial of that, of experience dark and unintelligible; and that is all.

This brings me to Mr. Cecil Chesterton and Mr. Muggeridge, whom I am always delighted to meet. Assuming for the moment a sentiment of property to exist in some degree (which they, I think, would not deny), it will scarcely be disputed that this sentiment is unsatisfied under our present oligarchy of town and country landlords, just as the sentiment of bodily freedom must be unsatisfied among otherwise comfortable negro slaves, or the sentiment of local patriotism unsatisfied among otherwise amiable Bedouins. Our present circumstances tend to make us mutilate or forget this function. Now, that assertion, right or wrong, is this: that we are passing easily from Oligarchical to Collectivist ideas precisely because they are so like each other: the earth-love of the common citizen is at a low ebb in both, and will not therefore be an obstacle in either. We are onlyiggers, being handed over from one overseer to another, without once having felt freedom. We are only Bedouins pitching another camp in the same inhuman desert, having missed the village which is the house of men. This is our contention, and to this Muggeridge and C. C. make their reply.

Now, I could best express my feelings towards my brother and Mr. Muggeridge by shouting at the top of my voice "If I, or 'look out!' as one shouts at a man walking gaily over a cliff, or at a child playing in front of an express train. Their innocence has something awful about it. They are both sincere and able persons; they know much more of economics than I do, and perhaps as much of the sentimential and that more reliable thing literature. The only thing that they do not in the least know is where they are. They have not the faintest conception of what country they are living in, to what generation they belong, or of what is going on under their own noses. They take for granted things that have never happened at all, like "the popular movement" for Socialism. They admit the faint and far-off possibility of things that have happened already, such as the conversion of the upper class to the essential ethic of Socialism. Sir William Harcourt, that typical aristocrat, said, with perfect truth, "We!" (that is the oligarchy) "are all Socialists now."

But let me illustrate the fatal simplicity with which—unconscious of their doom—the little Fabians play.

Perhaps I can do it most shortly by answering Mr. Cecil Chesterton's most direct question: "If G. K. C. were a Socialist candidate, would he rather run for West Ham or for St. George's, Hanover Square?" To this I reply at once. "If I wanted to call myself a Socialist, to wear a red tie, to talk about Ruskin and the New Jerusalem, to be quite incorruptible and quite powerless, I should run for West Ham. If I wanted to get rapidly to work on the Imperial machine, to run it nearer to Socialism, I should without hesitation stand for St. George's, Hanover Square." And so I should think would anyone else, with even the feeblest knowledge of the world. Coming in a flock coat from
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Hanover Square, I should be put on the Front Bench to pass Bills regulating the lives of the poor. "In the public interest," raiding their houses or sending round the State barber to shave them once a day. Coming in a red tic from West Ham, I should be universally respected as an honourable lunatic, and die without having given one Socialist touch to the Constitution. My uprisings have innocently touched upon just such a case as I should have chosen myself. It is my whole point that the man now in possession is much more likely to increase the State powers while he himself holds them, than to leave it to be done by less practised, though powerful hands. The oligarchy will beat Grayson as it has beaten Keir Hardie, because neither of those admirable men understands what the oligarchy really is or wherein lies its smooth and slippery strength. "Let it be granted," says C. C., "that a despotic State, or an aristocratic State, or a Papal State" owning the means of production would be correctly describable as a Socialist State, practical men will still answer that no Socialist in Europe wishes to see the means of production owned by a despotic, aristocratic, or Papal State. If this means that the system set up by Socialists would be called a Democracy, I daresay it would. Has it by any chance occurred to him that the present system is called a Democracy? There would be no legally established oligarchy of Socialism. But there is legally established oligarchy now. Mr. Winston Churchill is not supposed to be in power as a prince of one of the great houses; he is supposed to be the particular private citizen upon whom the local affections of the people of Dundee have chanced to fall. The question which I always ask Socialists, and which they never answer, is simply this: "As the English trust everything to the Churchills and call that Democracy, why shouldn’t we trust everything to the Churchills and call that Socialism?" At least it is no answer to say that these Socialists vaguely desire self-government. Most Englishmen vaguely believe that they have got it. But if it means anything more than this dim admission of the self-governing principle, if he means that Socialists are generally full of the democratic feeling, that they are allied by instinct to the habit and humour of the people, then I say with certainty that they are not. I have never met men in Bloomsbury or in Bankside as passionate in their passions as the disillusioned Socialists. I have never met men as much distinguished by their indifference to the fine points of the law as the Socialists. Bernard Shaw is a better statesman than Asquith; but Chamberlain has been less secluded from common sentiments. Bernard Shaw is a better statesman than Asquith; but Chamberlain has been less secluded from common sentiments. 

The Convert.

By W. L. George.

"Let me tell you, gentlemen, that in Tariff Reform, and in Tariff Reform alone, will you find the cure of the evils which beset to-day this most ill-fated Empire. It will replenish the State (John Bull's Store, I may say); it will feed the hungry, clothe the naked, secure for all men happiness and freedom; its triumph will make the Empire great, and turn out of office the rascally band of jackanapes ... "—"For shut it," cried a voice—"yes, gentlemen, rascally band of jackanapes, into whose predatory hands the governance of the land has lapsed." I paused for a moment to regain breath and survey from the vantage of the cart the grey vista of Westbourne Grove—its endless line of twinkling lights.

"What must we do? I ask you; what can we do for England?" ("Go 'ome," yelled the voice.) Gentlemen, the noblest lines of our greatest national poet ask that question: What can I do for thee, England, my England? What can I do for thee, England, my own?

We must educate our masters, and so most of that evening, as we walked Notting Hill, I talked to him of Tariff Reform, and art and religion, and other things. He seemed more inclined to listen than to argue; I slowly felt my liking for the democracy increase. As we parted an impulse made me ask him to dine at my house the next night; these men who do not know exactly what they think are part of the fluctuating majority which turns the tables at election time.

It is good to impress the lower classes: to impress those whom one would lead must at all costs be done. Now to it, therefore, that the first of all I will show him into the billiard-room after telling him that Sir John wouldn’t be a minute. There I found him, his back to me, clothed in blue serge, two large red hands with bony wrists clasped behind him. He was looking at a small bronze of Venus of Milo. As I came in he turned, flushed, a little flurried. After we had shaken hands and told one another it was a warm
evening, he clearly sought to say something. For these
great thoughts of the people I always wait: they are
the key to the feelings a politician must stir. I was
disappointed, however, for he jerked his thumb towards
the bronze, and remarked: "Very 'ot."

I dined him very well. He did not say much, but
helped himself to the hors d'oeuvres so liberally that I
realised he took them for the fish. My wife bore up
bravely, as I had thought it advisable to tell her that
he was the secretary of the local Conservative Associa-
tion. I saw her look away, however, when he thought-
fully selected the wrong forks and tried to eat bombe
glacée with a spoon.

He rose to his feet. "I'd best be going," he said,
and walked to the door.

"Stop," I cried; "you're not a Liberal, you're a . . . a
Socialist."

He looked at the carpet, gently digging into the pile
the toe of his boot, at the pictures, at the table still
loaded in picturesque disarray with the remains of the
feast. "I desay," he said.

THE MARCHERS.

In the light of the bright electric world
Running up, running down the Strand,
In the light of the hard electric world
The marchers face the thick street, and beat by beat,
We mark the tramp of their aching feet
Beatimg away till morning.

Christ, how weary they are of it all!
Only to rest a little while,
Lean a tired head on a kindly hand,
And lo, while they carried us down came sleep.

The rich sit oozed in the houses near,
They eat and laugh, and their jewels shine;
But we sit nowhere—we're not allowed;
And only the white policeman's shield
Remains a quivering disk, till that
turned moonlit into a moonly field
And a man picked up our poor old hat,
And they lifted us, muddy boots, torn face,
And lo, while they carried us down came sleep!

Sleep! We have long desired it, our eyes are stinging for
sleep;
Are there not in our ears and hearts always the words, "Ba
still!"

How can we face the phantoms that set and beset our path-
How can we face the phantoms that set and beset our path-

No, there is nothing to hope from This but mud and glare
"How should some 'ave everything, e' was sayin,' and we 'ave
nothing? We've got to take it. Yes, I see it all now."

He stopped. I held my breath and for a second gazed
at the narrow, bent back, the straggly head of hair.
Drunk, of course!
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An Interview with the Tsar.

By Maxim Gorki.

(Translated by David Weintraub.)

If the manner of reception at Tsarkio Selo is not exactly amiable, it at least has the advantage of being original. From the moment of my entrance I was surrounded by a group of gendarmes, whose hands evinced a decided predilection for reaching into my empty pockets with a most insatiable curiosity.

"Gentlemen," I said, politely, "it's not of the least use you searching me, the place I am coming to is quite a new one as well as the kind of people I was likely to meet, I took the precaution of leaving every kopeck at home!"

"But, Majesty!—I have no pockets!"

"Yes, yes," he replied, "but we nevertheless prefer you keeping your arms in the air. The people's inventiveness nowadays is only equal to their cupidity. . . ."

"Quite so, your Majesty!" I acquiesced, in all sincerity.

"I trust you are none the worse for the little precautions taken to protect Our life?"

"Here's the fear, your Majesty; I have already grown accustomed to it!" I answered, without taking my eyes off the fingers placed near the button, the slightest pressure of which would have sent the whole of my body into the limbo of forgotten generations.

One becomes most affable, though not unaccountably so, with a prospect like this in store.

"As you see we are Russians, not quite at our ease; but our duty to God behoves us to suffer," he continued, his head shaking mournfully.

Fortified as he was in the armour of knighthood, he still sat on a throne amidst bayonets, as do all the other monarchs of to-day! But his costume was too heavy, whilst his throne was tottering and infirm. When the Tsar moved in the least degree without the support of the bayonets threatened to give way, and so he was obliged to keep himself constantly poised in awkward equilibrium.

"We have read your interview with Our brother, the Emperor of Germany—Our brother!—I exclaimed the Tsar, dreamily, with half-closed eyes. "Yes, he is a monarch in the true sense of the word; he is a king, even when his outfit is at present that of a commoner!"

"Yes, your Majesty!" I acquiesced, instinctively.

"One becomes most affable, though not unaccountably so, with a prospect like this in store. . . ."

"And of Falsehood, your Majesty!" I protested.

"Our brother, the German Emperor, etc., and so forth. . . ."

"When the Tsar speaks one should listen to his tongue. True, you have written some justly beautiful things concerning Our brother, the German Emperor; yet, even that does not give me the right to call him Your Most Augustness! It is the duty of everyone to keep the place assigned to him—the Tsar on his throne, the subject at his feet! But you do not want that observe the following: we are well aware that you are not consumed with a desire to fall at our feet; and we are also aware," he added, with a renewed sigh, "that the time has long gone by when subjects were expected to throw everything away, even their hearts!—at the feet of the Sovereign, as the Court historians tell us. Now even that scanty tribe is no longer esteemed by them! They have in a nutshell the lamentable ideals that have attended the modern spread of education. To-day we have the ignoble sight of people throwing themselves at the feet of the Tsar, in my opinion, what order—killed and wounded in chaotic promiscuity! What strength of will-power, what depth of wisdom, a Sovereign must need have to bear of his own accord the weight of his time; to stem the Torrent of Ideas into the Bed of Respect—ever gliding towards the Horizon of the Ideal, the Goddess of Folly. . . ."

"Your Majesty!" I exclaimed, instinctively.

"Yes, it has been said that to trouble you would be an affront, as a cork from a bottle, and carrying beneath it a heavy sigh emanating from a grief-stricken heart, ascended my ear once again, and I beheld, as in a dream, a huge square of the floor rising gradually before me, as a cork from a bottle, and carrying beneath it a large cabinet, in which was seated the Emperor of Russia, King of Poland, Grand Duke of Finland, etc., etc., clad in plate and in armour! Fear and consternation seized my soul, my arms lowering involuntarily."

"Hands up!" shouted the Emperor, in a voice shaking with fear. Seeing that his hand was ready to press the electric button, my arms flew up instantly, like the wings of a mill driven by an impetuous wind.

"You understand," said the Tsar, and something resembling a smile spread itself over his wan features, "when we look at one of our subjects approaching us in hand in pocket, we suppose, as a rule, that he is going to throw us a bomb, even though, on the contrary, he is ready to give us a roule!"

"But, Majesty!—I have no pockets!"

"Yes, yes," he replied, "but we nevertheless prefer you keeping your arms in the air. The people's inventiveness nowadays is only equal to their cupidity. . . ."

"Quite so, your Majesty!" I acquiesced, in all sincerity.

"I trust you are none the worse for the little precautions taken to protect Our life?"

"Here's the fear, your Majesty; I have already grown accustomed to it!" I answered, without taking my eyes off the fingers placed near the button, the slightest pressure of which would have sent the whole of my body into the limbo of forgotten generations.

One becomes most affable, though not unaccountably so, with a prospect like this in store.
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"When the Tsar speaks one should listen to his tongue. True, you have written some justly beautiful things concerning Our brother, the German Emperor; yet, even that does not give me the right to call him Your Most Augustness! It is the duty of everyone to keep the place assigned to him—the Tsar on his throne, the subject at his feet! But you do not want that observe the following: we are well aware that you are not consumed with a desire to fall at our feet; and we are also aware," he added, with a renewed sigh, "that the time has long gone by when subjects were expected to throw everything away, even their hearts!—at the feet of the Sovereign, as the Court historians tell us. Now even that scanty tribe is no longer esteemed by them! They have in a nutshell the lamentable ideals that have attended the modern spread of education. To-day we have the ignoble sight of people throwing themselves at the feet of the Tsar, in my opinion, what order—killed and wounded in chaotic promiscuity! What strength of will-power, what depth of wisdom, a Sovereign must need have to bear of his own accord the weight of his time; to stem the Torrent of Ideas into the Bed of Respect—ever gliding towards the Horizon of the Ideal, the Goddess of Folly. . . ."

"Your Majesty!" I exclaimed, instinctively.

"Yes, it has been said that to trouble you would be an affront, as a cork from a bottle, and carrying beneath it a heavy sigh emanating from a grief-stricken heart, ascended my ear once again, and I beheld, as in a dream, a huge square of the floor rising gradually before me, as a cork from a bottle, and carrying beneath it a large cabinet, in which was seated the Emperor of Russia, King of Poland, Grand Duke of Finland, etc., etc., clad in plate and in armour! Fear and consternation seized my soul, my arms lowering involuntarily."

"Hands up!" shouted the Emperor, in a voice shaking with fear. Seeing that his hand was ready to press the electric button, my arms flew up instantly, like the wings of a mill driven by an impetuous wind.
any such thing! Moreover, Our hands are washed five times daily, and even more, in warm water and perfumes, in order to dissipate the odour of that liquid. O, would that every person knew how to tell the truth about Us! Thanks to the babblers of the European Press, we are judged everywhere with prejudice, and treated with injustice. If only those hierarchies were to know how sincerely concerned We are in the plight of our people! How Our heart goes out to them at the thought that their revolt against the power of the Tsar should be construed as denying the authority of God Himself!"

"I promise faithfully to repeat everything your Majesty will tell me," I suggested.

He threw an eloquent glance of the eye on the electric button, and said:

"Yes, to be sure! You are placed in a position where it would be an exceedingly rash thing to say anything that the one hand raised in the act of bringing down the cover of his helmet another sheet; read: "Ceratin newspapers have said that We have massacred innocents" by dozens and by hundreds. The latter a complete lie—and its lack of veracity is evident from what those same newspapers have written about Us ten years ago, what they may say of us to-day, or what they will say of Us ten years from now. It is not glorifying the beauty and wisdom of the Emperor of Russia that must be taken for lies, and as such they will ever remain! Europe considers us a Despot, a Tyrant, a monstrous Vampire sucking the living blood of other peoples, and then devouring its flesh—Russia's Evil Genius!"

He paused abruptly, his eyes ran once again over the paper, shrugged his shoulders, and said, under his breath:

"Why has he written that down—the imbecile! . . .

H'm . . . Yes, here is the commencement:

"Every right-minded person believes in the integrity of the Sovereign received his power from Heaven, from the Hands of the Master of the Universe, it is incumbent upon him to preserve his divine gift at no matter what cost, and in whatever manner, in keeping faith with his subordinates. That is the Heaven-sent Shepherd of his people! Know you in what the security of a Sovereign rests? I will tell you. In the naive practice of virtue, and in the unquestioning acceptance of all the precepts of the will of the Church, in silence, submission, and respect, as a gift sent direct from Heaven."

The Tsar interrupted his reading, closed his eyes, and smiled with an air of satisfaction.

"How neatly turned is that last part! That dog of a poet could not possibly express other people's thoughts with such felicity and verve as if he himself had originally given birth to them. It was not for nothing that he was driven out of the regiment for his knavish tricks . . . We will tolerate!"

"Your majesty, may I know who is the author of that work of art?" I asked.

"One of the officers of the Gendarmerie; a sharper of the first water. I have forgotten his name, but it is true that he is the sharpest of the sharp."

I at once thought to be back on the Mississippi of Mark Twain; my blood ran cold. I was not encouraged by anything that had happened in a civilisation which, both in Europe and America, is dead, killed by such phenomena as Sedan, the English Education Act, and the rise of Abraham Lincoln. I know not what Mr. Grierson was doing between the early seventies and the late nineties, when the first of his essays tumbled out of the sky at our feet. I well remember my conviction that "Francis Grierson" must be a pseudonym. For I could not conceive that a man who had lived so long, encountered so many people, and thought so much, could possibly then be publishing for the first time. However, it was so, and all our surmises were incorrect. Mr. Grierson was probably not specially interested in the practical and esthetic side of literature. He is, probably impartial among the arts, and esthetics as literature as merely one of them. He writes when it occurs to him to write. I should say that he is, in the fine sense, mainly a dilettante. Therefore I should not be surprised if he never wrote another book. But I shall be sorry if he doesn't. Indeed, if several more books do not follow, I shall consider that the faithful have been deceived. For "The Valley of Shadows" is really the first volume of Mr. Grierson's life, and in the matter of Mr. Grierson's life, it is certain his duty, having lived it so far, to spend a fair portion of the rich remainder in writing it. His life has been quite special in its inclusiveness. Not every author of life can talk of Lincoln and Mallarmé with equal knowledge and sympathy, as Mr. Grierson could if he chose."

"The Valley of Shadows" is a series of pictures—chiefly in Illinois and Missouri—of American life immediately before and during the Civil War. It is a disturbing book, because, though it deals with scenes and atmospheres that have been very frequently described and that are now docketed in history, it continually leaves impressions which refuse to tally exactly with conventional notions left in the mind by years of reading. In going through it, I was always expecting to meet types of men that I had met before; and I never did. But I often met types whose unlikeliness to them was too subtle to be easily seized. For instance, when Mr. Grierson got me to the Mississippi at once thought to be back on the Mississippi of Mark Twain's greatest book, the incomparable "Life on the Mississippi." But it was not a real one; they were both real! The simple explanation, of course, is that Mr. Grierson is original in a rather naive way. Not original from a wish to be original, but unconsciously. He writes as if nobody had ever written of..."
those times before. This is one of the principal things that give its extraordinary value to the book.

* * *

I can tell you it is not an everyday book. You feel that from the very start, when the author introduces you to the religious life of the countryside. Harsh, naive, true Puritanism! Naturally! The Puritanism of tea thousand novels and memoirs. But when you have read chapters such as "The Meeting-House," "The Load-Bearer," and "The Camp-Meeting," you will perhaps not again think of that Puritanism precisely as you used to do. You will see it as romantically as now you see the ritual and the piety of Indian temples. You will see it drenched in mysticism and in the vapours of sex. Mr. Grierson's description of a devout woman singing a hymn in meeting-house reminded me of the description of the singer at the beginning of d'Annunzio's "Il Fuoco." It has the same detachment sentiment of beauty, the same absolute visual quality. You perceive that a meeting-house is just as exciting, as spectacular, as lovely as the Cos-tanzi at Rome—that indeed all life is one in the homogeneity if its romance. I think that Mr. Grierson has thrown a new light on American Puritanism here, and that he could not have done it had he not lived a long time in France. Assuredly, he has somewhat modified my words both about Puritanism (which has, nevertheless, received the laudation of Nonconformists). I don't know why I should have been so blind. But one never does know why one has been so blind.

Evidently Mr. Grierson is deeply interested in the religious pageant. The finest pages in the book describe the Sundays of St. Louis before the war (pp. 203-206): Sunday school. Chapel. Cold luncheon (cooking forbidden). Second Sunday school. Third Sunday school. Chapel. And this was considered progress could be more correct. In St. Louis in 1860 it was as impossible for polite persons not to be familiar with chapels and schools, as it is impossible for polite persons in London in 1900 not to be familiar with fashionable restaurants. The chapels stood down all elegance and all beauty. The chapels were "the thing." You bowed your dazzling, elegant, and expensive inamorata into her pew with a bow that all might see and admire. And the preachers were forbidden to be national. The choirs were well paid, and they were operatic. In listening to "the gifted Annie Dean" you forgot both heaven and hell. This was how it was. And as the congregation emerged from chapel all the latest Parisian fashions emerged, too. "All the churches were filled when on a Sunday people streamed out, long stately lines of beauty passed through the central part of the town; and as we came to Pine Street we met the major portion of St. George's congregation coming up the street, and these intermingling with people from Christ Church, made the streets glow with delicate colours and the southern type of beauty..." And there was the comet. "Over Decatur and Fancy Creek way they built meeting-houses with steeples on 'em, en the wimmin-folks tuck to wearing 'em—choir-stalls, en the men-choir-stalls put on the hill-shirts. But when the comet came into view the wimmin on their ole sun-bonnetts, allowin' pink ruffled 'em more'n enough to be jugged in."

* * *

All these things have passed, together with the Mississippi steam-boats, and the fire-eaters, and the Sioux, and the buffalo herds and the mysticism, and the slave-running, and about nine thousand ideals. Everything has gone: a civilization has been utterly changed. But doubt not that the romance still remains, and that some day some historian will turn it out as Mr. Grevilan has done out of the fifties and sixties. I have only mentioned some 5 per cent. of the matters in his strange, true, and fine book. Mr. Grierson assisted, in Paris, at the decline and fall of the Second Empire, and there is an indication, in his preface, that a book of his reminiscences of the Second Empire is among the possibilities of the future. It ought to be among the certainties of the future.

JACOB TONSON.

REVIEWS.

Justice and Liberty. By G. Lowes Dickinson. (Dent. 4s. 6d. net.)

We are inclined to believe that at last we have got what we have been looking for so long—a book which will teach Socialism to those very timid, rather puny persons, the cultured middle-class man and woman. It is little use planting before their eyes tables of statistics, telling the tragedy of the slums and starvation: for the atmosphere of tragedy never succeeds in the calm of the libraries, where cultured people live their lives. Neither are they captured by abrupt speaking, by vigorous assertiveness. Everything in life, in their opinion, must be carefully weighed: at the best, there can be always so much as may be to one and the other. Thus, Socialism must be presented to them as a weighing of possibilities of a situation which is hedged round with infinite difficulties. Mr. Dickinson plays with the man of culture and wealth at his own game. He will discuss the broad issues of Socialism as a philosopher; he divests into the details as an economist and a statesman. He flavours it with wit, and colours it with notable thinking. It is almost the most masterly exposition of Socialism in print. It is a present in the light form of a dialogue between three men, leaves little more to be said in defence of Socialism or in attack on Individualism. There is only one thing he hesitates to tell: how he intends to vote at the next election. That is an essential point, we think. Will Mr. Dickinson please give us a whole book on that question?

England's Story for Children. By M. Baumer William. (Grant Richards. 3s. 6d. net.)

Our congratulations to the present generation between the ages of five and ten, and we hope they will have this book for a birthday present. We were not so kindly treated at that age; we had to take our first steps in history in a far less agreeable manner than the children of to-day. There are some alterations which the writer of this book might make to its great advantage: but take it all in all, it is the best thing of its kind we have seen. The alteration one would suggest is in those few places where a little old-fashioned sentiment slips, almost unconsciously, we believe, before an historical view which, on the whole, is modern. "Dear, kind, sensible Queen Victoria" is the sentiment mental sumption of that departed sovereign. On the other hand, "Queen Anne herself was certainly not an amusing queen" is a delicious thumbnail sketch. Again, "Mary [of Scots] loved her religion and would not change it, although many people, who intended to be kind, talked to her and lectured her and preached to her till she grew quite tired of the subject" gives history the reality of a Nonconformist tea-party. And the conclusion that "it was terrible that a bright, happy girl should have come to such a shocking end" brings down royal humanity to the possibilities of a police court tragedy. We cordially commend this book because it makes history real. The full-page illustrations by Mr. Norman Aust show the sense of decorative form and colour; and are distinctly pleasing.

Glimpses of the Twenties. By William Toynbee. (Constable. 12s. 6d. net.)

The light-hearted reader may somewhat hastily imagine that this volume is a most delightful storehouse of the raciest Court stories of the days of the most racy of English monarchs. He (the delighted reader) will be both right and wrong. It is true that none of the modern society-gossip papers can hold their own against the true flavour of Mr. Toynbee's tales of George the Fourth and his anti Puritan relations. But, however fortunate it may have been, the fact remains that history and Court gossip did not run in altogether different channels in the Twenties. A large proportion of history had far too much to do with the Prince's last amorous adventure; far too many men gut army commissions or State appointments (it appears that the Church once got a
A FAMOUS PHYSICIAN'S CONFESSION OF DEFEAT

The uselessness of drugs or medicine to cure Neurasthenia is strikingly apparent in the experience of one who may be truthfully called one of the cleverest and most famous of English doctors—a physician whose name is known all over the world.

By that I do not mean the born-tired temperament. I mean the exact opposite of that. It is the man who has been used to the innumerable presentiments of St. Mary's Hospital: "I defy Sir Almroth Wright or anyone else to discover a vaccine for what I consider one of the most serious disorders of the present day—Neurasthenia, or nervous breakdown."

If these words mean anything at all, they mean that a man at the very top of the profession, and I might add one of the cleverest and most famous of English doctors, is convinced of the futility of drugs as a cure for this condition.

If you will consider the matter further, if you will take a personal test and a personal investigation. We accordingly offer readers a Free Trial Supply of Antineurasthin sufficient to demonstrate its wonderful efficacy, together with free copies of Dr. Hartmann's work entitled "Nervous Disorders," post free upon application. We also offer an equally important Pamphlet containing a remarkable fact which will be of the greatest interest to all sufferers.
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The whole case for Antineurasthin is vitally important for the medical profession and the whole world. We CHALLENGE any person or persons, including Doctors, Scientists, Analysts, Chemists, or Food Specialists to prove that ANTI-NEURASTHIN does not contain Lecithin in its active organic state, or that this is not presented in a form by which the Brain and Nervous System may wholly benefit.

We CHALLENGE any person or persons to produce—in face of the fact that Lecithin is the principal substance of the brain, spinal, marrow, and nerve tissues—that it is the only Food and Tonic discovered by specialists to prove that ANTI-NEURASTHIN does not contain Lecithin in its active organic state, or that this is not presented in a form by which the Brain and Nervous System may wholly benefit.

A Challenge

The position has been this—that, knowing the facts as we do from research by doctors, the medical profession has simply used these to alleviate pain or to stimulate activity. It was the only thing possible under the circumstances.

PROVED BY FACTS

The whole case for Antineurasthin is readily proved by FACTS in the form of convincing evidence. It is simply-used these to alleviate pain or to stimulate activity. It was the only thing possible under the circumstances.
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A Challenge

The whole case for Antineurasthin is vitally important for the medical profession and the whole world. We CHALLENGE any person or persons, including Doctors, Scientists, Analysts, Chemists, or Food Specialists to prove that ANTI-NEURASTHIN does not contain Lecithin in its active organic state, or that this is not presented in a form by which the Brain and Nervous System may wholly benefit.
saintly Bishop) for services rendered under circumstances where discretion saved a deal of unnecessary scandal. Mr. Toynbee has written a delightful book for those who want to be amused; he has, at the same time, given to history that touch of reality and atmosphere which the ponderous historian cannot weave round his characters and narrative. A valuable book of history; a volume of national gossip.

Philosophers, Ancient and Modern: Hobbes, by A. E. Taylor; Locke, by S. Alexander; Malthus, by Sr. George Steck; Early Greek, by A. W. Benn. (Cont. stable. 18. net.)

For those who desire a smattering of the philosophies—a very commendable desire—these introductory primers will prove helpful. The one danger is that some of the handbooks may prove sufficiently interesting to stimulate readers to waste their time by poring over the originals. There is no danger of this from Professor Alexander's feebly exposition and criticism of Locke; a failure due to ignorance of the trend of recent physics and biology. Professor Alexander medleys his own views and Locke's, for instance, on pages 50 and 51, that the reader cannot readily distinguish who is responsible for some of the philosophical theories. Professor Taylor constructs a lucid account of Hobbes in 126 pages, and the two primers of Greek and Stolc philosophy are useful summaries.

El Greco. By A. F. Calvert and C. G. Hartley. (Lane. 3s. 6d. net.)

El Greco was an alien in Spain, having been born in Crete; yet he became more Spanish than Spaniards. As the pupil of Tintoretto he certainly learned the elements of colour; but it was not until his genius was transplanted to Spanish soil that his great discovery in colour was made. Thenceforward he set the model of Spanish art, and even Velasquez was in many respects not his superior. We gather all there is to be known of his life from the authors of this book, but it is painfully little. His inner life remains a mystery despite the revelation of his paintings. Of his paintings no fewer than 130 are reproduced in this volume, which, together with its fellows in the "Spanish Series," is amazingly cheap and good.

DRAMA.

Ibsen and Bedelia.

As Miss Solomon was kind enough to send me two tickets for her performance of Ibsen's "Master Builder" at the King's Theatre, Hammersmith, I asked my friend Bedelia to accompany me. Now, Bedelia had never, I think, heard of Ibsen before. She had never heard him denounced as a Moral Anarchist or of "moderns" and as a Pessimist by another. She had my friend Bedelia to accompany me.

I felt sure that nothing could be more agreeable than to see this new production of Ibsen's. But here was Bedelia, who knew of none of the Ibsenites, and the oration was delivered by Miss Solomon in the "Spanish Series," is fully little. His inner life remains a mystery despite the revelation of his paintings. Of his paintings no fewer than 130 are reproduced in this volume, which, together with its fellows in the "Spanish Series," is amazingly cheap and good.

THE MEASURE OF OUR YOUTH.

The immorality of Morality. Translated from the Italian of Leo G. Sera by J. M. Kennedy, with an Introduction by Dr. Oscar Lev. Demy 8vo. 2s. 6d. net.

Mr. Sera is a physician who has deeply studied literature and historical science, and the object of his book is, in the opening words of the preface, "to establish our conception of social life on its original basis." He holds that the diffusion of democratic principles is vulgarising science and art, and that present social conditions, especially work and Christian teaching, are leading to the intellectual and moral degeneration of the race.
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By Charles Low. 6s.
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By Alick Herbert. 6s.
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Edited by Alexander Carlyle, Nephew of Thomas Carlyle. Editor of "New Letters and Memorials of Jane Welsh Carlyle."

THE JOURNAL OF JOHN MAYNE During a Tour on the Continent upon its Reopening after the Fall of Napoleon, 1814.

Edited by his Grandson, John Maine Colles. With numerous illustrations. Demy 8vo. 2s. 6d. net.

MORNING POST." Very readable and obviously trustworthy and sincere."

UNDER PETRAIA, with some Saunterings.

By the Author of "In a Tuscan Garden." With Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 5s. net.

ACADEMY." We can imagine no pleasanter preparation for a leisurely holiday in Northern Italy than the perusal of this volume.""

A SISTER OF PRINCE RUPERT: Elizabeth Princess Palatine, Abbess of Herford.

By Elizabeth Godfrey. With numerous Illustrations reproduced from Contemporary Portraits. Fruits, etc. Demy 8vo. 12s. 6d. net.

MORNING POST." No historical biography published during the last few years surpasses this one in the minuteness of its research and the width of the field it has covered."

LADIES FAIR AND FRAIL.

Sketches of the Demi-Monde during the Eighteenth Century.

By Horace Blecakley. With numerous Portraits reproduced from contemporary sources. Demy 8vo. 12s. 6d. net.

TATLER." An interesting and most fascinating chronicle of the lighter side of the Eighteenth Century.""
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CHIP. By F. E. Mills Young. Author of "A Mistaken Marriage." 6s.

THAIS. By Anatole France. 6s.

SOMEONE PAYS. By Noel Barwell. 6s.
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By Alick Herbert. 6s.
What is Mental Fitness?

AN OPEN LETTER TO A STUDENT

Dear Sir,—I have no need to tell you what physical fitness is; your body tells you all the time. Or, rather, it tells you if you will listen to it; for the best health consists in being unconscious of the body; like the man who was asked about his digestion and replied he did not know he had one.

But there is such a thing as mental fitness—something quite distinct from bodily fitness. A fine physique and a sluggish intelligence may exist in one and the same person. And just as careful eating and physical exercises develop bodily health and strength, so mental exercises develop the power of the mind. (A suggestion, mentioned elsewhere, that the whole host of varieties, it is not surprising that you have no control over your powers, and hardly need some mental drill.

The point I wish to emphasise is that these two educations should be pursued together, whereas they are usually dealt with quite separately. The physical side is so prominent nowadays that it can boast of many journals, both weeklies and monthlies, devoted entirely to health culture and the acquisition of muscular power. But where are the journals which flourish and pay good dividends by showing how a man may make the best of his brain? They don't exist, papers, not the brains. There used to be a little tribe of them in the eighteen fifties onwards. But somebody made it fashionable to laugh at the serious young man who studied Watts's "Logic" and the laugh continues to this day. It is still bad form, don't you know, to be too obviously keen on making the best of yourself. Which is sheer nonsense.

But what is mental fitness? It implies, among other things, trained senses, concentrative power, imaginative sympathy, sound judgment, and a strong will. Do you know how to use your eyes? I do not mean in the feminine sense, to bewitch, but to use them as sources of perception in order to supply material for the mind. Examine the confessions of half a dozen sighted people, and you will find that the first step towards the elaborate is seen by someone who is conscious of an anomaly. The mind, in turn, gave rise to serious reflection. There may not always be a right relationship between the thing seen and the subsequent judgment, but I would rather have muddy conclusions from clear perceptions than no perceptions at all.

Of course, the way to learn how to use your eyes is to use them, but there are methods approved by experienced pedagogues which save much time and trouble. These are given in the course of study entitled "The Secret of Mental Power."

The power of Concentration is another mark of mental fitness. It is a word with a certain aweful pomposity about it, but, after all, it simply means that when you want, say, to give a full hour to Marx on capital, or Nietzsche on democracy, you can do it. If, on the other hand, your mind travels from Marx and Nietzsche to other things, and at the end of the hour you find you have lacked upon rent, wages, boots, Chesterton's future, Yorkshire pudding, lords and ladies, walking sticks, Beatrix Tailor, picture hats, Keir Hardie, De Rougemont, turtles, trousers, and a host of varieties, it is not surprising that you have no control over your powers, and hardly need some mental drill.

Again: take imaginative sympathy; the capacity for seeing other people's ideas as they see them. Socialists may heartily disagree with Nietzsche, but they were among the first to give him a hearing. That betrays on their part a keen hunger for ideas, and ability to recognise a strong man when they meet one. Mental fitness means mental avidity; a quick eye for originalities; an Athenian readiness to listen to something new. There is no Marx Hill in Britain. Make your own.

I spoke of sound judgment. This is the tricky spot in mental science. All the great philosophers have had sound judgment (as they believed), ditto the great theologians, ditto the statesmen, ditto all the great leaders of thought everywhere. And yet the world is a mass of conflicting theories and beliefs. Is it not absurd, to talk of sound judgment? Not necessarily. A thing may appear to be right in theory, and yet be wrong in practice. For instance, I am in theory a red-hot Republican, but from what I see of Republicanism elsewhere I can only conclude that a limited monarchy works infinitely better. To me, therefore, a sound judgment would seem to be based on the old scientific method of observation and experiment. And even then somebody would object to my interpretation.

But I must conclude this letter. You will say I am an enthusiast. I am, indeed. I believe my lessons, if properly followed out, will make life totally different; by deepening and enriching and beautifying it. They will increase the money value of your ability, and no man can at present afford to ignore questions of £ s. d.

You may be interested to know that Dr. G. F. Stout, Editor of "Mind," and Professor of Logic and Metaphysics in the University of St. Andrews, has been kind enough to say after inspecting a specimen lesson, that my "course of study as outlined is excellent, and he is sure the lessons will be stimulating and suggestive."

In addition, there are no dogmas, political, religious, social, or literary. The subject is the development of mental power apart from all creeds and theories.

Yours faithfully,

T. SHARPER KNOWLSON.

P.S.—You can get ideas by stealing them. Turn to p. 11 of my Prospectus, and compare it with the advt. of a Correspondence College which recently appeared in a Nonconformist paper. And to think these people believe in the Ten Commandments!

INTELLECTUAL DEVELOPMENT.

How To Acquire It.

A COURSE OF TEN LESSONS (Correspondence Tuition).

By T. SHARPER KNOWLSON.

What the Course Will Do for You. I. It will organise your efforts in the direction of mental efficiency. II. It provides a plan which is not only scientific in itself, but adapted to individual needs. III. It is a course suited to your personal requirements. Special attention is devoted to weak features, e.g., lack of observation, or memory power. IV. It will enable you to acquire the art of mental control and develop the creative functions of your mind. V. It will help you to become a good debater by showing you how to analyse an argument and detect a fallacy. VI. It will train you to see both sides of a question, and show you how to deal with prejudices of every kind. VII. It will assist you in analysing evidence and cultivating judgment. VIII. It will train you in habits of intellectual independency. IX. It will help to make you a practical man, for every lesson has a practical end in view. X. It will quicken your business perceptions and bring a trained mind to bear upon all commercial undertakings.

Prospectus, post free on application to

MR. T. SHARPER KNOWLSON,

20, Wenham House, Bloomsbury Street, London, W.C.
Well might the late Mr. Clement Scott call Ibsen "suburban." If only the suburbs had been given the chance of appreciating him! There are some very brilliant writers in our age who will never appeal to any but a restricted public. I doubt if Bedelia would have appreciated Maeterlinck. I daresay she would have laughed at Mrs. Solness's dolls; but she didn't—her eyes were shining. Ibsen's clear, fairy tale symbolism she followed perfectly. Had I taken her to see one of Mr. Shaw's plays I think she would have delighted in the humour, but the philosophy would have seemed hardly depth enough in her interpretation. For Mr. Shaw's genius is the genius of a detached intellectual, and its appeal consists largely in that very detachment. But Ibsen is of the very greatest—and therefore purely human. We, of the narrow scenes that show Hilda as self-willed and unscrupulous, but where her heart and imagination are given to some of the most interesting qualities of her artistry, so that to say that he owes something to Hans Andersen or, at any rate, to the sources from which Andersen drew his inspiration, may seem the most wan- gon of paradoxes. Yet his masterpiece, Peer Gynt, is full of that inspiration, and it fills his most realistic dramas with figures and symbols which seem to have stepped straight out of folk-lore—Wild Ducks, Rat Wives, Sea Ladies, and Towers which their builder could not climb.

Miss Jessica Solomon was a vivacious Hilda, but she seemed to me a shade too curt and, if I may be permitted the expression, too American. She was good in the scenes that show Hilda as self-willed and unscrupulous, but where her heart and imagination are touched there seemed hardly depth enough in her interpretation. The great mistake of the representation was Solness. Solness should obviously be a man well advanced in middle age—between fifty and sixty at least. Mr. Rathmell Wilson, who persisted in interpreting the part romantically, refused to make any greater concession to old age than the partial powdering of his hair, giving the impression of a man of about thirty-five who had gone prematurely grey. This weakened the force of the passages about "the younger generation knocking at the door," because Solness looked no older than Ragner. Also it spoilt the humanity of the drama, knocking at the door," because Solness looked no older than Ragner.

The passionate controversy which has raged round the highly successful "Henry of Navarre," Henry VIII. is made weaker at least when I think he really was, but the conception of him was interesting, and was admirably interpreted by Mr. James Hearn. Miss Potter's Katherine was a fine piece of heroic acting. I doubt if the historic Katherine was like that; she was a better sort of woman at her time, but she came out of a dirty clique, and I should hardly think she was so spotless as Mr. Huerfer makes her. On the other hand, I feel grateful to Mr. Huerfer for showing up that contemptible skunk, Cranmer. The best piece of acting was that of Miss Eily Mayson as Lady Mary, afterwards "Bloody Mary," the only Tudor who had the misfortune to possess a conscience—though a morbid one.

The play was preceded by a queer pro-Semite melodrama called "In the Name of the Cear," which seemed
to be inspired by a detestation of the present Government of Russia, which all decent Englishmen share, combined with a passionate admiration for Jews, which is shared by the English governing class alone. There was one passage which I should have called a quite brilliant piece of satire if I could have given the author credit for comedic intention—I mean the passage in which the young Hebraic hero is reminded, in the middle of a splendid rhetorical speech about the use they will make of their arms, of the fact that the arms have, as he already knows, been captured by the police. Otherwise the play was tolerable melodrama, and Mr. Esmé Percy, as the hero, acted in the traditional Adelphi manner. Miss Muriel Carmel acted the heroine much better than she or the author deserved.

CURL CHESTERTON.

ART.

Into Pralaya.

The most modern principle in Art seals one of the oldest in diabolonian ethic. It is: Flatter the Bourgeoisie!

For the bourgeoisie has got out of hand. It has donned as a crown the figleaf virtues which Art induced it to wear.

The magic of Art, indeed, clothed the bourgeoisie from its naked savagery. But Art visited earth for its own glorification. It is now in retreat, and the task for artists is to see that none of its jewels are forgotten.

There is plenty of proof that Art is abandoning humanity, curiously in the same manner and at the same time as woman is abandoning man. But in both cases the proof "discovered" is not the proof. The fact that women and artists are to-day very accessible and very prone to cupidity, is merely external argument and far from the point of the subject. Artists and women, as often, are always accessible and avaricious, and according to their temperament have always demanded all and nothing.

But what does support the subject—and here I divide art from woman for my purpose—is the indifference with which artists regard the sort of work which is being turned out broadcast among the mob. Once there was alive a fine contempt and a subtle revenge in every sphere are presenting the bourgeoisie with virtues. It would crucify, and has crucified, with monotonous certainty, the daring artist who should name its figleaves figleaves.

The best diabolonian is he who can persuade the bourgeoisie that it contains the stuff of its own existence. And the deadliest weapon possible to be employed against this hitherto mild and humble ass is Flattery.

Persuade it that its thistles are real gold, and that itself is its thistles and its thistles itself; say to it, for instance, "You are Man; in you are contained all the virtues of Man: you are Virtue;" we may then hope that the golden ass will slay itself to get its thistles all at once.

G. K. Chesterton is among the most ingenious literary diabolonians alive. It is the Moses of this art of Art. He stores up his jewel so cunningly that the bourgeoisie never suspects where it lies. They run about, looking for his treasure, and this great and subtle man knows well they will never search their own chimney; so he hides it just there.

The skeleton forms of art are still ostentatiously offered and left about by artists on public buildings and grand pianos. For instance, although, long since, the spirit within the form of blank verse has been withdrawn, this form is still made to serve artistic liberty. It hypnotises the bourgeoisie out of criticism. I hazard that if I had written this subject within that form it would not have been read, but would certainly have passed for some superfluous but well-meant encomium upon Man. As it is, I may need to escape from the thumbs turned down.

Special Offer to Readers of "The New Age" as an Advertisement. 20.000 1½ DIAMOND STAR FOUNT PEN. Fitted with a 1½ solid Gold Nib, for 5/- till 21st April, 1909. Non-Refundable. Money guaranteed—Money returned if not fully satisfied. Fine, Medium, Broad or 1 Point. Twin-Feed and Spiral to regulate Flow of Ink. 1½-SELF-FILLING & SELF-CLEANING PEN. Fitted with 1½ solid Gold Nib, for 9/-, until withdrawn, sent on approval on receipt of Postal Order. Your W.C., and acquire this bargain.

Any of our Readers desiring a really genuine article cannot do better than write to the Red Lion Manufacturing Co. Ltd., 61, High Holborn, London, W.C., and acquire this bargain. No other Pen like it for Reliability, Smooth Flow, and Smooth Writing. Agents Wanted.
CORRESPONDENCE.

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

Correspondence intended for publication should be addressed to the Editor and written on one side of the paper only.

SPECIAL NOTICE.—Correspondents are requested to be brief.

Many letters weekly are omitted on account of their length.

A LETTER FROM AMERICA.

To the Editor of "The New Age."

In a recent number of The New Age you say that The New Age appeals for the Fourth Estate everywhere.

Well, as a member of the congregation of the Fourth Estate of America, I testify that your journal does appeal to me, adding, however, that the rider that it appeals to us (and therefore to members of the Fourth Estate everywhere) would be much enhanced if it would, and if it could, voice the spirit of the new age, as that spirit is manifesting in America.

You can! How?

By making me your war correspondent in America, and allowing me to report from the front the Western campaign of the greatest war of all time.

Even if I were the blunter that to my mind young open on the staff of The New Age, pray appoint a qualified person to it instantly, because a most strenuous campaign of the spirit of the new age is being waged in America. There are those who already despise the result; there are those who profess to see America defeated, pillaged, and held captive, perchance for centuries to come; by the Philistines, the Barbarians, and the Populace. And there are also those who think they see a New America rising swiftly and growing, and who confidently prophesy the ultimate triumph of the spirit of the new age. I do not dispute this, but I am not distant, near the end of the song of enlightenment.

From England there came, only recently, the sound of one such voice of cheerful optimism, when Edward Carpenter wrote to me, on the occasion of the publication of a series of articles by me entitled "New America": "I rejoice to think with you that a New Age is really coming to birth... America will certainly have a large chief part, in the new synthesis..." And his voice, and my voice, are not lonely voices; there are many to be heard—and there are also many that are to be heard because they belong to the organ of expression, such an organ as The New Age provides for the voices of England.

I mention my series of articles on New America not merely to drag in an advertisement for myself (of course, an advertisement is important very important. Ask Mr. Shaw whether it be not important); but also to point an instance. The series was barely under way before my publisher stopped it, and forthwith changed his editorial policy, which had betrayed symptoms of inclining to the same conservative, political interests in ideas, to which his publisher was dismayed by my "damned mysticism" (to use a phrase once hurled at Chesterton's head, as he Or did he? or did he?): instead of this psalm of enthusiastic voicing of the high ideals of the new America to be merely "hifalutin"? Maybe he did; but if so, these were but subsidiary reasons for his action, which, in my opinion, he then had no reason; and if, in the long run, he should have, the organ had already, and rendered furiously vexed by the fact that I treated my subject as an artist. Probably, however, he is not at all aware of the real reason for his action; I rejoice in having this opportunity to enlighten him. He wanted facts in his magazine. His notion of a fact is, let us say, an evidence of the statement of the truth which explains why there are many to be heard—and there are also many that are not, and which cannot be, heard because they lack an instrument of expression.

Oshkosh numbered 23. My notion of a fact is, for example, the sound of one such voice of cheerful optimism, when Edward Carpenter wrote to me, on the occasion of the publication of a series of articles by me entitled "New America": "I rejoice to think with you that a New Age is really coming to birth... America will certainly have a large chief part, in the new synthesis..." And his voice, and my voice, are not lonely voices; there are many to be heard—and there are also many that are to be heard because they belong to the organ of expression, such an organ as The New Age provides for the voices of England.

Thus, although the spirit of Art has many devotees in America, our own Shaws and Chestertons, and Wellses, and Belloc's are not expressing it. If a violinist has no violin, how can he make music? An artist cannot profit to the market-place, American prose artists—the American prose artists who know that Art is the only builder of the ephemeral and the ordinary life.
here in America, I want to have my hand in the creation of the new age. "Repeating your quotation of the phrase: "The spirit of the years to come yearning to mix himself in life," I agree that in common with 1, other writers of America who desire to write like artists instead of shouting like campaign orators, are also that spirit. Hence, I offer to write. Your request I will describe the war of destiny in America which is the war of the Fourth Estate everywhere. Necessarily, warn you, I shall be obliged to write a good deal about myself. But, basically, it is my business to take a part in the promotion and recognition of Art in America by creating my own Art shapes, as well as by chronicling the progress of the campaign.

MICHAEL WILLIAMS.

* * *

SOCIALISM AND THE NAVY.

To the Editor of "The New Age."

I hope you will allow me space for a very brief reply to your comments on my letter.

In England, we trust for our government to the spare time of certain wealthy gentlemen, who consent to rule the country, and are allowed to recompense themselves by making as much out of it as they can. The hideous failure of this method of government is being pretty thoroughly shown up, and it is the duty of Socialists to assist the process in every way possible. The government of Germany is of a different type. It is a heavy official bureaucracy, and has special evils of its own, from many of which we have just undergone: here I say Germany is in a better peril. I shall dwell on these evils. As an English Socialist, I naturally dwell upon the characteristic English vices.

In regard to your other comments, they appear to me to amount to an attempt to confuse rather than to sharpen my position. Your reference to the great humiliation which we have just undergone, and to the tameness with which we have submitted to it, proves either (1) that the government class is even more cowardly and imbecile than I had suggested, or (2) that the Ministers know that our Navy is even now unequal to a contest with Germany and Austria.

CECIL CHESTERTON.

My statement as to Cecil Rhodes, as a matter of hard fact, is quite correct. Mr. Chesterton's original contention involved the superiority of the German governing class over the English governing class, and he admits that if he were a German Socialist he would put the case the other way; which proves our contention, that there is not a pin for a Socialist to choose between them. The "tameness" of the Government in the matter of the recent humiliation, may prove a third thing, namely, that the Government knows that the "humiliation" was all nonsense. We are surprised Mr. Chesterton believes that the English Navy is at this moment inferior to Germany's and Austria's combined. Not even Mr. Mann has said this.

* * *

PANIC v. PANIC.

To the Editor of "The New Age."

I will not rebuke Mr. Sharp for the form and matter of his letter on my methods of controversy; I will merely correct him.

The last three wars—the Hispano-American war, the Boer war, and the Russo-Japanese war—were largely engineered by financier-Imperialists of the Eckstein, Hearst, Rockefeller, Rhodes, and Rosebery type of men, who machinations were "secret" in the sense that the peoples of this method of government is being pretty thoroughly shown up, and it is the duty of Socialists to assist the process in every way possible. The government of Germany is of a different type. It is a heavy official bureaucracy, and has special evils of its own, from many of which we have just undergone: here I say Germany is in a better peril. I shall dwell on these evils. As an English Socialist, I naturally dwell upon the characteristic English vices.

In regard to your other comments, they appear to me to amount to an attempt to confuse rather than to sharpen my position. Your reference to the great humiliation which we have just undergone, and to the tameness with which we have submitted to it, proves either (1) that the government class is even more cowardly and imbecile than I had suggested, or (2) that the Ministers know that our Navy is even now unequal to a contest with Germany and Austria.

CECIL CHESTERTON.

My statement as to Cecil Rhodes, as a matter of hard fact, is quite correct. Mr. Chesterton's original contention involved the superiority of the German governing class over the English governing class, and he admits that if he were a German Socialist he would put the case the other way; which proves our contention, that there is not a pin for a Socialist to choose between them. The "tameness" of the Government in the matter of the recent humiliation, may prove a third thing, namely, that the Government knows that the "humiliation" was all nonsense. We are surprised Mr. Chesterton believes that the English Navy is at this moment inferior to Germany's and Austria's combined. Not even Mr. Mann has said this.

* * *

THE BROTHERTOWN CHURCH.

To the Editor of "The New Age."

I am requested by the members of this church to send you the following resolution, passed unanimously at our meeting on Sunday, in the hope you may find space for it in your paper:

"In view of the present war panic, this Brotherhood Church is strongly convinced the time has come when Christian brothers should refuse to become soldiers; and the Christian Church should throw its whole strength against the awful iniquity of war, and urge the nations to settle all questions in dispute by arbitration."

THOMAS BARNETT (Sec.),
(Continued from the New Age April Ill.)
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