"SUCCESS."
NOTES OF THE WEEK.

We see no reason to alter our opinion, expressed last week, that if the Government consent to a dissolution at the instance of the House of Lords, they will have betrayed the cause on the threshold of their flight for it.

The debate on the Budget in the Lords has not concluded as we write these notes, and there are plenty of signs that it will never be concluded in reality. Thursday evening of this week has been fixed as the fateful moment; but, as we have pointed out, nothing ever happens in England. The speech by Lord Rosebery made, it is understood, more or less with the personal authority of the King, may be said to have emptied the situation of a good deal of its inflation. The subsequent extension of the debate over the week-end, the suspiciously opportune absence of Lord Curzon, and the manifest effect on the Lords of the speeches by Lords Snowden and Balfour have still further reduced the threatened crisis to the normal dimensions of a party squabble. Only a consummately foolish Cabinet or a Cabinet intent on its own and its party's destruction would now fear to swallow it at the next attempt, and no more will be expected of them. For whose doubts and beliefs are entitled to respect. They will have done their duty once, and that is all that was wanted by the Liberal Party for a grand political phenomenon—a crisis between the Lords and Commons is as normal a war scare. Only in 1689, 1832, and of him, gentlemen are we contending at this moment is that the Elections of 1861 and 1909.

On the other hand, the Cabinet contains not only peers who naturally defend their House, but members who are even more jealous of the privileges and functions of the Lords than the Lords themselves. Neither Mr. Winston Churchill nor Mr. Lloyd George is a Single Chamber man in the sense in which Mr. Asquith once was and Socialists still are. And if these Ministers who profess to be so advanced are opposed to the abolition of hereditary Lords, what are we to expect of the Haldanes and the Gladstomes, the McKennas and the Birrells? Of course at times some threatening declarations require to be made, as when in chess, for example, an attack on the king is engineered to defend a weakness elsewhere; but we have not been kept in the dark about the present Government, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, in his last important utterance on the subject, declared at Leeds that all that was wanted by the Liberal Party for a grand single step in our direction.

If proof is needed, we need not turn to the speeches being delivered at this moment by Liberal Cabinet Ministers. At a time of crisis, more things are said than meant, and more are meant than said. But we can turn to the measured and sober expressions of opinion regarding the House of Lords by the Ministers who are actually in charge of Liberal conduct to-day. There are, for example, two, and only two, of the Ministers of the present Cabinet who have ever publicly or privately declared themselves in favour of the complete abolition of the House of Lords; in other words, who have at any time, strangely enough, have either repented or recanted. In 1894 Mr. Asquith at Birmingham denounced Mr. Morley's proposal to mend the House of Lords as 'sacred Toryism'; but six months later he was urging that the country was wedded to a bicameral Constitution. Mr. Burns is thus the only representative in the Cabinet of the Single Chamber view; and of him, in view of the present rumours, the less said the better.

It is within the memory of quite a thousand or so of our readers that this so-called crisis with the Lords has been heard of before. One would otherwise think that not since 1689, 1832, or 1861 has anything of the kind been under discussion in England. Really, however, a crisis between the Lords and Commons is as normal a political phenomenon as a war scare. Only in 1689, on the eve of the present Government, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, in his last important utterance on the subject, declared at Leeds that all that was wanted by the Liberal Party for a gran1 attack on the Lords was a strong Liberal House of Commons. "Well," he said, "what have we to do? I will tell you the first thing you have to do—strengthen the People's House, and then you can try conclusions with the Lords." The House of Commons is strong enough in Liberals at this moment, and has been for four years, to try conclusions with the Lords if only it wants to. Never again, probably, will the Liberals be as strong as they are now. Yet what do we find?
With the single exception of the New Age, which is not a Liberal paper, every paper in the country, both Liberal and Tory, is shouting for another election for the purpose of settling a question that might and should have been settled three or four years ago. As we said last week, we understand that a Liberal election, that is to say, an election, but that Liberal politicians should desire the same thing passes our divination to explain. To us it seems that the Liberals are seeking an excuse to run away.

It may, we admit, be tactics of an order beyond our comprehension, but, after all, we are bold enough to say that what we cannot understand as tactics will not be understood as tactics by the general electorate. To them, too, in our opinion, the tacit admission by the Government of the Lords' force is a discreditable affair, for to a discreditable solution would amount to running away at the first blast of battle; and nothing afterwards could undo the first impression. There will be no spirit in the fighting ranks that have seen their leaders decline to accept the challenge on the instant it was made. Until at any rate the resources of the Government have been manifestly strained to the uttermost in the struggle with the Lords there should be no calling in of the people.

There are two points of some importance which we would add to our comments on the situation. A General Election can yield only a general result. Absolutely nothing can emerge from a campaign in which millions of people, scores of organisations, dozens of questions, and a few personalities have been engaged. Until at any rate the resources of the Government have been manifestly strained to the uttermost in the struggle with the Lords there should be no calling in of the people. The other point concerns the Lords themselves and their scabbards at the Instant it was made. Until at any rate the resources of the Government have been manifestly strained to the uttermost in the struggle with the Lords there should be no calling in of the people.

The other point concerns the Lords themselves, and is treated at some length elsewhere by our contributor, Mr. O. W. Dyce. The Lords have everything to gain by together. The appeal to Caesar when Caesar is the electorate is an appeal to the Tower of Babel. The Feudal System is an appeal to the same thing passes our divination to explain. To us it seems that the Lords are seeking an excuse to run away.

The problem may be looked at from another point of view. We understand that the argument for an electoral canzone between the Liberal and Labour Parties pleads the superimportance of the Commons versus the Lords' issue. Admitted that it is important, and consequently of sufficient value to give pause to wild cat candidates in either of the progressive sections. But it is, after all, merely a demand to instruct Liberals who take their politicians more seriously than their politics, think? Suppose the Lords won on their present challenge; would it be an irretrievable defeat for the Commons? By no means. Give us, the Labour Party might say, the return of the Unionist Party; a majority of Labour members in the House and we will undertake to change the Constitution in a single sitting. For twenty years at least, half of which time there have been extended mandates of the Lords, have been formulated against the Lords, yet nothing has been done. How much more would be done on this occasion should the Lords be returned with the help of the Labour Party? One thing is certain, the Liberals in the present House would have the support of the Labour Party in an immediate struggle with the Lords; but it is just that immediacy that is being shirked.

Again, it appears on the face of it sheer madness for a Labour candidate to jeopardise a Liberal seat in an election on which Labour no less than Liberal interests depend. But we beg our readers to look below the surface. There are some six million wage-earners whose representatives in a House of Commons of 670 members might or only that enough for you ask? On the supposition that the Liberals really want to deal justly with Labour, is one in twenty of a Representative House a fair proportion for the largest and most important section of the population? We must be remembered that there are nearly five hundred seats, excluding the Irish, in which no Labour or Socialist candidate is run. There, we have no doubt whatever, the Socialist votes will go to the Budget and anti-Lords candidate. If there is any talk of bargaining, should not these be taken into account?

Important as the present issue undoubtedly is, we can conceive a succession of such political issues as would keep the country in a state of political agitation and would keep the attention on Liberal election agents. Suppose when this battle is won, the Liberals raise the issue of Adult Suffrage: is not that enough to invite or even demand Labour support upon it? Any Liberal Repeal agitation? And Payment of Members? And Redistribution of Seats? And a score of other rearrangements of political machinery? We see an unending vista of questions down which Labour may be asked to walk: arm in arm with Liberalism; but the prospect of Labour ever walking alone becomes in the same degree remote. The point is whether the immediate issue is of such a nature as to mean life or death not to Liberalism alone, but to Socialism and Labour. And that depends upon how the issue is stated by Mr. Asquith this week.
The possibility of the House of Lords rejecting the Budget is attracting the closest attention of foreign reformers to English home politics, because such an act, if early October, could herald a period of social reaction in Europe. Onlookers abroad are confident that the House of Lords does not care much about the actual taxation. It is pointed out that the taxation of land values is a commonplace of legislation in any country. The license duties are regarded as severe; but the peculiar obligations of the Liberal Party to its Nonconformist supporters are taken as explaining its insistence on these duties. The cry of "revocative force" does not deceive the critics, argued, with some justice, that to reverse the whole fiscal system of England at the dictation of the House of Lords is a far greater revolution than any or all of the Budget proposals. Fear of the Labour Party is put as the motive actuating the Conservative Peers in their wish to regain control of finance. By this means the economic pressure of the Labour-Socialist Party in the House of Commons could be checked. The reactionary organs abroad hold that rejection would be justified. The moderate Conservative, Republican, Nationalist, Liberal, Radical, and Socialist papers are against rejection.

Nowadays the word "revolution" is ceasing to have any distinctive meaning. Lord Palmerston, in his "Civis Romanus Sum" speech, vigorously denounced the character of those revolutionists who call every reform proposal a revolution. It is not that they are revolutionists of another kind; blind-minded, men who are animated by antiquated prejudices and daunted by ignorant apprehensions, dam up the current of human improvement until the irresistible pressure of accumulated discontent breaks down the opposing barriers and overthrows and levels to the earth those very institutions which a timely application of renovating means would have rendered strong and lasting. Such revolutionists as these are the men who call the Liberal Party revolutionists. In the orthodox foreign view the Budget is "a timely application of renovating means," and those who attack it are derided as playing into the hands of Socialism. Some foreign journals think the Budget proposals. Fear of the Labour Party is put as the motive actuating the Conservative Peers in their wish to regain control of finance. By this means the economic pressure of the Labour-Socialist Party in the House of Commons could be checked. The reactionary organs abroad hold that rejection would be justified. The moderate Conservative, Republican, Nationalist, Liberal, Radical, and Socialist papers are against rejection.

In a remote corner of an article in the "New York Times" on the Ferrer affair has some importance. Its writer, after dwelling on the apparently spontaneous character of the Ferrer demonstrations, quotes Liebknecht's comment on the Dreyfus demonstrations—that there was an unseen force in Europe guiding the people on special occasions. In Ferrer's case were not the demonstrations in reality organised by some unknown body of men? It is obvious that the reactionary movement in Europe is centred in St. Petersburg, Berlin, and Vienna. The progressive movement is inspired from Paris and Switzerland. In England and Italy to some extent contribute, but neither Rome nor London is so revolutionary as Paris and Geneva. The political difference between the early part of the 19th century and the present day lies not in the fact that the Liberal Alliance (Austria, Prussia, and Russia) could not then count on the support of England. In 1909 England has been committed very deeply to Russia, while France is financially as well as politically entangled. The power of Jesus has been enhanced by the religious freedom of recent years. This Society has ranged itself against the people always, and that policy is unchanged. On the whole, the reactionary forces have materially strengthened their position. On the other hand, the growth of Democracy and Socialism has almost balanced their gain. The development of Socialist science has been most marked. The destruction of theological dogma has freed the mind, with the consequence that freedom of thought has led to a widening of outlook. There is far less respect for hereditary position, and the worship of money has not been much lessened. Against the Society of Jesus must be put the growing power of the Jews. Now the Grand Orient of France, consisting of Freemasons, with its connections in many countries, is one of these progressive political forces. The Society of Jesus, as a secret society, is faced with the secret organisation of the Grand Orient of France. The former was beaten in the Dreyfus affair, but was victorious in the Ferrer case. The Society of Jesus is now, as it always has been, slowly organising their forces for a struggle. It may be that the spark which will cause a social explosion will be applied in England in a few days. Perhaps something is going to happen in England at last—perhaps!

The meeting of the Chinese Provincial Assemblies has completed a programme drawn up in an English merchant's house in Tokio a year before the Russo-Japanese War. There were present representatives of Turkey, Persia, China, the Indian Nationalists, the Prime Minister of Nepaul, and several Japanese statesmen. The object of these statesmen was to form an Asiatic League for the maintenance of their respective state's independence against Russia, and to consider the possibility of applying democratic forms of government to their countries. In Japan the scheme had been adopted. The Russo-Japanese War postponed it, but carrying out of the programme is now with the exception of Nepaul, which is still ruled by a military oligarchy, representative government has now been established in all these States. China is proceeding by degrees. The Provincial Assemblies are consultative, like the Indian Councils which have just been set up in India. They are to develop in nine years into full constitutional government, with a central Parliament. It is a momentous experiment. The "Times" has expressed great alarm at the possibilities of this constitutional movement. The Provincial Assemblies are taking a strong line on some questions, and have voted adversely against certain taxes. The anti-foreign feeling is very strong, and European concessionaire are likely to be badly in the future. In China there is some depression in Anglo-Indian circles at the cool reception of the reform scheme. Lord Morley had the opportunity to grant an amnesty to the notables who are still incarcerated, but the advice of the Indian Police Commission was issued, in which it was recommended that the prisoners be convicted of having committed "conspiracies to fabricate false evidence in order that certain persons might be convicted of an offence punishable with seven years' imprisonment." In 1903, the report of the Indian Police Commission was issued, in which the Indian police were found "to associate with unpatriotic in their gains to fabricate false charges against their neighbours, to torture suspected persons." As Sir Andrew Fraser said: "What wonder is it that the people are said to dread the police?" Would it be believed that six years have passed without any reform? Not only that, but Lord Morley has placed the liberty of men of the highest character at the mercy of these policemen. The assembling of a Parliament in China may force upon England the granting of a franchise to all Chinese. The populations are equally vast, but that argument will disappear if China has a Parliament sitting at Pekin. The "unchanging East" is changing on the surface; it is too early to say whether this is more than a surface transformation. With active Parliament at Constantinople, at Tientsin and at Pekin, and at Tokio, how long could England maintain an oligarchic supremacy in India?

"STANHOPE OF CHESTER."
A Future for the House of Lords.
By O. W. Dye.

No one seems to know exactly when it was that the Conservative Party disappeared from British politics. Certainly it was several years ago probably about the time when Mr. Chamberlain and other Radicals secured ascendency in the party that had been Conservative previously. Since that date the policy of each of the two big parties has been a policy of sweeping changes, and there is no party interested in the general scheme of things that is not sufficiently dissatisfied with the present state of things. The Unionists are hard working to extinguish that freedom. For more than 200 years the Commons have passed Budgets without amendment or abatement by the Lords; the Unionists propose to revolutionise the method of voting supplies to his Majesty. In other words, after repeatedly demonstrating a love of change, they are prepared to show the British Constitution into the melting-pot. Call them what you choose, but not Conservatives, forsooth!

Taking it, then, for granted that the Conservative Party has been extinct for years, although individual Conservatives still roam about whose names come easily to mind, what reason have we of all people to lament? I for one delight in the constant appearance of the melting-pot. The School Boards were mostly inefficient, especially in the rural districts, and London Vestries were corrupt. Even the topsy-turvy Reform agitation, although a shocking waste of time and an insult to common sense, serves one useful purpose in reminding the democracy that Free Trade is only the status quo of four positions: (a) abolished; (b) weaker than before; (c) exactly as it was; (d) stronger than before.

I if I knew my fellow-countrymen, (a) is a long way off, (b) will cease, (c) is as it was, and (d) is inevitable.

A small majority polled for the Lloyd George Budget will ensure the passing of that Budget; a large majority will entitle the Government to insist upon the "reform" of the Second Chamber. As usual, that "reform" is likely to be a compromise. Mr. Asquith, behind him the popular verdict, alongside him the compact majority, and in his pockets new pleasures do up in bags in hundreds (in case of need), puts forward his "minimum" scheme of the Unionists to alter Bills. His part of the bargain is simple—a one-clause demand, possibly supplemented by a claim that the Crown shall resume the ancient right to initiate wars or stop wars, to create life-peerages. On the other hand, one may speculate to an unlimited extent as to the nature of the concessions to the peers. Obviously, they retain their ornamental dignities, their ceremonial functions, their golden ring. They are out of the Court of Appeal, deputing legal responsibilities to some of their number. A veto may be left them on constitutional questions, as distinguished from ordinary legislative. Rule Number Five will dictate the compulsion of that particular concession. They may take over certain functions of the Privy Council, and perhaps absorb that body. The country might tolerate, on terms, the enlargement of the Second Chamber, so that judges, ambassadors, heads of the armed forces, colonial statesmen and others could sit as life-peers, with technical and administrative duties, even if the Commons' Bills were free from their clutches.

All these surmises seem to imply that the Lords have only to be told to capitulate and that they will obey. Would they consent to the loss of those powers? Is considering that aspect of the question, it is worth while to point out that they manage to exist to-day without some very important powers. They cannot initiate wars or stop wars, cannot make treaties or abrogate them. They do not appoint Ministries, and their votes of censure on Ministries are no more directly effective than the curses pronounced on the Rhine stuck. As they live comfortably without such powers, they could put up with still further the day of coercion comes. From another point of view, they stand to gain, for the hand that disconnects them from legislative work is likely to offer them the right of election to the Lower House. Of the 20 or more places now amusing themselves during the periodical crises, at least two hundred might hope, with their exceptional opportunities of "nursing" electors, to capture seats in the Commons.

To retain their existence peers will fight to the bitter end, but they will accept the (b) compromise when the (a) solution looms over them. It is the custom of Radicals to describe them as audacious flouters of the people's will, but, as a matter of fact, their courage has generally been the courage of a chairman giving a casting vote when two disputants were of equal size and strength. Lord Lansdowne said that the Trades Disputes Bill would bring ruin to trade, bodily suffering to individuals and mental anguish, with loss, danger, and inconvenience, to the community at large, and Lord Halsbury stigmatised it as gross, outrageous, and tyrannical, but they passed it, well aware that 19 workmen out of every 20 were marshalled behind it. The resistance to the Budget is the first example for a quarter of a century of any discernible resistance of Lords from an attitude of natural timidity which they will resume after the elections. "It never has been the course of this House," said Lord Derby sixty years ago, "to resist a continued and deliberately expressed public opinion. You have bowed, and always will bow, to the expression of such an opinion."

Let it be assumed that they show fight! Contemplating some such emergency, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman observed that the resources of civilization were not exhausted, and Mr. Asquith is believed to have no fewer than six policies up his sleeve. It is the custom of Radicals to describe them as audacious flouters of the people's will, but, as a matter of fact, their courage has generally been the courage of a chairman giving a casting vote when two disputants were of equal size and strength. Lord Lansdowne said that the Trades Disputes Bill would bring ruin to trade, bodily suffering to individuals and mental anguish, with loss, danger, and inconvenience, to the community at large, and Lord Halsbury stigmatised it as gross, outrageous, and tyrannical, but they passed it, well aware that 19 workmen out of every 20 were marshalled behind it. The resistance to the Budget is the first example for a quarter of a century of any discernible resistance of Lords from an attitude of natural timidity which they will resume after the elections. "It never has been the course of this House," said Lord Derby sixty years ago, "to resist a continued and deliberately expressed public opinion. You have bowed, and always will bow, to the expression of such an opinion."

Let it be assumed that they show fight! Contemplating some such emergency, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman observed that the resources of civilization were not exhausted, and Mr. Asquith is believed to have no fewer than six policies up his sleeve, one or two of which surely apply to an after-election deadlock. The policy of creating innumerable peers would delight the public for a week. They might pass a bill in 2 days, and a beginning could be made with John Burns, Thomas Burt, and Charles Fenwick. If the Upper House complained that the new peers were being drawn from the classes now possessed of seats in the Commons, they would humour them by sending Messrs. Carnegie, Cadbury and Lever to the Second Chamber. The Irish Party and the Labour Party would willingly join in the fun, and the next batches might be composed of Messrs. Redmond, Dillon, Swift MacNeill, Barnes, Clynes and Jowett. Just about the sixth week, when the Sinn Fein contingent would be coming up, the Lords would surrender, and the world would at last learn that the presumptuous claim of an oligarchy to govern the King, the Commons, and the Empire was to be dished once and for all.
In Camera.

No Freeman shall be seized or imprisoned or dispossessed or outlawed, or in any way brought under legal judgment of his peers. — Magna Charta.

A few weeks ago the English Press was rioting in the sensationalism of the Steinheil murder trial. The President of the Old Bailey Court of Justice was trying to brow-beat the prisoner; the President was actually behaving as prosecuting counsel: but it was scandalous! And sententious little sermons were preached from the pulpit, and winded paragraphs of the British dailies. The French law regards any prisoner as guilty until he has proved himself innocent! Monstrous! Take a glance across the water, Messieurs les Parisiens, and see how we do things in this little island.

The British lion posed to the Continental camera. Aggressive virtue, impeccable justice irradiated the surrounding atmosphere. Thrills of self-righteousness and spine-chills! A frown of disapproval on his brow, he patted his mane and flung out his chest, pricking up his ears for the strains of "Rule Britannia."

But the British lionness—a creature of trying existence! The judge said her (her state) was just begun to be aware—didn't join the chorus. Her sentiments were different. Her intellectual "Tu quoque," her plebeian "You're another!" struck discords in the harmony. And the cubs—well, the cubs, "Pharisee and "Vulgar Virtue," being hypocrites were the mildest epithets in their vocabulary.

"We will not go against any man save by legal judgment of his peers." So our ancestors at Runnymede. Here is the corner stone of the English code of justice—the foundation of trial by jury. "Men of trial shall be remembered, translates " homo, not " vir, in these old charters—human being, man and woman. No need in those days of Lord Brougham's Bill to provide for it. No need to tell the words male person be used. They shall be held to include the female."

A man is to be tried by his peers, by those in the same circumstances as himself, and whose interests being much the same may be supposed best to understand the peculiar sentiments and motives of the prisoner.

On Thursday last Mrs Alice Chapin and Miss Alison Neilans, members of the Women's Freedom League, underwent trial at the Old Bailey on the charge of unlawfully interfering with certain ballot boxes at the recent Local Government Board election. In both cases a verdict of "guilty" was returned. Mrs. Chapin and Miss Neilans also found guilty of common assault on account of a slight accident to the eye of the presiding officer, the further charge of maliciously wound being dismissed. Both were sentenced to imprisonment for the second division, Mrs. Chapin for four months, Miss Neilans for three.

They were charged with an offence of which no man could have been guilty, because no man could ever have found himself in the same circumstances. They were tried by man-made law; they were found guilty by a jury of men; they were sentenced by a man (Mr. Justice Grantham, the judge who figured in the Yarmouth Election Petition case) in 1900, and in the more famous Penruddock case. No woman barrister being allowed to plead in court, Miss Neilans defended herself; but whenever she tried to show the jury the motives from which she had acted she was pulled up short by the judge.

And women were excluded from the court.

By the order of his Lordship, no woman was to be allowed to enter. The daughter of one prisoner and the mother of the other were excluded. All friends of the accused were shut out. But yet, sitting in the seats of the mighty, were about a dozen women—friends of the judges, we must conclude—impelled thither by vulgar curiosity. After innumerable interviews between the prisoners' solicitors and the Deputy Sheriff, ten members of the League were allowed to be present, having been wrong from them that they would do nothing in court. Needless to say, the pledges given were scrupulously respected, but in the afternoon orders were again issued by the judge that no woman should be allowed in the court—Mrs. Despard was excluded, and only after a long delay were Mrs. Neilans and Miss Chapin admitted.

An attempt was made to muzzle the woman's Press, Mrs. Holmes, the editor of "The Woman's Diary," was called in. No need in those days of Lord Brougham's Bill to provide for it, or to ask for the prosecution to be noted. An attempt was made to muzzle the woman's Press.

But the British lion takes no notice; not because he is proud of injustice—he has a certain proper pride; but because the attitude of the Press, to his own satisfaction at any rate, has gone to sleep again. He sleeps and dreams imperially of happy Kaffir households, and plans for the extension of his sway. Matters domestic cannot disturb him; these he settled once and for all—centuries ago.

Is it quite impossible to make him understand that his tail is being continually jumped upon, and that the lashing of that attenuated member must shortly inspire laughter, not respect?—Muriel Nelson.

M. Aristide Briand and the Revolutionary Societies.

By Margaret Houghton.

Two men, once comrades in the political arena but now of widely diverging opinions and aims, have lately attracted to themselves a considerable share of the attention of the Parisian public. Of the two, the most eminent is M. Aristide Briand, first chief of any European Government who has come into power as a Socialist. The lesser light is M. Gustave Hervé, member of the United Socialists and editor of the weekly journal "La Nouvelle République." In 1909 M. Briand defended M. Hervé in the celebrated case of "Ploujou de l'Yonne." He also assisted him when the revolutionary opinions of Hervé caused his revocation by the Superior Council of the University. In both instances he played the part of a generous and disinterested friend. On the other hand, when Briand had become Minister of Justice he caused his former friend and colleague to be disqualified at the bar on account of the very unorthodoxy of which he himself had once so warmly espoused. Later on, as collaborator of M. Clémenceau, he confined Hervé for a year in the prison of "La Santé."

Both men may be said to be popular, but popularity in Paris is a thing in itself subject to the most unstable of myths and to topple over with a suddenness which
is in direct ratio to the height it has attained: such, for instance, as that of Boulanger, which was less dependent upon the coup d'état than upon the alluring vision which his name suggested of a feathered hat upon a black horse. It is not always so easy to ticket the germ that is to issue, in the future course of the argumentation of the public headdress. For it is certain that from the day, seven years ago, when M. Briand made his début as a Socialist Deputy his name, by an indefinable current of unanimous consent, has moved more strongly to the generally indifferent mass of the people. The public has fixed its eye upon him. It is known that he has come from very far social horizons and has come very fast. He has risen up from his corner in the provinces, he is a native of Normandy. For the stages of small lawyer and unknown journalist, he braved the barriers of poverty and obscurity, and in seven years has he become Minister of Public Instruction, author of the greatest law of his day—that of the separation of the Church and the State—Minister of Justice, Chief of the Government.

Shortly after he had taken the reins from the hands of M. Clémenceau, M. Briand was asked if he had not found three Socialists in the Cabinet a rather large proportion.

"Three!" he answered. "There are only two, Mlle. and M. Vivian."

"And you, M. Briand?"

"I, sir, belonging to no party."

"To belong to no party may bear a certain resemblance to being possessed of no convictions, though such conclusion is not inevitable."

In his first presidential speech M. Briand pronounced a sentence which caused the entire bourgeoisie to draw a breath of relief, and for once nobody found an excuse for jumping up to cry "We are betrayed!" or even "Où allons nous?" He said, "No useful reform can be made except in a prosperous country." That, if not original, was at least extraordinarily comprehensible to the spectators.

The constantly recurring note in his first speeches has been one of pacification and relaxation. In his remarkably non-committal oratory at Périgueux on the tenth of last month the whole draft was towards a loosened rein for all citizens, liberty of opinion without distinctions of party, a republic so beautiful that one and all would wish to inhabit it, the emanicipation of all consciences.

It was unfortunate that it should have occurred to M. Hervé, while the President of the Council was thus overflowing with generous sentiments, to remind him of his antecedent opinions. In the further course of his speech M. Briand thus expressed himself:

"When I think that it has actually been suggested that this country, if attacked, would be deserted by certain of its children, I ask myself if it is possible to believe that such a problem should be posed, that such anxieties should be justified! If it is possible that were France attacked she would be deserted by certain of her citizens, the entire nation would not rise in its defence . . . . and that it should be for philosophic and humanitarian considerations that the cause of France should be deserted, that she should be allowed to be oppressed or destroyed? Is there any sense in such theories? Is it even worthy of a Government chief to discuss them?"

At that very moment the staff of the "Guerre Sociale" was distributing throughout the country a reprint of "Le Pioupiou de l'Yonne," a pamphlet which had appeared as a supplement to "The Socialist Worker of the Yonne," a provincial journal edited by Hervé in 1902-3. In it the anti-militarists expressed their righteous wrath they came once more into the manifestations of the 13th ult. But Mervé and Hervé had become known friends of Ferrer during the 22 years which he spent in France. In the expression of their righteous wrath they came once more into collision with the Government. The sympathetic personality of M. Hervé is a pointer of no negligible quantity amongst the proletariat. As soon as the assassination of Ferrer became known he forewarned the Government that he and his friends intended to express their indignation in the streets, and, if possible, before the Spanish Embassy, that night; but the question was, as it always is in Paris, What will be the attitude of the police.

"We warn them," said Hervé, "that we are not going to allow ourselves to be beaten by the Cossacks of the Republic." This language will not surprise anyone who has watched, and even suffered from, the manners of the French or rather Corsican, as they almost invariably are natives of Corsica, police.

Since the police on several occasions bore witness of the brutal ferocity of these men, I have understood that it is not the crowd who make the trouble in those sudden upheavals for which Paris is renowned, so much as the men who have been sent to take care of the crowd. Such was certainly the case on the occasion of the manifestations of the 13th ult. But Hervé and his devoted followers kept their word. To the absolutely uncalled-for charges of the mounted guards of the Embassy they replied by putting out the gas, obstructing the horses by overturning the kiosks and turning the water-pipes upon their adversaries. Had M. Briand begun his policy of pacification by a recommendation to his Chief of Police to hold his subordinates a little better in check, not only the revolutionary element, but the more sensible of the bourgeois, would have been highly appreciative of such a measure.

The enormous pacific manifestation of the following Sunday was imposed by the revolutionary Socialists, not authorized by the Government, which was indeed notably an occasion to "corner" the "flies," as the police are called. It was a successful demonstration to all Paris that, should the peace-keepers not wilfully create trouble, the men of disobedience, in order, and the conquest of the right to the street in which it attained was a victory for which the proletariat has more and more bitterly struggled ever since the Empire.

By W. Shaw Sparrow.

III.

The Tyranny of Speed and of Shams.

People very often forget the result of book education on children, who very often learn from it to hate any kind of reading not connected with sensational news and fiction. The great day in a young life is that in which he or she is going to leave school. These facts, had they been remembered forty years ago, would have suggested the use of craftsmanship as a part of the new school training, for there is a wonderful pleasure in seeing a thing grow day by day under the skill of your own hand. Artists and craftsmen are not braver than other folk, yet they suffer more willingly in defence of their ideals, just because of the honourable pride that belongs to thoroughness of aim and effort in production. In comparison with that joy, facts acquired from books are stale, flat, and unreal. Yet the apostles of book education have been quite willing that the hardships should be added from State schools. And are they ever much disturbed when they see issuing from the Press the new types of trashy, snippet literature for young readers? Our extraordinary zeal for education in all its forms—elementary, secondary, and higher—has borne in its train evils of its own, and among them is a dwindling conscience in the practice of handicraft. Few workmen earn their bread with the pleasure that the act and art of doing themselves. Is there no prospect of a great future when a country goes away from its conscience in breadwinning toil. On the other hand, you have never heard that any Empire, any State, did not at least flourish a middling degree as long as its own liking and care for its handicraft lasted.

I contend, then, that the true aim of education is the reverse of what it has been during the last forty years. It has not taught the public either to turn away with disgust from snippets and trash in reading, or to hate shams and a degrading cheapness in the equipments of home life. What signs of popular advance are there now other than those which, like motor cars and aviation, add to the fever and flurry of human effort? Science rules, God, and we are expected to worship it uncritically. Record-breaking is a cult among all classes, as if it were a token of social advance. Will flying machines carry us away from the unemployment which afflicts all towns—a Jaquerie in embryo? What the world now needs is a law to impose upon it an epoch of quieter invention, accompanied by a healing policy of unfettered effort and ripe ideas. No country is so great an athlete that it can bear without harm a hundred years of racing in the domain of speed. Truth is quiet, and to arrive at truth we need peaceful days for transforming thought.

One class alone has improved during our time of hurry and of shams, and the members of that class are Socialists, as a rule. While the many have mistaken speed for progress, Socialism has become a student of the warring forces of society, in the hope that the capital of work may be saved from the predatory habits of the capital of wealth. It is sometimes forgotten that there are two forms of Socialism, the political and the artistic. They fight for the same thing, but in different ways. Both see in the man of a day eternal humanity; and both wish to give that man the richest opportunities to improve his present risks amid the grim hazards of industrial warfare. As a socialist of the Kropotkin school, I want to point to three things as cratic necessities: first, discipline over landlords, so that tenants may get fair rents not crippling to their incomes; next, improved parentage and housing, for indeed it is a fright to hear right everywhere; and third, beauty and honour in all craftsmanship for homes, since without them human life is no better than the life of quadrupeds, a thing of animal appetites.

In fact, man is distinguished from the birds and beasts by his gifts for progressive invention. He owes his all in history to the fact that, having neither the wings of birds nor the self-protective power of wild animals, he has had to create his own safety and his own triumph. His mind grew because it was obliged to grow. His needs produced the arts and crafts, and every change in his condition has influenced his home, for good or ill. He alone is free to retrograde in the environment of his farmyard, for the Spring makes animals and birds change not from century to century, but keeps in its nurseries the same architecture and the same guardianship over its young. For example, the beaver's lodge and dam have not altered since they gave hints in architecture to the earliest lake-dwellers. It is only man who has not a settled and fixed pride of thoroughness. To quicken that pride in improving work is the most urgent question of to-day.

Look in the shop windows of any town, and you will see how low we have fallen under the dual tyranny of speed and deceitful cheapness. Shams rule everywhere in the equipment of the people's homes, while fair prices are given for all sports and all amusements. Throughout the households who bear the burden of work and the shoddies. Those who buy well-made sporting implements at a just price are glad to get ill-made furniture on the guarantee of lying advertisements. Debase the home—and amuse yourself outside? That folly is as common to-day as gambling. Architecture, too, is very important—it is complicated by the fact that Labour is debauched by dishonest methods and traditions. Thoroughness alone is the capital of Labour, and Labour cannot afford to get rid of its real strength and value. All the organisation in the world will not help it if its honour is a thing of haste and shoddiness.

And that point is one to be considered in company with another, namely, that while the organisations of Labour are local and national, those of Capital may serve to provide a big battalions so as to crush out of existence the small employers who wish to be loyal to sound methods of work? The socialism of art answers this question by giving four suggestions:

(1.) That Labour must become a capitalist, transforming trade unions into Unions of Productive and Thriving Industry:
(2.) That each town should have a Municipal Show-room for the display of the most reputable household things:
(3.) That the public should never buy from trade catalogues and advertisements without a written guarantee as to the quality of the goods; and should remember that big retail shops demand from manufacturers a huge discount, the minimum being 25 per cent., enough to ruin good craftsmanship;
(4.) That a Home Defence Society should be set on foot for the purpose of uniting householders in all parts of the country.

There will be retrogression, not progress, while the Trust system of finance in trade is allowed to get a firmer grip on the nation's industries. It is well known that limited liabilities have no morals; they hunt for profits as wolves do for food, with a murderous tenacity that goes hand in hand with cowardice, for they are soon frightened by opposition and loss. They are thus as dependent on the people's suffrage as Members of Parliament. Would that the public would use with vigour its scouring Whip-handles.

WALTER SHAW SPARROW.
A Continental Trip.

V.—Fighting for a Wash.

By Bart Kennedy.

How inviting looked the sea on that particular morning! As I looked at it I filled with a desire to cleave the salty wave. I can't say, however, that I was ambitious to swim the channel. Indeed, had I the ambition, it would have been impossible even to attempt it, for the Ostend authorities are as careful of their bathers as a hen of her chickens.

If a venturesome swimmer even ventured up to his neck, horns were blown and the men on watch in the boats turned a pale sea-sick green with anxiety. If a swimmer were to go out for a quarter of a mile, I don't know what would have happened. Most likely a gunboat would be sent after him. You would have to be a suicide of a very determined calibre indeed to be able to effect your own happy despatch at Ostend.

In that delightful place they don't believe in letting people drown. As I said, my desire was to cleave the beautiful, sunlit, salty wave. But how? How was I to manage it?

There was the sea—here were the sands—and here was myself.

And, I must add, here were hundreds upon hundreds of people all filled with the same desire as myself. Hundreds upon hundreds of people were all anxious to cleave the beautiful, sunlit, salty wave. And there were hundreds of machines—for a franc, for two francs, for three francs, and for ten and twenty francs. But all these machines were engaged. And people were crowding up every moment. All were anxious to do their dip in the briny. All anxious to do their dip between eleven and twelve. And that was the difficulty. The whole of Ostend wanted to bathe from the fashionable part of the beach at the fashionable hour. Between eleven and twelve there were financiers and trades-people, and lords and counts, and—I would take my oath—dukes and confidence men, and bookmakers and respectable men, and all other kinds of men—and financiers, and duchesses, and actresses, and all other kinds of esses, all waiting and ready and eager for their dip. I'm sure that dear old Father Neptune must have felt highly complimented.

All of them carried towels and bathing dresses, and all of them spoke excitedly in their own particular language. The hundreds of machines were unable to accommodate them. And if there had been as many again, or even twice as many again, there would still have been a struggle to accomodate them.

For everyone wanted to bathe at once. I looked out at the people bobbing up and down in the sunlit sea. It was a very hot day, and men and women of counts, of course, and financiers and their ladies, and dukes and actresses, and all the rest of the whole Ostend human show. It was a great fight, but I must bear witness to the fact that it was democratic. It was a free fight and no favour. The Ostenders were wise in their season, if I may be allowed to so put it. They gave their visitors the beach and the machines and the sea and let them fight it out for themselves.

Money!—Money would do you no good. You had simply to fight for your machine. There were officials of course—controleurs. But they were diplomats of the highest orders. They listened politely to the and other things of dignity. But if you interfered. They were just polite listeners who were there to see that the would-be bathers did not assassinate one another in their eagerness to get a wash.

Here was a fight going on. I stopped to gather it in. I was so interested in the vivid liveliness of the scene that I had forgotten all about my own desire to cleave the salty wave.

A German Jew and a French Jew were arguing loudly. And there was a fellow that you might call the shadow of blood quivered in the air. It seemed as if in the parley of the ring—there would be a mix-up.

"Go on!" I shouted to the French Jew. "Punch him!"

But it didn't come off.

They gesticulated vigorously in the good old-clothes fashion, and once I thought that there must positively be a little real fun, for the French Jew actually—by accident, of course—touched the face of the German Jew with his fingers as he worked the old-clothes gesture.

But it didn't come off.

The row had come about in this way:—The German had waded into the water and waited like a shark waiting for his dinner to come along—till a driver hooked his tackle on to a machine to drag it inshore. Now was his time! And he rushed and planted his towels and bathing dress on the steps of the machine.

And on went the machine, Germany sticking to the fatter end. Triumph was with him. He could now have his wash. But alas! France basely rushed up and planted his towels and his bathing dress on the front of the machine.

So, said Germany. And then the fat was in the fire—or rather the words were in the air. France asserted that he was there before Germany, and Germany vowed that he was there before France. The Controleur was called up to settle the dispute. This Solomon listened to them and then he delivered his judgment, which proved him to be the wisest of the wise. He said that beyond all doubt or quibble or question the person who was the first had the right to the machine. And then Solomon went on quibbling. And the row went on accompanied by a drooping chorus of comments from the delighted crowd around. Suddenly the slave at the side of the bathing machine came up and a German peasant put his head out and made a remark, the drift of which I could not get. But it obviously bore some humorous relation to the scene—for nearly everyone around laughed. And the row boiled merrily on. By this time the wives of Germany and France were well into it. Each of them appealed to the crowd in turn. And then they cried out again for the Controleur. But he was on some other part of the beach settling some other dispute in his sage Solomonic fashion. (Let it be understood that these rows were going on in six or seven places at once.) The row continued between France and Germany, and finally France won, for the wife of France turned out to be a warrior indeed. She out-shouted them all. And Germany even off to seek another machine. In ten minutes afterwards I saw him disputing with someone else.

Finally, the people who had been in the machine came out and France went in with a conquering air. To be driven out of his dip is the salvation of a Frenchman.

And this was the way of it. You had to roll up your trousers and wade out and catch a machine just as it was coming in. It was the only way. And when it got in, you had to fight for it.

It was great sport! (To be concluded.)
"Christ."

An Interpretation.

By Allen Upward.

A POPULAR melodramatist and novelist of the last age, having managed, on one occasion only, to be misunderstood by his Victorian public, turned on it with the declaration that he was not a foolometer. From Charles Reade such a protest was not only ungracious but untrue. Though far from a fool, he was an excellent foolometer, and seldom wrote a line which did not go straight to the British heart.

But there are others of us who feel that our mission is to the thoughtful rather than to the thoughtless, and for whom it is a hardship that we should have no means of marking on the outside of our books, without offence to the thoughtless, that we are not addressing them, and therefore that it is a liberty on their part to read us, and an impertinence to complain that they do not understand us.

In former ages the learned were able to exchange their views in Latin, without fear of being overheard by the untaught. To-day, Latin is dead, except among the class that is least disposed to listen to anything worth saying; and we have nothing to replace it. It is true that many men of science express themselves in a kind of jargon of their own, but they are believed to use this Babu to hide their ignorance rather than their knowledge.

I have often thought that I should find myself driven, in the end, to fall back on the French language, to escape that censorship of stupidity which, though it may not be official, is not less crushing and disastrous. But after so many years, and so much toil, spent in learning how to write truly in English, I shall find it hard to begin over again with another tongue.

In the meantime, there seems to be no way of reaching the thoughtful public without running the gauntlet of the thoughtless. In The New Word I expressed a hope that I might one day be allowed to explain to the apologists of Christianity the meaning of the word Christ. In Lord Alistair's Rebellion I have partly fulfilled that promise; and because I have made the explanation easier by a story the book has been read and reviewed by the good people whose plain to the apologists of Christianity the meaning of the thoughtless. In the meantime, there seems to be no way of reaching the thoughtful public without running the gauntlet of the thoughtless. In The New Word I expressed a hope that I might one day be allowed to explain to the apologists of Christianity the meaning of the word Christ. In Lord Alistair's Rebellion I have partly fulfilled that promise; and because I have made the explanation easier by a story the book has been read and reviewed by the good people whose proper business it is to tell ladies with too much time on their hands what volumes to order from Mr. Mudie. The result has been a sadly lack of thoughtfulness, and for whom it is a hardship that we should have no means of marking on the outside of our books, without offence to the thoughtless, that we are not addressing them, and therefore that it is a liberty on their part to read us, and an impertinence to complain that they do not understand us.

Lord Alistair's Rebellion is, on the surface, the story of a "decadent," told with sympathy, though with impartiality. Lord Alistair is not an extreme or eccentric type. He is drawn from life, and has the merits and faults of his original. But he is touched with a yearning to understand his fate and as he gradually comes to do so the book becomes an apology for the decadent, and a consolation offered to him. Such is the book which one of its reviewers has pronounced, with the air of a discoverer, that it "does not precisely attack" the decadents.

That is the expression of a mesmerised mind. The reviewer reminds one of the boy who was found stoning a toad, and saying to it, "I'll learn ye to be a toad." If any one had tried to stop that boy by pointing out to him that toads did not create themselves and cannot change themselves into boys, or even frogs, however much they may wish, and try, to do so, the boy would have been bewildered; not because there was anything hard or obscure in the observation, but because it would have seemed to him strange and irrelevant.

Just such has been the bewilderment of my reviewers. They know that decadents ought to be stoned, and that every right-minded person wants to stone them. They have generously given me credit for good intentions, but have detected a certain weakness in the performance. From their point of view they have let the book off lightly. Considered as an attack on the decadents, Lord Alistair's Rebellion is undoubtedly a failure.

And, now, what is this thought that has baffled the commoners of the literary anarcho-sympathisers? It is a very obvious reflection, so much so that when it first occurred to me I felt sure it must have occurred already to many other minds; so obvious that the first friend to whom I repeated it urged me to print it at once lest I should myself be anticipated. Alas! truth is not so often anticipated. I have taken ten years to utter this, and, moreover, I have no one to stand, or at least tolerate. Christ mind. But it seems to me the answer which stands most clearly revealed by the whole is a true reconciliation of Christianity and science, because it shows them both saying the same thing in different words.

Religion is rudimentary science, saying in emotional and figurative language what science comes to say more distinctly and dispassionately. The prophet feels the truth far in advance of the measurer, and tells it to his generation in such words as they can best understand, or at least tolerate. Christ was neither understood nor tolerated by the scientists, who should now pretend to understand Christ; and to tolerate him. Why, then, should a clear and scientific restatement of Christ's teaching carry confusion to every Christian mind?

It is remarkable that Christians have always admitted in theory, and to some extent in practice, that Christ was right in his attitude towards the sin of the infirm in mind, body, and estate. The poor, the idiot, and the incurable have ever been recognised as lawful objects of Christian charity. Alone among the weaklings of the world, the infirm in character, the morally unfit, have been excepted from the rule, to be preached at and persecuted in every age of Christianity.

No such distinction, of course, is drawn by the
Christ of the Gospels. Or, rather, to be accurate, it is the other way about. Christ sometimes shows a certain reluctance to heal the sick. He goes out of his way to forgive the sinner. The man who comes to him to be healed of the palsy is told that his sins are forgiven, without his having asked it. On no occasion in the whole of the four Gospels is Christ ever reported as rebuking a sinner, or ordering him to repent. The Samaritan quarrel is always with the righteous.

We learn from the same Gospels—that is to say, we learn by the admission of the disciples themselves—that they so obstinately shut their minds to their Master's teaching while he was amongst them, that he was obliged to set a little child in the midst of them and bid them become like that. The Christians have obeyed that command ever since by seizing upon the little child itself and mesmerising it from infancy so as to render it incapable of understanding Christ.

It was in vain that Christ put his teaching before them in parables too simple for any child to misunderstand, unless its mind were maimed by orthodox education. We see the apostles wrangling with each other as soon as the Master's back was turned. We seem to overhear them puzzling over the meaning of such a parable as that of the Good Samaritan. What did it mean? I wish I knew what that parable meant. It sounded so very strange.

James: I thought it was plain enough. If we meet a man who has fallen among thieves, we ought to take him to an inn, and give the innkeeper twopence.

PETER: I wish I knew what that parable meant. It sounded so very strange.

James: I thought it was plain enough. If we meet a man who has fallen among thieves, we ought to take him to an inn, and pay the twopence. That is practical Christianity, and as long as we stick to that we can feel sure that we are doing right.

John: Don't you think it may mean also that Samaritans are sometimes better than priests and Levites?

Peter: Nonsense, my dear John! It sounds like that. I know; but it can't mean that. Samaritans are not even as good as ordinary Jews; they are heretics. How can they be better than reverend priests and Levites?

James: It is better for us not to pry into such questions. We have nothing to do with Samaritans. What we have to do is to take the wounded man to the inn, and pay the twopence. That is practical Christianity, and as long as we stick to that we can feel sure that we are doing right.

John: But suppose the wounded man happens to be a Samaritan?

Peter: That is just like you, John, raising extravagant points. If the man were a Samaritan, of course we could not help him, because we are Jews, and the Jews have no dealings with the Samaritans. But we know what I mean to do. I am going to believe that the story is true, and that it all really happened, in order to show my faith. I am sorry the story did not say that the man was helped by an angel, instead of a Samaritan. But I am going to believe that it was an angel, disguised as a Samaritan. That will be harder to believe, and so I shall show more faith; and it will get round your difficulty about the Samaritan being a good man. Because, of course, we know that Samaritans are heretics, and that we ought to hate them.

That is, it seems to me, the spirit in which the Churches have dealt with the parable of Jonah. They honestly thought that the book was written to prove, not that God is more merciful than they are, but that the Creator of the world is powerful enough to make a fish that can swallow a man. Well may the Churches boast of their apostolical succession when, after two thousand years, they are no nearer than the apostles to the understanding of Christ.

Such is my book, and such has been its reception. I do not believe it could have been misunderstood by a Mahomedan, or a Hindu, or a Buddhist. But Christian England has found it unintelligible. It is easier for Christians to believe that the earth is flat than to believe that Christ was right.

Against that attitude it is time to protest. It is time to rescue Christ from the Christians. If toads are to be stoned, let them be stoned in the Devil's name. If men will crucify, let them do so in the name of Caliphas, and not of Christ.
that at last with the appearance of Buckle's book this had been cleared up, and the whole world made trim and tidy. Law was universal. You saw here what was repugnant to him, the idea of freedom and chaos. The ideal was a system which should restrain us. This dominant ideal invaded philosophy.

It began to regard itself as a science, to consider itself a systematic structure, solidly built up, which should give us certain unquestionable results. As in the sciences the ultimate nature of the world would reveal itself to continuous and patient work, and not to bold speculation. Philosophy, tempted by science, fell and became respectable. It held its freedom for a quite imaginary power of giving sure results. It was a solemn structure, in face of which light-heartedness was out of place, and individual idiosyncrasy a sin. One felt uncomfortable in it. Nothing could be done by sudden insight and images; such things were mere folly, here was accumulated wisdom, here we were no royal roads. The days of adventure were gone when we could set out to find new lands. Here the problem for the artist to imperiously express an attitude before the cosmos, but rather for the humble professor to work honestly in a corner.

To a certain extent this movement was correct. Logic, psychology, etc., look like, and as a matter of fact, they are, the artist; he is here certainly out of place. But the danger was when they began to absorb philosophy itself, when it began to consider itself as merely a scientia scientium.

But with this modern movement, philosophy has at last begun itself free from the philosophic sciences and established its right to an independent existence. In Bergson's "Idee d'une Metaphysique" one even finds it defined as the exact inverse method to that of science. The end of science has imprisoned us, restraining our vagaries, and made speculation seem childish. My gratitude to De Gaullier and these other critics of science is that they have rescued me from this nightshade of philosophy as an art. She has once more escaped the spirit that would make her a dull citizeness. Once more, without the expedient of turning herself into myrtle, Daphne has escaped the god's embraces, which promising love would but result in ungraceful fertility.

This is not a mere piece of reactionary or religious sentiment. We don't assert that a philosopher need not know the sciences, and that the simple man is in the best position to write metaphysics. It is not so; he must know them well.

But we assert that throughout the ages philosophy, like fighting and painting, has remained a purely personal affair. The only effect the advance of science has on the three activities is to elaborate and refine the weapons that they use. The man who uses a rifle uses it for the same purpose as a man who uses a bludgeon. The results of the sciences merely increase the number of colours with which philosophy paints. The possibilities of the rapier have been worked out till they have become a science, but the artist who once exterpolated the curve of truth outside its proper place. But the danger was when they began to absorb philosophy itself, when it began to consider itself as merely a scientia scientium.

But with this modern movement, philosophy has at last begun itself free from the philosophic sciences and established its right to an independent existence. In Bergson's "Idee d'une Metaphysique" one even finds it defined as the exact inverse method to that of science. The end of science has imprisoned us, restraining our vagaries, and made speculation seem childish. My gratitude to De Gaullier and these other critics of science is that they have rescued me from this nightshade of philosophy as an art. She has once more escaped the spirit that would make her a dull citizeness. Once more, without the expedient of turning herself into myrtle, Daphne has escaped the god's embraces, which promising love would but result in ungraceful fertility.
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But with this modern movement, philosophy has at last begun itself free from the philosophic sciences and established its right to an independent existence. In Bergson's "Idee d'une Metaphysique" one even finds it defined as the exact inverse method to that of science. The end of science has imprisoned us, restraining our vagaries, and made speculation seem childish. My gratitude to De Gaullier and these other critics of science is that they have rescued me from this nightshade of philosophy as an art. She has once more escaped the spirit that would make her a dull citizeness. Once more, without the expedient of turning herself into myrtle, Daphne has escaped the god's embraces, which promising love would but result in ungraceful fertility.
The Passing Dispensation.
By Judah P. Benjamin.

II.

When we leave the world of art and music and enter pieces of their kind. And they represent social apathy, to contemporary life that many of his plays are masterpieces of dramatic and the human social and ironic humour, trivial ambitions, and vulgar passions. He possesses one of the most observing and penetrating minds that ever depicted the follies of the human heart. In his plays men and women of the worlds see themselves as in a mirror. Competent judges deem the characters natural and life-like. And they are helplessly hypocritical; at once nonchalant and eager, frivolous and tragic, witty and pathetic. Their wealth is as millstones, and their titles hindrances, yet, enormous as their wealth and higher titles, and the dramatic ensemble represents a cynical and callous class of people, born from an instinct born of degeneracy, they seek greater wealth and higher titles, and the dramatic ensemble

The play galvanised the nerves of a people long tired of the ordinary religious emotions, of a people fatigued by the monotony of chapel-going and Salvation Army gymnastics, of a people in need of a glimpse of the pagan arena, a cry from the dungeons of the Roman Coliseum, the mingled horrors and splendours of Imperial and neurotic Rome; in need, above all things, of the spectacular, the poignant, and the puerile. The mass would yield in signs and in symbols, in promises of to-morrow, in shifting scenes and varying movement, in panoramic and illusive pleasures which keep the mind from the real cause of misery and the heart from the real cause of sorrow. How to escape from the present, one complete night of the hour. Because, hidden deep down in the recesses of human nature there dwells a consciousness of decay and helplessness. This consuming desire to escape is the cause of romantic adventure, symbolic idealism, fervent religiosity, and the excitement, the political excitement, spectacular show, and the chimeras of war. Here lies the inner and secret meaning of that movement known as the Celtic Renaissance. After Dickens and Thackeray, George Eliot and George Meredith, after Browning, Tennyson and Swinburne, after three centuries of literary glory equated in the history of the world we arrive at a period when aspiration, sentiment, and emotion assume a mystical and symbolical form. A climax has been attained in the long series of literary schools. But in the realm of British ascendency it means the passing from a dream of contentment to a consciousness the reality of which is again screened by a veil of poetical and allegorical illusion. The story of literary perception that the soul and faith have reached a barrier. A refuge is sought in a region of symbolical mysticism, pure and noble in itself, but still quixotic and allusive.

If Mr. Yeats willingly seeks the legendary and the symbolical, Mr. Kipling tries to escape by means of the active. But while Mr. Yeats takes refuge in a world of poetical symbols which he has created for himself, Mr. Kipling, without knowing it, is living in a fool’s paradise, where he invites the whole British Empire to join him. The stimulant of Mr. Kipling’s verse and prose may be likened to the spurs applied to a tired horse. His writings stimulate, but, like all stimulants, they do no more than make the patient think himself stronger. In reality there has been no strength gained. The heart of the Empire is London, and he has left it untouched. He has dissected the veins, sinews, and arteries of the Empire, but the heart has not been stimulated. The metropolis it is optimistic poison. It means that the foreign wine of life is preferable to bread made at home; it means joy for the robust young adventurer who leaves England never to return, but for the Mother Country it means decay and disaster. For while Mr. Kipling plants one tree he eradicates two old ones.

The late G. W. Steevens was a striking example of the difference between a mind qualified to penetrate the surface of things and a mind satisfied with the superficial and the apparent. Mr. Kipling is an observer of outward things; Mr. Steevens looked through the visible to the invisible. And, again, the difference between Mr. Yeats and Mr. Kipling is the fact that the first accepts the poetic illusion of the old-world life, while the second attacks its political and philosophical delusions. Mr. Steevens went straight to the core of material power. He saw the heart of the Empire was London, he has been deceived by appearances, for he has scarcely seen. He has been deceived by appearances, for he has no true vision of the Empire to join him. The stimulant of Mr. Kipling’s has no more effect than make the patient bid the patient at home look beyond himself and his immediate danger of reaction. He is good enough to realise that the heart is the extremity of material dominion. The Celtic Renaissance is an indirect proclamation by symbols of the close of the old dispensation, while the writers of actuality like Mr. Steevens announced the end by going direct to fact and experience, despising political preten-

The Celtic movement is not concerned with the scientific aspect of things, it is still a hopeful symptom in the domain of British art and literature. It looks down at the world from a great distance. And yet it is a real presence manifest at the very hour when the idea of Imperial ascendency has taken root in the heart of the masses. We have, therefore, two forces in literature which demonstrate by a sort of prescience the extremity of material dominion. The Celtic Renaissance is an indirect proclamation by symbols of the close of the old dispensation, while the writers of actuality like Mr. Steevens announced the end by going direct to fact and experience, despising political preten-

The Celtic Renaissance is an indirect proclamation by symbols of the close of the old dispensation, while the writers of actuality like Mr. Steevens announced the end by going direct to fact and experience, despising political preten-

The Celtic Renaissance is an indirect proclamation by symbols of the close of the old dispensation, while the writers of actuality like Mr. Steevens announced the end by going direct to fact and experience, despising political preten-
less people, at a time when all the signs of unrest and disintegration are plainly manifest, literature of this kind can not only gain the popular ear, but that of the classes which govern? The danger would not be so great were the author less gifted. Are the forces of Destiny then against the possibility of an awakening of the governing classes? It is not too much to assert that the majority of popular English authors belong to the chimerical school? The fabulous African stories of Mr. Rider Haggard, the piratic adventures in Stevenson, and the histories of Sir Conan Doyle, the detective stories of Sir Conan Corelli—there is not in any of these so much as a thought given to the needs and the welfare of home life in any department, political, social, or religious. The reading public is busily engaged in trying to escape from the actual, through the open door of legend and make-believe, mistake the mythical for the mystical, so that what is true in the political world is also true in the world of literature. If the governing powers find momentary escape in the excitement of sport and luxurious living, the reading public finds a narcotic in fictional nonsense, one popular novelist going so far as to pack three dukes into one novel, and this at a time when we are so depraved in the spirit of the poetical ideal. It is no wonder, then, that the middle-class mind of the present day rests secure in the fool's paradise which popular romance, popular plays, and popular criticism have prepared for it! But between the middle-class mind and man who begins to learn and the blunders of one who can learn no more the wise man can make but one choice. Men are put to govern who are living in a world of illusions which they insist is real. This gives rise to another illusion in the world of politics. It is the notion that wealth and titles constitute both talent and wisdom.

A Dream

I had been reading in some newspaper how certain sons of Belial had disfigured the statues of Zola and Scheurer-Kestner in Paris. "Statues!" I mused: "Statues to Zola and Scheurer-Kestner! I never heard that either of them added a square yard to France. Neither of them was the hero of a human battle. They did but strive to save the honour of their country by protesting against the madness of the times. Statues!" And then I fell to thinking of our statues, grimy, for the most part deplorable, whether as works of art or objects of worship, disfigurements of the Square a guide approached me, and, seemingly aware that I was the Square a guide approached me, and, seemingly a change.

...over nature men have been erected in honour of the slayers of I of as works of art or objects of worship, disfigurements of I never mused on the statues, for I had not seen them, but my thoughts were strangely coloured by my last waking thoughts. I went sadly to bed, and my dreams were strangely coloured by my last waking thoughts.

I stepped into the familiar corner, busily enlisting three dukes into one novel, and this at a time when I passed Trafalgar Square. They were celebrating the death, now revered as teachers of men. But time before the statues of great discoverers of moral truths, were material inventions here celebrated. We stood before the statues of great discoverers of moral truths, were material inventions here celebrated. We stood between him and his fellow. The rude half-man is in a sense vulsive movements in the leg of a dead frog and disfigurements of a flint implement, however rude, was as great a strike the first. Symbolising the first makers of tools."

"This again," said my guide, "is a typical figure, symbolising the first makers of tools."

"What," I said, "a monument to a flint-chopper!"

"And why not?" said my guide. "The first maker of a flint implement, however rude, was as great a discoverer as he who invented the steam-engine (long since discarded), or as he who first noticed the cumulative movements in the leg of a dead frog and discovered electricity. This rude flint-man is in a sense the father of all inventors, for his invention includes and foretells all that man has since made out of the matter of the world. This rudely-chipped flint foretells to me, the telescope, the printing press."

So we went from one statue to another. Not only were material inventions here celebrated. We stood before the statues of great discoverers of moral truths, discoverers in the realms of ideas. We were figures of men despised when alive, persecuted even to the death, now revered as teachers of men. But time would fail me to tell of even but a small part of all I saw—in vision.

I woke, and found it was all a dream. Later in the day I passed Trafalgar Square. They were celebrating a "naval victory"—stirring up the memory of old bloody feuds. In the Square still stood the old dismal population of military demi-gods. The recruiting-sergeant was at the familiar corner, busily enlisting hungry waifs.

Alfred Marks.
Books and Persons.

(AN OCCASIONAL CAUSERIE)

The world is still waiting for proof that Mr. William Heimann, the sister of Professor Walter Raleigh, has any enterprise. The price of the novel is a success. He published Mr. Hall Caine in two volumes at four shillings net the pair. Rumour has said all sorts of things about the circulation of "The White Prophet," but the general view of people on the inside of the market is that Miss Marie Corelli may continue to sleep quietly of a night. Then Mr. Heimann published Mr. Philip Gibbs in one volume at three shillings net. Mr. Gibbs's novel, a sincere and clever, though unequal, work, had, I am told, a very good sale. I cannot say that his reputation is still very young, and that the British public doesn't care for young authors to succeed too brilliantly. And now Mr. Heimann is bringing out Mr. William de Morgan in two volumes at half-a-sovereign. The price is apparently not net—so that the real figure will be seven and sixpence to the buying public; but even seven and sixpence is very high, and it is somewhat startling that Mr. Heimann, instead of lowering the price of the novel, should end his season by raising it 60 per cent. "It Never Can Happen Again" is exceedingly long—quite as long as its title. Now the public admittedly likes long novels. But I am quite sure that the public of the present day will not buy them if they cost more than short ones have cost. What the public complains of is—not that long novels are too cheap, but that short novels are too dear. The libraries may or may not ultimately be compelled to buy Mr. de Morgan's books, and on that very reason Mr. Heimann chooses to put upon them. But the piling public will start back with an affrighted gesture at the prospect of paying fifteen sixpences for "It Never Can Happen Again," seeing that it only paid nine sixpences for "Joseph Vance." Moreover, as to the length of "It Never Can Happen Again"—I have not counted the words, but I doubt very much if it is as long as many celebrated mid-Victorian novels. Is it as long as "The Virginians"? "The Virginians" is sold at a six-shilling price, with its plain buckram binding and dignified page, is an improvement on that of the century. I have little doubt that Mr. de Morgan's public will willingly peruse those novels, but I am less convinced that his public will unmurmuringly agree to pay for them according to quantity. My impression is that next year (if the election does not ruin the entire trade) we will see a return to the ancient price of six shillings all round. Neverthe- less, I applaud the earlier portion of Mr. Heinemann's experiment. Indeed, I have been formally requested to "go," and Mr. Heimann has made a beginning of its end—whatever may immediately happen.

In circles where they read, a certain amount of attention has lately been given to a novel entitled "A Crucial Experiment," by Mrs. A. C. Farquharson (published by Edward Arnold). Mrs. Farquharson is, I believe, the sister of Professor Walter Raleigh. I have noticed several times in the Press that the eye of the mandarins has gazed benignantly upon "A Crucial Experiment." Indeed, I have been formally requested to read the book. I have read it. Mrs. Farquharson has talent of a marked and unusual kind, but I do not think she has much talent for fiction. I have seldom read a more improbable novel than hers. It has the appearance of a first book, but is not. So far as one can judge, Mrs. Farquharson's enterprise makes no attempt whatever to be realistically convincing. Her plot, with its mariage blanc, its untaught musical geniuses, its fading away from life in a hill village of Northern Italy, is a wise and native medley of outworn elements. It never offers anything superficially re happening. Nevertheless, it might have been worse. Though he does not comprehend, Mr. Ransome has the merit of being interested. It is to his credit that he acquaints the drawing-room public with the existence of a thing known as technique. It is also to his credit that he omits from his scheme Dickens and Thackeray on the ground that technically they were behind their times and have no economic place in the scheme. Mr. Ransome's critical view is far-sighted, and, if he handles de Maupassant as though de Maupassant were a bomb and might go off, he does not pretend that de Maupassant is not what he is. On the other hand, I cannot imagine upon what ground Mr. Ransome had the effrontery to ignore Russian novelists in this piece of bookmaking. He does not even excuse himself for the singular caprice. There is no reference at all to Gogol, Dostoevsky, and Turgenev, three of the greatest and most original stylists. And, if, and only a useless mention of Tolstoi, the fourth; and not a word about Tchekhoff, who took up the short story where de Maupassant left it, and developed it further. Mr. Ransome ought to have entitled his book: "A History of Story-telling—until the best." Mr. Gavrin's illustrating portraits in line are not bad. Indeed, the portrait of Guiet is quite notable.

Mr. Arthur Ransome is a bookmaker—at any rate this season. His "History of Story-telling" is published in the latest drawing-room-table form by Messrs. F. C. and E. C. Jack. Let it be admitted that the latest drawing-room-table form, with its plain buckram binding and dignified page, is an improvement on that of our youth. Ah! The monstrosities of the seventies. It must have been they that embittered my literary infancy! My own mind was not yet prepared. I have read every manner of fiction-writers from Chaucer and C. Farquharson (published by Edward Arnold). Mrs. Farquharson is, I believe, the sister of Professor Walter Raleigh. I have noticed several times in the Press that the eye of the mandarins has gazed benignantly upon "A Crucial Experiment." Indeed, I have been formally requested to read the book. I have read it. Mrs. Farquharson has talent of a marked and unusual kind, but I do not think she has much talent for fiction. I have seldom read a more improbable novel than hers. It has the appearance of a first book, but is not. So far as one can judge, Mrs. Farquharson's enterprise makes no attempt whatever to be realistically convincing. Her plot, with its mariage blanc, its untaught musical geniuses, its fading away from life in a hill village of Northern Italy, is a wise and native medley of outworn elements. It never offers anything superficially happening. Nevertheless, it might have been worse. Though he does not comprehend, Mr. Ransome has the merit of being interested. It is to his credit that he acquaints the drawing-room public with the existence of a thing known as technique. It is also to his credit that he omits from his scheme Dickens and Thackeray on the ground that technically they were behind their times and have no economic place in the scheme. Mr. Ransome's critical view is far-sighted, and, if he handles de Maupassant as though de Maupassant were a bomb and might go off, he does not pretend that de Maupassant is not what he is. On the other hand, I cannot imagine upon what ground Mr. Ransome had the effrontery to ignore Russian novelists in this piece of bookmaking. He does not even excuse himself for the singular caprice. There is no reference at all to Gogol, Dostoevsky, and Turgenev, three of the greatest and most original stylists. And, if, and only a useless mention of Tolstoi, the fourth; and not a word about Tchekhoff, who took up the short story where de Maupassant left it, and developed it further. Mr. Ransome ought to have entitled his book: "A History of Story-telling—until the best." Mr. Gavrin's illustrating portraits in line are not bad. Indeed, the portrait of Guiet is quite notable.

JACOB TONSON.
**BOOK OF THE WEEK.**

The Newest Liberalism.*

Ir in many respects it is better than the older, it is not so in all respects; it is worse exactly in one sphere where Mr. Churchill claims that it has been most successful. "Our policy has prospered better abroad than at home." "How utterly have all those predictions been falsified that a Liberal Government would be incapable of the successful conduct of Imperial affairs." The measure of this prosperity is the measure of its abandonment of Liberalism. In foreign and colonial affairs the Liberal Party had hitherto, apart from certain extraordinary aberrations, when the moneylenders' pressure became overwhelming, exercised a mighty influence in moulding public opinion; it had stood for political liberty and for equality before the law. How is the account to-day? There answer Denshawai and Hassan Mahfouz, Natah and Dinuzulu, India and its deported leaders, the Transvaal and Mr. Gandhi; the South African Union which excludes the native races; we have protests against cruelty by the Sultan of Morocco, none against tyranny, torture and murder in Russia or in Spain.

With Mr. Churchill I agree: "you have not far to look for the reason. Abroad we have enjoyed full responsibility, a free hand, and fair play." Exactly, there has been a continuity of foreign policy; there has been no criticism by the older section of the governing classes. Criticism by the people has been ineffective, partly because we have not always the knowledge. As a "London Working Man" says in this week's "India": "Outside a very small circle nothing is known of the exact facts of Indian daily life and custom, especially as affected by political conditions. We cannot tell how a particular law is affecting the common people or the commerce of the country." It is for this reason, of course, that our governing classes are able to continue the rule of those dependencies in the interests of their uncles, brothers and nephews.

The people of this country have not taken any interest in colonial and foreign politics, they have not recognised how intimately related these things are to their own affairs. Nor is it quite the case that profound study and much leisure are required to understand them, though all this may be wanted to unravel the tortuous ways of the Foreign and Colonial Offices.

Though Liberal and Tory politics are identical to-day in foreign and colonial affairs, it is mere pretense to assert that the outlook of the two parties is the same in other directions. The only means open to myself and to most other people to judge the intentions of the Liberal Party is a careful scrutiny of their words and of their deeds. It is mere cant to keep on repeating that all other than Socialist politicians are shallow hypocrites. We said twenty-five years ago, but it is growing a bit stale nowadays.

The Tory Party gave us the Factory Acts—it has been so often said it was because the Liberal Party opposed the Factory Acts; and it has been sorry for it—since a few years. In Mr. Churchill's speeches you will find a complete abandonment of the laissez-faire policy; that means Mr. Churchill has come to see whose disastrous effects greeat us at every corner; a policy which has built us up Middlebroughs and Jarrow.

In his speech at Birmingham last January Mr. Churchill said: "There is no great country where the organisation of industrial conditions more urgently deserves attention. Wherever the reformer casts his eye he is confronted with a mass of largely preventable and even curable suffering. The fortunate people in Britain are more happy than any other equally numerous class have been in the whole history of the human race. I believe the left out millions are more miserable. Our vanguard enjoys all the delights of all the ages. Our rearguard struggles out into conditions which are grimmer than barbarism." The Liberal Party is "to build up—so far as social machinery can avail—to tolerant basic conditions for our fellow-counrmen."

Leaving this qualification aside for the moment, one discovers that these basic conditions resolve themselves practically into the actual Fabian programme.

The Fabian Party, exactly as the Fabian Party four years past, Mr. Churchill introduced (and passed) the Anti-Sweating Bill, asking the House "to regard these industries as sick and diseased industries." For the first time the House was asked by responsible Ministers to differentiate between "a healthy and unhealthy condition of bargaining."

The Old Age Pensions Act, a direct outcome of agitation carried on for many years by Socialists, has undoubtedly been an enormous blessing. Something like 600,000 old men and women are now saved from ending their days in the workhouse. Those Socialists who have scoffed at this as a mere dole, of no use to any working-class person, can have no sort of personal relationship with the people; I know what a help a pension has been to many of my own friends, and thus I readily endorse Mr. Churchill's remark: "I must say that he is rather a sour kind of man who can find nothing to notice in the Old Age Pensions Act except its little flaws and petty defects."

The best way for Socialists to receive this Act is to express their gratitude in the well recognised method by demanding its immediate extension to all persons over fifty, and by the removal of the pauper disqualification.

Looking through Mr. Churchill's speeches on Social Reform, I find he is already prepared to carry out the main proposals of the Minority Report in regard to unemployment. An instalment of Labour Exchanges has already been given; whilst speaking at Dundee on Oct. 10th, 1908, Mr. Churchill spoke in favour of "some averaging machinery to regulate and even up the general course of the labour market; national industries to be expanded or contracted according to the needs of the labour market."

This is the principle of the £4,000,000,000 expenditure over ten years of the Minority Report. He then went on: "I say to you deliberately that no boy or girl ought to be forced merely by the circumstances of his birth to eighty years of age by every boy and girl in this country should, as in the old days of apprenticeship, be learning a trade as well as earning a living." At Manchester last May, Mr. Churchill at Leicester last September, Mr. Churchill definitely promised a Government insurance scheme "against sickness, against invalidity, and for the widows and orphans"; together with a scheme of insurance against unemployment. This last will enable upwards of 2½ millions of workers in the most uncertain trades of this country—trades like shipbuilding, engineering, and building—to secure unemployment benefits.

With proper political pressure and persuasion, it looks to me as if Mr. Churchill must grant the rest of the Minority Report proposals. Over and over again he declares himself in favour of the minimum wage and standard conditions of health, etc.

The Budget, as The New Age at once recognised, conformed the Fabian principle of taxing the unearned increment to pay for the uplifting of the struggling people.

Now none of this is Socialism. But we are in a fearful flux with less than one century of industrial laissez-faire. We have to get out of it. The Minority Report proposals will, I believe, get us out of the rack. Perhaps we shall not journey much further by political methods, and I am pretty sure that Socialism, which will abolish employment, will make no great progress in this country until the worst effects of unemployment have been removed, until the nation is

---

*Liberalism and the Social Problem.* By the Right Hon. Winston Churchill, M.P. (Hodder and Stoughton 3s. 6d. net.)
placed on a sounder physical basis, Revolutionists, like soldiers, move on their stomachs.

Mr. Churchill sees nothing beyond this present industrial system mitigated by insurance and benevolence. For him it is ever to be a minority of wealthy persons governing a mass of ill-to-do persons. He sees no need to reform anything except the law, and he is quite satisfied that it is for him the new law has been passed; but he has not yet paid taxes. The editor has used an address by Mr. V. Broaden slowly and yet so surely, from precedent to branch of industry.

Mr. McCullagh believes in "Turkey's future." The editor has broadened down so slowly and yet so surely, from precedent to branch of industry.

"Socialism seeks to pull down wealth; Liberalism seeks to raise up poverty. Socialism attacks the rich, Liberalism attacks the poor." Socialism seeks to pull down the wealthy and it attacks capitalists. There is no way to raise up poverty except to destroy the monopoly due to property—which it be land or whether it be machinery. Agreed that land is the greatest of monopolies, and much and in the model industrial order of what use is land unless we have the means of cultivating it and of marketing the produce? So long as the monopolies in capital and trade exist, so long will there be a monopoly in land. However, I have no space to argue the Socialist position in a notice of Mr. Churchill's speeches; I wanted to discover only how far he was prepared to go. It is pretty clear, I think, that he will help in the uplifting of the people so long as it is done on universal annual basis. Obviously he belongs to the band of social reformers who desire to help and reform the people; the Socialist, on the other hand, wants the people to help themselves (literally and figuratively), and to reform the classes—out of existence. M. D. Ender.

The Magazines.

M. ZEFÉBURE, in "The International," gives an account of "The New French Small Holdings Act." "In the country of the great Revolution, with its democratical principle of the subject's right as a primary, there is less incentive that is not to accept as possible or reasonable the existence of a class of people living in the country but without any owner of the soil. The economic ideal is found only in small holdings or in the rural co-operative associations. The genuine agricultural labourer was found to be losing ground. It is for him the new law has been passed; but he must possess a capital of £10. State loans at 2 per cent interest are granted to agricultural associations, which are obliged to grant loans on mortgages to labourers. The results of this law have not been very extensive; it is obviously much too cumbersome, and the writer pleads for more simplicity. The Act will "come into operation with the division of large landed estates among the former labourers." Mr. McCullagh believes in "Turkey's future." "If every village in Anatolia were ruled by a Young Turk officer, progress would be rapid there, that of Anatolia would be very unlikely." He hopes much from a "modernist movement in Ottoman Mohammedanism, or the entry of the Sultan into the Western phase," Saint North Singh, writing on "How India is being Remade," gives an interesting account of village life, and makes us look askance at some of the reforms over which the writer rejoices. Kroustawell writes of Russia; Emile Fleures writes about "London is a matter which did not greatly concern the working classes. The incidence of taxation was a matter which did not greatly concern the working classes; that is why the workmen left the work-shop in the factory, the expenses of government must perforce, in the main, be met out of the surplus-value created by their unpaid labour." A few lines further: "It has had to be admitted that indirect taxation in the shape of customs and excise duties, especially when imposed on their luxuries, does afford a means of taxing the workers; another means of still further fleecing those who have already been stripped almost bare by industrial and tax exploitation. Mr. Quelch does not explain the "especially when imposed on their luxuries," but as he proceeds to castigate severely the Labour Party for supporting the Budget, he obviously taxes the incidence of taxation as a form which does very greatly concern the working classes. The expenditure on Old Age Pensions, etc., "should have been provided for by other means including taxes on property, or by reduced expenditure on armament." What becomes, then, of the surplus-value theory? Edith Swift puts the woman's question in a nutshell in "Bax and Feminism v. Women": "Why does he (Bax) not insist that all women under Socialism, and as soon as possible, work for their living, as a right as much as the man's?" And there are many shrines around the wall.

We are concerned to know whether the Rev. R. Fullerton truly represents the young Irish view as "The New Ireland Review." "What is Socialism and Morality," this moralist says: "It is obvious that Socialism and right order are incompatible terms. Starting from injustice and ending in justice, Socialism can be nothing but in common with right conduct. It is not necessary to point out at length the total disregard for morality fostered by a system which would legalise wholesale robbery. To deprive a person against his will of what belongs to him is theft or robbery, and this is the main plank in the Socialists' platform." The subterranean, gentleman's opinions on marriage are interesting. "If it were regarded as right for married people to dissolve partnership and enter into fresh alliances, there would be found but few couples who would remain exclusively in each other's company, and co-operate with one another in rearing and educating their children to be good and useful members of society." What an exquisite family life is here depicted as the normal one of to-day—the parents kept together by force, hating the bonds that tie them to their children, who are being brought up in the teeth of this beautiful example to be good.

Drama.

A Suggested Prologue to "Eager Heart." [This should be delivered to a Gregorian chant. If unintelligibility is desired, it should be sung in canon. A step dance may be introduced where necessary.]

Dear friends and gentle all, it does me good To see so many well-dressed people here. You've come to see our play? I thought you would. Two-shilling seats are cheap, the ten not dear. We have no dear seats, but the play is cheap. But what we have we sell as cheap as any. We really have salvation for you all. This place is like a church, for there's the organ, And there are many shrines around the wall Where you may worship Dickens, Arnold, more than Professor Jowett, who translated Plato, Or Emerson, or even Doctor Martineau.

This is not quite a play. Let's call it service Of Truth, or the Ideal, or what you will. The critics then will be sure to prefer this To every playhouse drama on the bill. This is not quite a play. Let's call it service Of Truth, or the Ideal, or what you will. Some ethics that have lost their way in history.

Here where I stand will represent the street, And three steps higher is Eager Heart's abode. Heaven is the next step. In the same way the pain And liquor this round table will commode, And over by the wall the lady's bed is; 'Tis not approved by our Professor Geddes. The story's not all Gospel, for we found That Cinderella's sisters came in handy To taunt our heroine, upon the ground That suffering makes a splendid newspaper. She has no past, but hopes to have a future. And doubtless will, unless someone will shoot her.
We've got some shepherds, and some proper sheep. The three Kings wander in from Seven Dials, or whereabouts, when they should be asleep.

No frankincense or myrrh in their viols. The crowds are not of gold that do adorn 'em. For if they were, they might desire to pawn 'em.

We have a pretty tableau at the last. The Holy family, en séance, as a vision; the Holy Ghost can't come into the cast, he's far too slight to stand against dervish which might arise if any inspiration showed in a play of every time and nation.

Well, that's the play, as near as I remember. There's something about scars and viewless voices, and some stray angels wandering (in December!)

But I forget. I only know the boy says the play is really very nicely written, a bit old-fashioned, like grandmother's mitten.

But quite, O! quite respectable! Each phrase was chosen by our authoress to show that, tho' now poor, it had seen better days, and might have once been poetry. I know that what the past approved must win your reverence, and leave you to the play and books of reference.

And now I want to talk of the Ideal. This age has lost its faith, its—God knows what, its bowels, its brains, the ability to kneel. And many other things that I've forgot.

And yet it wanders seeking everywhere its spiritual comfort, and that comfort's here! Here is the thing you want, and you must have. It has so bowels, and not too many brains, its faith is well diluted, so be brave; or else some quack will cure you of your pains with some pernicious doctrine in large doses we have Vice-Presidents, all well inflated.

You'll know that she's related to a Bishop. But if you see its spiritual comfort, and that comfort's here! Here is the thing you want, and you must have. It has so bowels, and not too many brains, its faith is well diluted, so be brave; or else some quack will cure you of your pains with some pernicious doctrine in large doses we have Vice-Presidents, all well inflated.

You'll know that she's related to a Bishop. But if you see its spiritual comfort, and that comfort's here! Here is the thing you want, and you must have. It has so bowels, and not too many brains, its faith is well diluted, so be brave; or else some quack will cure you of your pains with some pernicious doctrine in large doses we have Vice-Presidents, all well inflated.

You'll know that she's related to a Bishop. But if you see

We are the only firm incorporated. Our President and our President are not frisky:

We have Vice-Presidents, all well inflated; our great red seal has nought to do with its bowels, its brains, the ability to kneel, and sociological meanings. In fact so intent is Mr. La Farge upon surrounding Millet, Corot, and others with a merely ethical and ethnographical interest that he quite misses the meaning of Dupres, whom he quotes as follows: "Nature to these (Barbizon) men was not a thing to copy from, their painting from Nature was an excuse for the statement of their capacity for reverence and admiration." That is, their capacity to treat and praise a subject whose value they understood in a special sense. I prefer the artist's view of himself to the professor's, and for this reason admire the many reproducitions in Mr. La Farge's book, but scorn his text, which is, in many respects, sheer nonsense when it is not mere Emerson.

The words of Dupres prove the fact that artists not only consent to talk about art, but influence to invest the subject with the character of art. Occasionally they descend to mere school-boy chatter, as is the case with Mr. Shirley Fox, who has undertaken to relate "An Art Student's Reminiscences of Paris in the Eighties." What he says of the professors in the Paris of my recollection. I first visited Paris in the late seventies with my father who was making some portrait studies. All I remember of the visit is a word from Mr. Bashkirtseff (Lepage) Then the École des Beaux-Arts (Mr. Fox's first influence) was the dull affair a State School usually is, and Lepage (another influence) was turning out stunted and not too many brains, its faith is well diluted, so be brave; or else some quack will cure you of your pains With some pernicious doctrine in large doses That mars the soul with spiritual ecchymosis. And now the stage is ready, I descend.

I must suck peppermint to ease my cough, and sure the scent's too fragrant to offend. The finest nose, upon the stage or off, and you who never in your lives have sucked one can get supplies quite cheaply from Miss Buckton.

ALFRED E. RAILDALE.

ART.

Beneath the dark pines of the Schwarzwald, where I was hobnobbing with the charcoal burners, I once heard a university professor express the mania of his class for getting pictures hung by the Academy that ought to have been burnt. Mr. Fox misses these points and draws inferences upon the tricks played by the academy upon the novice. I shall continue to stick to Henri Murger's "Scènes de la vie de Bohème," to Filson Young's "Sands of Pleasure," to George Moore's "Reminiscences," for a real view of Paris, and turn to Mr. Fox when I want to see Paris as a City of Chestnuts.
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Hitopodesa. "No friendship should be made with the evil. Charcoal is an evil. It burns the hand when it is hot, blackmails it when it is cold." We stood this sort of thing in recent utterances of the man's half-a-crown.

Then we took him out and burnt him. It was the only reasonable way to dispose of the treacherous man. Now he is demonstrating the moral use of charcoal in another place, in another form.

This ethical illusion of the Strasburg Goose we have always with us. It was by my side as I stood in fair France contemplating the Barbizon Nature of Millet, it stirs out from the book before me. The Higher Life in Art (In Unwin, 8s. 6d.) is the work of a professor who has apparently engaged in art without coming to proper terms with it. One day Mr. La Farge is called upon to deliver the Scammion course of lectures at the Art Institute of Chicago. He chooses, a very interesting subject, but influence to invest the subject with the character of art. Occasionally they descend to mere school-boy chatter, as is the case with Mr. Shirley Fox, who has undertaken to relate "An Art Student's Reminiscences of Paris in the Eighties" (Mills and Boon, res. ed.) and others with a merely ethical and ethnographical interest that he quite misses the meaning of Dupres, whom he quotes as follows: "Nature to these (Barbizon) men was not a thing to copy from, their painting from Nature was an excuse for the statement of their capacity for reverence and admiration." That is, their capacity to treat and praise a subject whose value they understood in a special sense. I prefer the artist's view of himself to the professor's, and for this reason admire the many reproducitions in Mr. La Farge's book, but scorn his text, which is, in many respects, sheer nonsense when it is not mere Emerson.
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DECEMBER

and original part of 'The New Word is that in which Mr. Upward 'Word' is a book to add to the store by your bedside. It is naive, poetic, searching, and most effective. He is half playful at one science, theology, sociology, logic, geometry and the rest. His method the actual weekly household budgets of several wealthy families, contrasted the literature riches and poverty is capable of proof,' says

I think it is impossible to do Mr. Upward justice by quoting a few pages, unless we quote nearly the whole of his book. It is a book of the first order, and as a whole it is all good. . . . The New Word' is a book to add to the store by your bedside. It is full of scholarship and wit, and full of hope.

THE CAMEL AND THE NEEDLE'S EYE.

Crown 8vo, Cloth gilt, 3s. 6d. nett, postage 3d.

The subject discussed by Mr. Ponsonby in his new book is MONEY—the universal belief in money and its equivalent and the selfishness, pride, and passion of the poor, and the正品 of the rich. One in every book is given the special weekly budget of the bad of several wealthy families, contrasted the lives of the rich and the poor. The subject is treated by a man who is what is called a self-made man, and who has a unique knowledge of the subject. It is a book of the first order, and as a whole it is all good. . . . The New Word' is a book to add to the store by your bedside. It is full of scholarship and wit, and full of hope.

THE PRINCE OF DESTINY.

A Romance. By SARATH KUMAR GHOSH, Author of "100 Indian Nights."

A presentation of India by an Indian, with its eternal patience, religious fervour, and passionate love. The book also reveals BRITAIN'S PERIL IN INDIA. In circumstances depicted it would need the extraordinary love of an extraordinary man like the hero to save Britain's cause.

Some Press Opinions.

The Daily Telegraph — "The story is splendidly conceived and drawn...A treat provided by the most skilful novelists."

The Outlook — "Siris the imagination and quicken the pulse."

The Review — "We have had no book in which the atmosphere of India is so wonderfully reproduced."

Just published. Demy 8vo. 6s. 6d. net.

PROGRESSIVE REDEMPTION.

The Catholic Church, Its Functions and Offices in the World reviewed in the Light of the Ancient and the Modern Science. By Rev. HOLDEN B. SAMPSON, M.A.

This book is eminently impressive to the practical laity in the many fields of effort for the betterment of mankind and the reform in human conditions, in which every individual soul who is not entirely selfish cannot help being employed. It gives in clear and forcible logic a complete exposition of the defects in modern efforts of humanity and reform, whether political, social, or religious, and breaks into pieces the delusions of sanguine thinkers and workers, who think that permanent and beneficent results will follow the methods of Christianisation, philanthropy and social reform, which are carried out without reference to the Divine methods embodied in the Catholic Church.

New ready. Two demy 8vo vols. Cloth. 3s. 6d. net.

PROGRESSIVE CREATION: A Reconciliation of Religion with Science.

By Rev. HOLDEN B. SAMPSON, M.A.

A book of high importance, of which Mr. Arthur Waite has said that it is the quality of Revelation."

Just issued. Demy 8vo. 6s. 6d. net. Cloth gilt.

SCIENTIFIC IDEALISM.


In a broad field it is impossible to work of this magnitude...It has the merit of dealing with great merit of dealing with and stimulating point of view.

Just published. Crown 8vo, paper covers. Price 1s. 6d. by post. 1s. 1d.

THE CAMEL AND THE NEEDLE'S EYE.

By ARTHUR PONSONBY, M.P.

Crown 8vo, Cloth gilt, 3s. 6d. nett, postage 3d.

The subject discussed by Mr. Ponsonby in his new book is MONEY—the universal belief in money and its equivalent and the selfishness, pride, and passion of the poor, and the正品 of the rich. One in every book is given the special weekly budget of the bad of several wealthy families, contrasted the lives of the rich and the poor. The subject is treated by a man who is what is called a self-made man, and who has a unique knowledge of the subject. It is a book of the first order, and as a whole it is all good. . . . The New Word' is a book to add to the store by your bedside. It is full of scholarship and wit, and full of hope.
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started in ninety-three to forward the “New English Art” movement, and which has been a real help to the arts and crafts movement. If it has dropped somewhat over its original purpose it is because there is no present movement to forward. But its competitions are doubtless of great service in promoting fresh talent. The new volume furnishes an extremely interesting record, pictorial and otherwise, of up-to-date work in summaries of pictures shows both in this country and abroad, and is a useful guide to what is being said and done in the arts and crafts world. But its criticisms are not exactly torch-bearers lighting the way for eternal truth.

As to the new art publications strong language is the only thing to use. Their trick of getting into the public eye on the optical illusion of a greater general love for art than formerly, is reprehensible. If the public today so love art for art’s sake why does it not crowd the shows of the modern men and buy their works? In some such way the “National Gallery” (A. and C. Jack) introduces itself. The publication is not a bad one as it publications go. It aims to bring the National Gallery to our doors, and this in cheap and convincing shillingworths. Its text is useful, and its “masterpieces in colour” are so good that they introduce into the art of the modern period the requisite emotion without troubling him to go and fetch it. Why a work of this kind should seek to bolster itself up with many inventions is something beyond my comprehension. If the old masters must come knocking at our doors over the bodies of neglected modern men, then let them do it on their own merits. If the public has not yet gained the use of its eyes, bunkum will not help it to do so.

That we are in for a great crusade of the ancients may be seen at the Exhibition of the Medici Society’s reproductions after the Old Masters. These reproductions are very faithful; the Durers, especially those by the four-colour process, are amazing. In many respects they are better than those of the Arundel Society—examples of whose work are shown—and also much cheaper. When all has been said, however, there is no reason to acclaim such reproductions as the fulfilment of a long-felt want, and to consider that we are on the way to institute a great nation, instead of a nation of fools. On the contrary, this attempt of the old fellows to establish themselves as art story-telling guests in the home of the bourgeoisie makes me yawn. It is only really true to the artist when it becomes the larger has the good purpose of the Arundel Society who sent me round to the galleries to make first-hand water colour copies of the originals. Nowadays it serves merely to put money into the pockets of photographers, hunters, and unless care is taken co-operative insurance agents will not follow the Old Masters would follow the Old Crusaders and go crusading elsewhere, say to Jerusalem or Jericho.

It is refreshing to be able to turn from this wearisome contemplation of art in the professor’s chair, and as counter-jumper, to the consideration of a real attempt to promote the work of one who is both an artist and a counter-jumper, to the consideration of a real attempt to promote the work of one who is both an artist and a craftsman. The present exhibition at the Carfax Gallery revives the strange story of [L. Havard, Countess] and the R.A. It will be remembered that one day Mr. Thomas staggered the R.A. by flinging an original statue of Lycidas at its dense head. The R.A., true to its traditions, kicked both Havard and his wonderful Lycidas out. Then came the New Gallery, who took Havard by the hand and obtained for his work that appreciation which good sculptors desire but seldom obtain. Now comes the Carfax, places our sculptor in the sun, gives him a little gallery, and calls forth on behalf of his clever work praise so incomparable as if it were rejected by the R.A. ! What was the R.A. thinking about? Does it ever think?

HUNTY CARTER.

Insurances Notes.

Collecting Friendly Societies.

To all appearance the Assurance Bill will become law in July next, and in its amended form should prove a blessing to the public and a benefit to insurance agents and officials. As regards insurable interest, the deficiencies of the past will be pardoned and greater scope given to societies to secure business. On the whole, what appeared at first to be a dangerous measure is found after amendment to be an advantageous one. It is well that the position of Collecting Societies has been strengthened, because their existence has always been a powerful lever in determining the remuneration of collectors and agents not only in said societies, but also in companies.

When the Assurance Bill was introduced containing the conversion clause which has now been dropped, it was published abroad by interested parties as an attempt by the Government to aid of Collecting Societies. The rumour became so persistent that an enquiry was lodged with the Board of Trade, and Mr. Churchill replied that there was no foundation whatever for the notion that the Government was in any way that those societies should be converted into companies. The misleading nature of the rumour has been thoroughly exposed by the fact that the President of the Board of Trade has carried the amendment securing no change shall take place without the consent of the adult members of a Collecting Friendly Society.

As Mr. C. J. Pettitt, a writer on industrial insurance, points out, Collecting Friendly Societies are part of the great co-operative movement born in the early part of last century, on a wave of altruistic feeling. The movement met with the sympathy and support of the Government of the day, in the shape of exemption from income tax and stamp duty. This movement was an idea of socialising production, and as such the principle of collective ownership and ministering to the needs of the people without individual profit. The idea took another form in the founding of trading and insurance institutions, both trade and insurance societies. At present these are powerful influences at work, secretly and openly, in favour of dividend-hunters, and unless care is taken co-operative insurance institutions are doomed.

It seems that an organisation has been formed to oppose the conversion of the Liverpool Victoria into a proprietary company. It is called the Liverpool Victoria Workers’ Defence Association, and the headquarters are in London. Mr. Thomas, a well-known representative of the society and several popular representatives of the society and deserves to succeed. We are strongly in sympathy with efforts on the part of employers to protect their interests, but we should like to see a more drastic development, namely, the formation of a Workers’ Defence Association in connection with each Collecting Friendly Society. It is often charged against the members of those societies that they do not take advantage of the representative means at their disposal, and the truth is that the charge, and therefore we cannot conceive a healthier influence in those societies than a members’ association with branches in every district.

Newspapers which circulate chiefly among the workers of the country have come to be looked upon as helpful adjuncts to industrial assurance enterprise. Sir J. H. Dalziel, M.P., is who is in the main, proprietor
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By NORMAN ANGELL
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NEW LIGHT ON THE ARMAMENT QUESTION.

THE BUSINESS SIDE OF THE MILITARY QUESTION.

A BOOK THAT GOES TO THE ROOT OF THE FUTILITY, SHOWING

HOW THE CREDIT SYSTEM HAS RADICALLY CHANGED THE PROBLEM IN THE THIRTY YEARS, AND

WHY THE CREDIT SYSTEM IS OUR REAL DEFENCE;

WHY IT WOULD MAKE EVEN A VICTORIOUS GERMANY IMPOSSIBLE TO AVOID, AND

HOW IT BRINGS ABOUT THE ECONOMIC FUTILITY OF MILITARY POWER, AND

MAKES MODERN WEALTH, EVEN WHEN UN-DEFENDED, SECURE FROM MILITARY AGGRESSION.
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By Norman Angell
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EXTEMPORE SPEAKING.

By the Rev. J. EDGAR FOSTER, M.A.

Fourth Edition. The most complete and practical text-book on this subject. The system herein taught is very simple and easily acquired. There is no possibility of forgetting a discourse during delivery if prepared according to instructions.

Price 2s. 6d. per copy, post free.

From J. F. SPRIGGS, 21, Paternoster Square, London.

SCHOOLS OF TO-MORROW

HOW THE CHILDREN OF THE FUTURE WILL BE EDUCATED.

By MARGARET MCMILLAN.

24 pp., 1.80, with Cover Design.

A dreamer who is also a great-hearted and indefatigable worker—that is the person so elusive in any cause. All will do well to read and ponder over this inspiring vision of what our schools might become.

Post free 6d., from the Publisher, J. P. STEELE, Shelton, Stoke-upon-Trent.

SOCIALIST CHRISTMAS CARDS.

NOW READY.

These are the best Socialist Christmas cards ever produced; although 'we try it as should be, and have advertised 'em yet, but already we're dealing with thousands of orders and are receiving unsolicited testimonials galore.

"BADGE" SERIES—lively white cover, embossed with "Clarin" Full-Tonship badge in red and gold. Retains the best obtainable portrait of a prominent Socialist, with appropriate quotation opposite, together with seasonable greeting. The cards are tied with red silk ribbon. The portraits are: Two of Robert Blatchford (portrait by W. G. Read), William Morris, Kate Hardie, Victor Grayson, Julia Davison, and H. M. Hyndman.

"FLAG" SERIES—same as above, except that cover is embossed with Red Flag bearing the word "Socialism." Price 1s. 2d. each, 2s. or more, 2d. each; right for 1/3; 6d. for 2/6, and so on, all post free.

"RED" SERIES—This is a cheaper line, and consists of the cards thousands of which sold so well in previous years at 2d. each. They are absolutely up-to-date. The main difference between these and those previously mentioned is that these are enclosed in a bright red cover. We have a limited number of the Blatchford portrait by C. de Vries, Grayson, Hardie, and Morris cards left and are clearing them out as follows: 6 for 5d., 12 for 1s., and 24 for 2s., all post free. We shall not reprint these cards; it would not pay us.

A SOCIALIST CHRISTMAS PRESENT—Blatchford's Best Portrait, framed in brown case, 1s. post free. With gold slip, 1s., post free. (The gold slip adds to the richness of the picture, but is not essential.) Unframed copies, vol. card £1, 3s. 6d., 2s. 6d., all post free.

ORDER NOW. We may be sold out later. Cash—postal orders or 3d stamps preferred—must accompany orders.

Address—SOCIALIST SOCIETY, Leazes Park Road, NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE.
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The True Story of JACK CADE.

By JOSPEH CLAYTON

Every one has heard of Jack Cade, but who knows anything about him? Hitherto not a single book has been published in Great Britain relating to Cade. And we have not the true story and a vindication of the character of the famous rebel, which may be accepted as a real contribution to the history of democratic movements in this country.

FRANK PALMER,
11, Red Lion Court, London, E.C.
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and editor of "Reynolds's Newspaper," occupies the following positions: Deputy-Chairman of the British Widows' Assurance Co., Ltd., Director of the Liverpool Victoria Insurance Corporation, Ltd., and Trustee of the Royal London Mutual Insurance Society, Ltd. These three companies cater for the same class of business, and more or less they receive favourable recommendation to the public from "Reynolds's." At one time the newspaper referred to was in opposition to the conversion scheme of the Liverpool Victoria, but it has since advocated conversion. Sir J. H. Dalziel has been at it again, and recently assisted the formation of the National Commercial Insurance Co., Ltd. Not long ago Mr. Francis D. Bowles, L.C.C., a Managing-Director of the Fire Assurance Co., Ltd., became a Director of the "Weekly Times and Echo" and there after the paper gave special prominence to industrial assurance. They all recognise that their prosperity is built on the confidence of the working class, and the best medium for supporting that confidence is a popular newspaper.

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.

THE RESULTS OF CONSCRIPTION IN GERMANY.

To the Editor of "The New Age."

Struck by the number of cases of venereal disease I saw among youths who had been through the service, I made enquiries, chiefly among rankers, but also of some officers and German medical men. I found that the official statistics were quite unreliable. Men serving in different regiments or left untreated. Dr. Greenwood will understand how easy it is for a man to avoid detection in most cases, whilst the later results may be disastrous.

TO THE EDITOR

M. D. EDER.

THE PASSING DISPENSATION.

To the Editor of "The New Age."

In the course of the article entitled "The Passing Dispensation," published in your columns, reference is made to the "democratic spirit of the Salvation Army." I leave your readers therefore to surmise whether Miss Neilans, whose extracts from the official "Orders and Regulations" are to be taken as testifying to the army's democratic spirit.

Soldiers' meetings are not intended to be, nor must they be, political, for discussions or displays of political bias. In fact, it would be regarded as a proof of great incompentence on the part of a commanding officer that he should be heard to say of any subject, "I have laid it before the soldiers, and they object." The affairs of a corps must be directed by the commanding officer, and not by the voice of the soldiers. Nothing in the nature of voting or taking sides must be tolerated in any soldiers' meetings.

The reason for this is that the field officer will have acknowledged a principle which is, and must be for ever, foreign to the constitution of a free country.

The principles of the army, we are told, "remain as unchangeable as the throne of Jehovah himself."

Under the system adopted that seems to be assured.

ELEANOR JACOBS.

BERESFORD AND PORTSMOUTH.

To the Editor of "The New Age."

Of course he'll get in; he's a Madhimal! One can search the pages of modern history in vain to find a more wanton insult to the electors of this country than to give Beresford standing up and say he had the decency to go where he is not known one could forgive him; but here in Portsmouth, asking the men of the navy and dockyard above all others, to put him in the House of Commons! "Charley" may have been boomed by pseudo naval writers in the Hampshire Telegraph, but the "lower deck" smiles.

The men of the navy and dockyard are thinking of larger issues than a war with Germany, and are not to be drawn from the path of reform by such red herrings. They are realising only too well that this talked-of and hatched-up bogy is another game of the very class who invariably call themselves the "governing classes" (?) and imagine they, and they alone, have the sole prerogative of officering the services. One wonders whether Beresford would advocate on the floor of the House a democratic system of officering the navy.

Beresford, old man, take my tip, and try somewhere else! You have counted without your host—the dockyard man and the man behind the gun—who are going to have a voice. Matters pertaining to the wars of the future. Vote for Beresford? "Not I," says Jack, "he's one of the bounders who voted to keep the 'cat' going to flog bluejackets." No; officers were never boggled in the future. "Open-air audiences are not the thinking part of the electors," says his lordship (vide "Morning Leader" of the 28th). Questions may have been awkward for publication. Well, I'm only a common sailor compared to his aristocratic lordship, but I might say I've had some intellectual treats listening to Sanders outside the dockyard gates; and, by the way, he is going to have my vote.

SOCIALIST R.N.
Learn how to become successful

"As trade and commerce increase, so will the chances of success; but the man who succeeds must be the strong man—the man of power—the man with will and determination. And such a man will be he who does not consider it contrary to his dignity and position to regard with a friendly eye everything and anything that will enable him to understand his position."

—MARES.

Let us send you our book which tells you how you can become a strong man—a man of power, a man with will and determination—a success. Let us send you this book. You possess the qualities which are essential to success; they will remain dormant, however, until awakened by exercise. The difference between a successful man and an unsuccessful man is brain power. You have the brain, exercise will give you the power, our book will tell you how to exercise.

Let us send you our book, it's yours for the asking, Write to-day.

Address the Secretary,
PELMAN SCHOOL OF MEMORY,
20, WENHAM HOUSE, BLOOMSBURY ST., LONDON, W.C.
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In consequence of the increased price of The New Age, the new SUBSCRIPTION RATES will be as follows:--

Great Britain. Abroad.
One Year ...... 16/- 17/4
Six Months..... 7/6 8/8
Three Months... 3/9 4/4

All remittances should be sent to The New Age Press, Ltd., Red Lion Court, Fleet Street, London.
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By Dudley Tennant

NOTES OF THE WEEK
VASHTI: A POEM.
By Beatrice Tins
LE JARDIN DU TREPAS
By W. L. George
PETER THE PAUPER
By E. H. Visiak
FOREIGN AFFAIRS.
By Stanhope of Chester

PERKS!
By O. W. Dyke

F. E. SMITH: AN APPRECIATION.
By Montagu Brixton

EQUALITY AND OPPORTUNITY.
By Francis Gribson

A CONTINENTAL TRIP.—IV.
By Bart Kennedy

THE ART OF HOME MAKING.—II.
By W. Shaw Sparrow

THE SOCIOLOGIST UPON THE STREETS.—II.
By Professor Patrick Geddes

THE PASSING DISPENSATION.—I.
By Judah P. Benjamin

ON CONSUMPTION.
By The Right Hon. John Burns, M.P.

BOOKS AND PERSONS.
By Jacob Tonson

SOME DISREMEMBERED LESSONS.
By Ll. D. Eder

BLIND: A POEM.
By Wilfrid Wilson Gibson

ART.
By Huntly Carter

CORRESPONDENCE.

MIscellaneous advertisements.

Accountant Undertakes auditing or writing reports, day or evening; moderate. A., 2,2a, Darlan Road, Fulham, S.W.

Bed-sitting Rooms, with breakfast; other meals by arrangement. Vegetarian or otherwise.—199, Albany Street, Regent's Park, N.W.


Hungary and the Hungarians. Books gratis; post free. Apply, Swansmore, 29, Halton Road, Ealing, Kent.

Lady Wanted to Share Flat with another. Near stations, trams; cheap, healthy.—L.M.N., c/o Miss BARMBY Mount Pleasant, London, E.C.

The Spirituality of the Bible Proved by the Spirit of Truth.
By FRIENDS' WORKS, with Catalogue, in Free Libraries.

"Unitarianism an Affirmative Faith," "The Unitarian Agreement" (Biss), "Eternal Punishment" (Stephen Brooke), "Abomination" (Price-Hibbert), given post free.—Miss BARKER, Mount Pleasant, Skiddaw.

Young Man (21), well educated, Knowledge French, Spanish, shorthand, typing, Literature seeks clerical or literary post. British Museum experience. G.W.C., 31, Daneville Road, Camberwell.

THE NEW AGE.

A CARTOON.

The Dignity of Labour.
By Holborn Bagman

The Pale Person.
By Allen Upward

The Situation in Finland.
By a Finn

Twelve Hundred Frozen Men: A Story.
By Aage Madelung

The Higher Education of Boys.
By F. J. Kettle, B.A.

The Sociologist Upon the Streets III.
By Professor Patrick Geddes

A Continental Trip.
By Bart Kennedy

The Verse.
By F. S. Ilín

Drama.

Art.

Music.

Etc. Etc.