The Parliament Bill will have passed the House of Commons. The problems of Home Rule, Federation and the Reform of the Second Chamber must be re-threshed, though in each practicable or desirable. Federation, similarly, is beyond instance the amount of corn to chaff is inconsiderable. We must see what price in Dreadnoughts, the region of practical politics. England, after all, is enough. We must address to the machinations of malcontents, beginning with the criticisms of Foreign policy the Social Democratic Party's Congress. They were offered the advantage of the best friendly criticism, officials of the I.L.P. would attribute the decline was inevitable from the moment that the other political parties began stealing the Socialist thunder. But Mr. Snowden, in cautious language, in our opinion, bears to the great when he declares that the propaganda of the I.L.P. has been unattractive and unintelligent. In less timid language we would repeat the charge: the I.L.P. has failed, is failing and will continue to fail on account of the incompetence and downright stupidity of its personnel, leaders and rank and file. This incompetence and stupidity have been manifested in a thousand ways, but in none more conclusively than in this single fact that to this very moment no person of the smallest pretension to brains has been permitted to acquire influence in the counsels of the I.L.P. As a body, in fact, they have become notorious for their positive hostility to brains in any form. For at least two years the best intelligence of the Socialist movement was at its disposal and they refused it. For two more years they were offered the advantage of the best friendly criticism, and they ignored it. And to-day we are beholding the results.  

The Easter Conferences of the two chief political Socialist bodies have attracted even less attention than usual this year. Both were obviously more concerned about their internal affairs than about Socialism. It seems to be the fate, indeed, of most organisations to exhaust their energy on self-maintenance. As for their objects, other people with their hands free must look after them. We do not propose to discuss the doings of the Social Democratic Party's Congress. They were dull, uninteresting and ineffective. But several points arose during the Independent Labour Party's discussions which may be mentioned. Official optimism is allowed a certain amount of fiction, but we really think the limit may add from common observation that this so-called reaction shows no signs of ceasing. On the contrary, everything points to its continuance and to the final disappearance of the I.L.P. from the active political forces of the day.  

Various more or less plausible explanations have been offered of this serious but unmistakeable decline in the popularity of Socialist politics. Doubtless the officials of the I.L.P. would submit it to the machinations of malcontents, beginning with the criticisms of the I.L.P. two years ago. Others, again, pretend that the decline was inevitable from the moment that the other political parties began stealing the Socialist thunder. But Mr. Snowden, in cautious language, in our opinion, bears to the great when he declares that the propaganda of the I.L.P. has been unattractive and unintelligent. In less timid language we would repeat the charge: the I.L.P. has failed, is failing and will continue to fail on account of the incompetence and downright stupidity of its personnel, leaders and rank and file. This incompetence and stupidity have been manifested in a thousand ways, but in none more conclusively than in this single fact that to this very moment no person of the smallest pretension to brains has been permitted to acquire influence in the counsels of the I.L.P. As a body, in fact, they have become notorious for their positive hostility to brains in any form. For at least two years the best intelligence of the Socialist movement was at its disposal and they refused it. For two more years they were offered the advantage of the best friendly criticism, and they ignored it. And to-day we are beholding the results.  

All this, however, is past history, and would be of no public importance if at this year's Conference a question of parliamentary procedure had not arisen bearing on the recent indictment by Messrs. Belloc and Chesterton of the party system. We have not had the interest to discover the conclusion to which the Conference actually came on the subject, but the preliminary speeches and votings were enough to convince any reader that the I.L.P. members of Parliament have about as much notion of the political situation as the most ignorant of their members. In particular the speeches of Mr. Ramsay MacDonald and Mr. Keir Hardie betray an ignorance so great as to make it necessary to assume that it has been acquired. The question arose whether the Labour Party as a whole, and the I.L.P. in particular, were not guilty of breaking their pledges, defeating their objects, and opposing their members by maintaining a thick and thin alliance with the Liberal party. It was urged that the Labour votes should cease to be regarded by the Government as bought in bulk on minor as well as on major issues,  
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and that, generally speaking, consideration for the safety of the Government should less often determine Labour votes in the House than it does now. There are, we freely admit, great difficulties in making a rule upon this point. School was the Government chosen to make minor questions vital, so long must a vote against the Government endanger its existence. But the reply even here is that a Government that maintains a tyranny by such crooked devices is not worth main-
taining, though its alleged immediate programme be the restoration of the Garden of Eden. Doubtless the pre-
sent Government’s programme on the Veto Bill has the approval of the Labour Party and of the Labour votes in the House, but that fact does not entitle the Government to a free hand in every matter outside the range of the Bill. Loyal co-operation with the Government on the Veto Bill is one thing, but to yield allegiance to every extraneous matter is robbing Peter to pay Paul. * * *

What lay at the back of Mr. MacDonald’s elaborate apologies, however, was something that the I.L.P. Conference had not the courage to discover. We refer to the “bargain” entered into by the Labour Party with the Liberal Whips. Of this bargain we confess we have no direct knowledge; it may exist, and there are reasons for supposing that it does exist. On the other hand, we should be prepared to learn that no such bargain had taken place. The notion that it was first definitely formulated in no uncertain terms by Messrs. Belloc and Chesterton in their book on “The Party System.” It runs as follows:

It has often been suggested by those unacquainted with Westminster that the breakdown of the Labour Party and its absorption and digestion by the professional politicians was due to the influence of “the tone of the House.” The suggestion is plausible, but inadequate. It was due to a definite compact with the Executive by which places, advantages in moving motions, etc.—ultimately, perhaps Cabinet rank—should be the price of compromise: the bargain was accepted. * * *

The charge therein made received no reply whatever from the Labour Party. Twice it has been repeated in the correspondence columns of The New Age, and the attention of Labour members has been specially drawn to it. Why has there been no reply? We certainly expected that if our own columns were not honoured by an explanation at least the annual conference would be entrusted with a disclaimer. But not a word has been said. The wavering conclusions most men are driven to by the hitherto held of that real state of affairs will be immen-
sely strengthened by the complete silence. In fact, we may now take it as settled that Messrs. Belloc and Chesterton were right in their guess. This it is that lends almost a sinister air to the political discussions of the Conference. The failure of the rank and file to insist on enlightenment involves them with their officials in ineptitude and something worse. * * *

Mr. Garvin has become the editor of an American millionaire’s journal, but his accuracy is in no way improved. Writing in the “Observer on Sunday, he puts forward a view of the Holmes circular which he says everybody appears to have missed. The point was made in The New Age three weeks ago, and has been made every week since for the sole benefit of journalists like Mr. Garvin who cannot think alone. It is that the inspectorate of the elementary schools should be better and differently educated from the elementary teachers themselves. It is not to be won-
dered at that the Conference of Teachers should hold the contrary doctrine. They are naturally disposed to think (perhaps) that different education from their own must necessarily be inferior. But too much attention should not be paid to the Teachers’ Union’s opinions of educational questions. In the first place, they do not meet to discuss educational affairs; in the second, they are unrepresentative of the mass of the teachers in these matters. Usually, indeed, such inspectors as are appointed by local authorities from among the ranks of teachers have been officials of the Union in their salad days. So that a conference of delegates declaring in favour of the Holmes Circular would be a conference passing a self-denying ordinance, —an incredible thing! * * *

There are two aspects of the Holmes Circular dis-
cussion. The one is its bureaucratic aspect and the other is the educational. At present nobody but our-
selves seems to have the smallest idea that these two aspects have no necessary relation with each other. The “Nation,” following the lead of the Teachers’ Conference, declares war on “the self-willed arrogance” of the education officials and demands a Parliamentary inquiry into the Civil Service. The Teachers’ Union declares that “the dry rot of official-
dom must be uprooted.” Very well, we do not object to the upsetting of the dry rot, even if it involves a long Parliamentary inquiry. In fact, the appointment and control of the teachers themselves could be regarded as widely private if not of public scandal. But in the name of sanity let not this question of bureaucracy blind our eyes to the question of what is the true educa-
tional line in the matter of the Holmes Circular. Here the question is simple and distinct. Bureaucracy or no bureaucracy, unless the inspectors of our elementary schools are superior in culture to the teachers they inspect, their work is entirely superfluous when it is not positively harmful to education. * * *

The question of whether men of superior culture to their fellows are to be found in the ranks of elementary teachers does not call immediately for discussion. We are inclined to believe that they are to be found there as in every other body of men. But nobody with any practical experience of how appointments are made by local authorities would dream of supposing that these gifted individuals are likely to be chosen for any office but that of scapegoat. In fact, we would go so far as to say that few appointments made by local education authorities are anything else but jobs, and that in such jobbery it is precisely the lowest type of teacher that stands the best chance of success. If, as we have often suggested, the teachers themselves could be regarded as a guild and given the selection from among their own number, both of their inspectorate and of their heads, the importation of University men would be unneces-
sary, for if the best could be chosen the best could be found in the elementary ranks. But we repeat that under the present system the best are never chosen. Consequently, for the safeguarding of some standard, it is advisable that local authorities should be generally confined in their choice to University men. The worst University man is at least a shade superior to the worst elementary teacher. The choice between these two is what the Holmes Circular thrusts on us. * * *

With the public generally, we find it difficult to pump up sympathy with the London taxi-cab drivers. They may publish their grievances, as the Duke of Well-
lington once told somebody, and be damned for all we care. It was commonly believed when the service was first instituted that the new vehicles would involve new manners. Had not Mr. Shaw taught us to regard the motor-driver as the new aristocrat? The taxi-cab drivers, however, rapidly degenerated from this proud position; and at this moment there is probably nobody men more greedy, ill-mannered, rascally, and lazy. The contrast between these privately-employed tip-hunters and the publicly-
employed tram drivers and conductors is a lesson in collectivism. Had the service been municipalised from the outset both public and drivers would not be now complaining. * * *

[The present issue closes the Eighth Volume of The New Age. Next week’s issue will contain an Index and a Literary Supplement.]
Foreign Affairs.

By S. Verdad.

Like Lord Brooke (I think it was Lord or Sir Somebody Brooke), I stayed in my club during the holidays and looked out at the damned people—a highly undemocratic thing to do, perhaps; but something that everyone would do if he could. I expected to be plagued by ecstatic gush about Peace Sunday, a thing that everyone would do if he could. I expected of affairs in Mexico. No wonder peace is having a rest speak in the name of the people of England, but happily on the part of those penny-a-liners who presume to highly undemocratic thing to do, perhaps; but some-...
The Civil Service.

The incident of the "Holbein circular," comparatively unimportant in itself, has had the happy effect of bringing under review the whole question of existing methods of appointment, promotion, etc., in the Civil Service. This is a matter for congratulation, and it is to be hoped that, now that the opportunity is given them, the boards will carefully examine the antiquated machinery of public administration and see whether in its present condition it is fit to be entrusted with the large schemes of reform which they are endeavouring to push. And let it always be borne in mind that the Service should, with certain exceptions, be staffed by three classes—the First Division to do the bulk of the work with Boy Clerks engaged for copying work and discharged on reaching five years from their age to bring them within the age limits. So in order to prevent the able Second Division men cramming up "public school subjects in their evenings, and by their superior merit crowding their way through the examination. Still, even with this practical monopoly the First Division failed to satisfy the need of the governing classes for jobs; while, at the same time, with more and more men from the public elementary schools finding that with hard work and additional "coaching" they might aspire to entrance to it, the competition for the Second Division became more and more severe. The result was twofold. A barrier was established between the First and Second Division in the shape of the "Intermediate" class, in response to the demands of the Head Masters of "public" schools, who complained that while the pay of the Second Division was not sufficiently remunerative to attract their pupils, the examination was not of such a nature as to prevent them from having access to it. Prior to this, existing Civil Servants competing for higher examinations had enjoyed the privilege of deducting five years from their age to bring them within the age limits, in order to prevent able Second Division men cramming up "public" school subjects in their evenings, and by their superior merit crowding the public school men out of these intervals. But the First Division examination was drawn up by the Civil Service Commissioners in consultation with the Dons of Oxford and Cambridge, with the result that an incidence of the "gentlemanly initiative and responsibility could only be filled by men of the work with Boy Clerks to assist in copying. The First Division examination was drawn up by the Civil Service Commissioners in consultation with the Dons of Oxford and Cambridge, with the result that an instance where no corruption is suggested, but where, on the contrary, the motive for appointment is quite honest and even praiseworthy though none the less unjustifiable. A man was selected for a responsible post in connection with the Labour Exchanges, not because he had any knowledge of the scope and nature of unemployment, or a knowledge of economics or, indeed, any acquaintance with industrial conditions, but simply because he had assisted a fellow of University College, London, to pay of the Second Division was not sufficiently remunerative to attract their pupils, the examination was not of such a nature as to prevent them from having access to it. Prior to this, existing Civil Servants competing for higher examinations had enjoyed the privilege of deducting five years from their age to bring them within the age limits, in order to prevent able Second Division men cramming up "public" school subjects in their evenings, and by their superior merit crowding the public school men out of these intervals. But the First Division examination was drawn up by the Civil Service Commissioners in consultation with the Dons of Oxford and Cambridge, with the result that an instance where no corruption is suggested, but where, on the contrary, the motive for appointment is quite honest and even praiseworthy though none the less unjustifiable. A man was selected for a responsible post in connection with the Labour Exchanges, not because he had any knowledge of the scope and nature of unemployment, or a knowledge of economics or, indeed, any acquaintance with industrial conditions, but simply because he had assisted a fellow of University College, London, to "staffed by three classes—the First Division to do the bulk of the work with Boy Clerks engaged for copying work and discharged on reaching five years from their age to bring them within the age limits. So in order to prevent the able Second Division men cramming up "public school subjects in their evenings, and by their superior merit crowding their way through the examination. Still, even with this practical monopoly the First Division failed to satisfy the need of the governing classes for jobs; while, at the same time, with more and more men from the public elementary schools finding that with hard work and additional "coaching" they might aspire to entrance to it, the competition for the Second Division became more and more severe. The result was twofold. A barrier was established between the First and Second Division in the shape of the "Intermediate" class, in response to the demands of the Head Masters of "public" schools, who complained that while the pay of the Second Division was not sufficiently remunerative to attract their pupils, the examination was not of such a nature as to prevent them from having access to it. Prior to this, existing Civil Servants competing for higher examinations had enjoyed the privilege of deducting five years from their age to bring them within the age limits, in order to prevent able Second Division men cramming up "public" school subjects in their evenings, and by their superior merit crowding the public school men out of these intervals. But the First Division examination was drawn up by the Civil Service Commissioners in consultation with the Dons of Oxford and Cambridge, with the result that an instance where no corruption is suggested, but where, on the contrary, the motive for appointment is quite honest and even praiseworthy though none the less unjustifiable. A man was selected for a responsible post in connection with the Labour Exchanges, not because he had any knowledge of the scope and nature of unemployment, or a knowledge of economics or, indeed, any acquaintance with industrial conditions, but simply because he had assisted a fellow of University College, London, to
pushed into responsible positions do not control the appointment or dismissal of their subordinates, they are often compelled to admit their capacity for better work and the justice of their own "Blocking Motions." The result that while merit in their subordinates goes unrewarded, inefficiency too often goes unpunished.

If we are unwilling to revert to a system of direct selection, open competition must be established as an "iron" law of appointment to the Civil Service and the existing "caste" barrier must be broken down.

In a further article I propose to deal with the immediate steps that must be taken to make the Service efficient and the ultimate ideal that we must keep in view.

X.

**Blocking Motions.**

It is always interesting to watch the dissolution of a fabric, the break up of a sea-wall under a storm, or the exposure of an elaborate financial fraud under cross examination, or the melting of the ice in spring on the great inland rivers.

It is not only interesting, but pleasurable, to watch this sort of disintegration when the thing that is breaking up has long been evil and is becoming contemptible.

The Party humbug is going on at such a pace that weekly comments upon it seem all too far apart; but the recess gives one a little breathing space to look round.

Of twenty matters that might attract one in the entertaining spectacle, the chief matter is the active help which the "official Opposition" are giving the Treasury Bench in turning the House of Lords into an undignified annex to the Caucus. It is a spectacle full of irony, at white Mr. Balfour and Mr. Asquith are actively supporting each other in destroying the old Second Chamber, and replacing it by some new-fangled thing that shall be subject to the machine, that machine itself is going to pieces in their hands. The chief character of the peers that will remain when the business is over will be the continued acquirement of peerage by purchase...

However, I am not writing on that main matter today, but on a particular point of the farce, and that is the vital point of the "Blocking Motion."

When an institution is breaking up, the action of men appears to be facilitating the catastrophe is largely unconscious. Events converge towards the final disaster in spite of individual human wills, and private people find themselves doing public things upon a scale they never intended. So it is with what has happened to the blocking motion. Yesterday this venerable fraud seemed immortal; only this week it has been tripped up and broken utterly! It will not recover from that fall. It will die, and when it dies yet another of the remaining props of the Party System will have gone by the board.

It was the Labour Party, of all people in the world, who did the deed.

I presume they intended nothing so enormous—nay, deliberately to murder the Blocking Motion would be treason to the Front Benches. It was an accident... surely it was an accident. But it has happened and it is irretrievable.

At the risk of repeating something which a few people may not know accurately, very many vaguely, and most people not at all, it is worth while stating plainly—if only for the sake of future historians—what the Blocking Motion was.

A rule must exist in every possible assembly—even the House of Commons—that only one man shall speak of a thing at one time. A man having given notice that he is going to speak about, let us say, a piece of cheating worked by a contractor upon the great public services, has obviously the prior right of speaking on it. If the gentleman who so desires to ventilate the scandal falls ill, or becomes the victim of some other misfortune, and yet neglects to take the motion off the paper before the appointed day, it evidently cannot be discussed at all. His motion being down on the paper blocks the way to any other similar motion.

It is self-evident that if the contractor in question were a member of the House, it would be very much to his advantage indeed to put down such a motion and then to fall ill and to forget to take the motion off the paper.

In any public assembly (one would imagine) summoned to discuss public business, a trick of that sort would be severely dealt with. It certainly is not tolerated in any other national assembly in Europe. But in the House of Commons the thing was a custom, and such public opinion as the House retained was satisfied with the explanation that it was a "quaint old custom" which, like many other quaint old customs, such as taking off your hat on the Gangway and keeping it on on the Benches, not standing northward of a bar which isn't there, bowing to the place where the altar of St. Stephen's Chapel used to be—or rather, never was—and crouching as you passed anyone upon his legs, was of ancient national tradition, and therefore worthy of preservation.

It might be notorious that the man who put down the motion never intended to move it, that his object (or the object of his masters) was actually to prevent the motion being discussed: but the quaint old custom preserved his right.

Now there are in our political society three kinds of quaint old customs.

First:—There are quaint old customs which are to the advantage of the commonwealth and restrict a privilege of the well-to-do, or of those in power. These are either killed or allowed to die; if revived, their revival is severely punished. Among such quaint old customs may be numbered the quaint old custom of a village to use its common land, and the quaint old custom by which such huskodies as the inspectors, private societies might not walk into a poor man's house and cross-examine him at pleasure. In Parliament the quaint old custom which rendered Ministers responsible to the House of Commons has been effectually disposed of, and the quaint old custom of free speech has nearly disappeared.

There are a second kind of quaint old custom which consists in harmless memorials of the past: such as the wigs of judges; of such also the venerable and respectable ritual of Hat and Bar and Gangway and bowing and crouching in the House of Commons, which I have just mentioned. They are valuable, and every wise man will retain them, even where they are grotesque, for they bind us to our past without doing us any harm.

But there is a third kind of quaint old custom which is quite another kettle of fish. It is usually fairly modern. It is deliberately invented for the purpose of bolstering up privilege and fraud, and its quaintness or frivolous. That is why the mass of the electorate were frivolous. That is why the mass of the electorate were simultaneously the representative of an English constituency was ever allowed to stand up against it.

Suppose a Minister to have blundered on some important point; or the two Front Benches to have thought it important that Indian affairs should not be discussed; or a department of foreign affairs to be set aside by the
Front Benches as too grave for the House of Commons to meddle with—in such cases, and in many others, a fellow was got hold of by the promise of some bribe or other (be it never what-not) to move down a motion with the direct intention of not rising to speak on it and of so preventing public discussion upon a public matter in the public assembly of the nation.

Now a trick of this sort, whenever it was practised, was either of great importance or of none.

If the full public discussion of public affairs is necessary to the safety and health of a nation, then this absurd and fraudulent trick was a grave evil. And other nations were right to prevent any such follies in their deliberative assemblies.

If, upon the contrary (as our chief professional politicians believe), the corrupt expeditious methods are the best for government, and if it matters little who is entrusted with the task, then the Blocking Motion was an excellent device, for it prevented the vulgar interference of criticism with administration. But, whichever view we hold, whether that the public discussion of public affairs is a good or an evil thing, the point for us to seize at this moment is that the two Front Benches and their supporters in the Press only tolerated the Blocking Motion so long as it served their interests.

The hacks in the Press called it “a legitimate weapon of Parliamentary warfare.” Each half of the machine duped its followers by pointing out to them the great advantage of preventing the “Opposition” of the moment from criticising some act of the Government and the dependants of the Government from speaking upon something the other Front Bench wish to leave untouched; the local “Liberal” who played at politics was pleased to see that Mr. Runciman could not be brought to book over the Swayne school case; the provincial or suburban “Tory” who played at politics was delighted to hear that a “Radical” was debarred from discussing Indian affairs.

The mass of the electorate, as I have said, never dreamed that the corrupt expeditious methods are the best for government, they must have wondered why the House of Commons was so often silent on the most important matters.

But in this Parliament, and in this session of it, the old conventions are going to pieces. Blocking Motions were put down to prevent discussion upon the adjournment before Easter, and, behold, some of these were not only dictated by the Front Benches—such aberrations had before momentarily interfered with the plans of the “leaders.” Here was a business! The Party papers and their hungry proprietors were troubled beyond measure. The thing was a harmless and even necessary part of the Constitution so long as it silenced debate. But those who were expecting or the dependents of the Government from speaking upon the state of the world.

There are but few main supports of that intrigue which is con- cerned to their own system (which they are fatally condemned to attempt to save the Blocking Motion, but it is too late—the

**The Good Friday Procession.**

**An Impression.**

By **Duse Mohamed**.

Lest me state forthwith that I am not a Christian. I believe in God: but no religious system holds me captive. Having made this quite clear, the subjoined impression may hence be considered quite detached. I rarely trouble about processes of any kind—unless they cross my path and observation becomes imperative. But I heard of this procession quite accidentally and determined to see whether this was some mummeries of a Church which seems to be fast losing its grip on the public conscience. I did not come to scoff, and I must admit that the solemnity of the whole ceremonial almost persuaded me to remain to pray. From the martial blast of the brazen trump, followed by the short impressive prayer of the Bishop of London on the steps of St. Martin’s Church, to the conclusion of the brief service in St. Paul’s Cathedral, when the resonant and spirit-lifting swells of “Rock of Ages” pierced the awe-inspiring stillness of a hundred tombs, and which one could almost feel were echoed by the Mosaic prophets that surround the inverted dome of the sacred sphere, the souls of those assembled seemed impelled, enthralled, and permeated with a holy fire, joining themselves to the immortal hosts in suppliant adoration at the feet of the Creator.

There can be little doubt that although “the world is still deceived by ornament,” ornate sacerdotism and ceremonial, while appealing to the senses of the crowd, have lost their hold upon the thinking mind, which, for the most part, regards such survivals of a medieval age with abstract veneration; and as the sad-coloured habiliments of “primitive” Christian systems find their chief attraction in their sentimental play on the emotions, with a gloriously limned heaven and luridly painted hell at the two extremities and no middle course for the groping soul, the main body of their followers is recruited from the ranks of the timorous. The Church of England, therefore, by striking, as it were, a middle path between the excessively theatrical and the depressingly sober, makes for a subdued solemnity which strongly appeals to the man of average understanding. This procession of the Bishop of London was obviously an exceptionally master stroke of inspiration. The inspiring prayer, the “solemn supplication on the Day of Atonement in the year in which the representative of the English Church is to be crowned King,” was all in the best possible taste.

The distant strain of brass instruments growing in volume as it approached, rising from the deserted streets, blending with the voices of ten thousand pilgrims, and ascending to the almost cloudless sky, stirred the heart with a holy, an ineffable joy quite without the bounds of human comprehension. And the serenely beatific rendering of “There is a green hill,” which set the procession of white-robed and bejeweled priests in motion, provoked a melancholy greatly enhanced by the rhythmic measure of shuffling feet. As befitted the occasion, the cross, an upraised symbol of the people’s faith, moved in the van—the multitude representing almost every grade of society followed, chastened, in the clergy’s wake, until arriving at St. Paul’s the massed choirs broke forth in “The hymn of London.”

Now there can be no possible doubt as to the success of this innovation at a time when the London Press is flooded with the adulatory eulogies of the English public has hitherto been ruled in the making of the laws that govern it.

It is questionable whether so large a crowd of laymen could have been induced to enthrone over a mere Good
Friday service at St. Paul\'s divested of the externals produced by the procession. It would appear that the Church is waking up. It is in the throes of a contest wherein its very existence is imperilled. The disestablishment of all stable institutions of the decorative kind is in the air. An institution, whether religious or civil, which is incapable of commanding respect by reason of its reactionary methods, is doomed. A Church unable to retain its following must inevitably be supplanted by some more comprehensive system. For in these days of advanced thought all institutions are compelled by force of circumstances to show some valid excuse for their continued existence.

If, therefore, bishops, priests, and deacons of the Church of England will make further processional effort so as to prove in the throes of a contest wherein its very existence is in the air. An institution, institutions are compelled by force of circumstances to show some valid excuse for their continued existence. His lordship will be induced to continue to make further processional effort does not begin and end with dull sermons and set prayers, I venture to assert that the newly-awakened interest must, as a natural consequence, result in at least fewer empty pews.

The Bishop of London should hence be flattered by the success of his enterprise, and it is to be hoped that his lordship will be induced to continue to "process" with discrimination in the interests of the people who are gradually drifting into a state of mental apathy and contempt for the institution which his lordship so ably represents.

Notes on the Bologna Congress.

By T. E. Hulme.

BOLOGNA, April 7.

I.

One may hold two very different views as to the value of congresses in general. One of these views is always associated in my mind with a simple-minded Scotch undergraduate I knew at Cambridge, whose constant topic of conversation at dinner in hall was the extra-ordinary progress that would take place in science if only the leading people in mathematics and physics could be got together in conference. If only Larmor, Poincaré, J. J. Thomson, Kelvin, and the rest of them could be put together in one room for a month, the exchange of views would solve the problem. It was a real trouble to the poor fellow that the attempt had never been made. I believe that at night, turning over on his pillow for the last time before sleep overcame him, he was lost in amazed wonder that the scandal of the ether\'s dubious position had been allowed to go on, year by year, when such a simple thing would have finished the matter once and for all.

To show that this congressomani is by no means confined to youth, I can give another example of its ravages. At the last annual meeting of the Aristotelian Society, a member raised an objection to the variety of the subjects proposed for discussion in the following year. Let the society take some pressing subject like the number of such attitudes is, of course, decided for you by metaphysics itself, but by other circumstances. Generally in discussing metaphysic limits of one\'s first concept. But in this case fate made want to drag out, and so one never passes outside the limits of one\'s first concept. But in this case fate made me a perfect listener, for while I understood him perfectly, I had not spoken French for so long that all my uprisings of interruption were stilled automatically before utterance. The result was that I was extremely impressed. Previously, while I enjoyed reading him, yet I always thought "Bovarysme" to be a paradoxical though interesting position. While I admired the dialectic by which it was supported, I had not found it at all "inevitable." But since meeting him I have formed a much clearer and more definite conception of his philosophy. This different view I now take of De Gaultier. I can only explain when I have first indicated my rather sceptical opinion of philosophy. Metaphysics for me is not a science but an art—the art of completely expressing certain attitudes which one may take up towards the cosmos. What attitude you do take up is not decided for you by metaphysics itself, but by other things. The number of such attitudes is, of course, necessarily limited—like the four traditional ones. It is not an attitude which many people can take up, but for those who take it De Gaultier has written the complete metaphysic. I cannot express how intensely I admire the logical consistency with which it is all worked out.
In so far as philosophers are still peripatetic and like to walk the road gesticulating, Bologna seems to be the ideal place for them to meet in.

Walking about its streets for the first time, this evening, I would further and say that it is one of the few real towns still left on this earth. There is a great misconception as to what really constitutes a town. The usual idea is that city and country are a pair of opposites, and that the progress of events tends to spread the one and destroy the other. Nothing of the kind. The country is not the raw material out of which the town has been evolved. In the beginning was something I can vaguely call desert. Out of this matrix at one period of history evolved two perfect relatives of artificial and deliberate construction: the compact walled town, and the country. That was the ideal State. Now the period of decadence has set in, as you get it, for example, in South Kensington, is fully back to the state of desert again. Well, in so far as a street is to be a street, i.e., a place for strolling and talking in, and not a railway, Bologna seems to me to be the perfect town. It is all compact of little piazzas flanked by arcades, and never a broad straight street or an open vista whose place you find, then to you may never see it, the bracing feeling of a disciplinary wall keeping it up to the ideal pitch of town I require, and never allowing it to sprawl into desert. It is a quadrangle and cloister raised to the highest vista in the whole place. You feel always, though you are sitting in the hotel this morning, writing letters, included, as an essential feature, the possession of large and sweeping brown cloaks, then I will be a democrat.

I have now to chronicle what is perhaps the most important event that has yet happened to a philosopher. I was sitting in the hotel this morning writing letters, and was vaguely conscious of the noise of bands in the background. I hurriedly left the hotel and rushed to the square. Lining certain streets were troops with enormous numbers of firemen which guarded us later. I missed a spectacle I shall never see again. I heard words I shall often hear again—I left the real world and entered that of Reality. Then again, there would be much talk inside of the "all" and the "whole," and of the harmony of the concert of the cosmos, and I do not believe in the existence of these things. I am a pluralist, and to see soldiers for a pluralist should be a symbolic philosophic drama. There is no Unity, no Truth, but forces which have different aims, and whose whole reality consists in those differences. To the rationalist this is an absolutely horrible position.

There is one Truth, one Good. It is for this reason that the conception of nationality and everything connected with it appears so extraordinarily irrational to the intellectual. He simply cannot conceive that these are not one truth, but different truths which win or lose. But however symbolic my remaining outside in the street might have been as an assertion of my belief, yet the stage was hardly large enough, the limelight was lamentably absent. Time passed and here was I presenting this spectacle of indecision on the pavement. Finally inward ridicule decided the thing. To cross Europe with the sole purpose of attending a congress, and then to watch a procession instead, would be too much of a comic spectacle. To my lasting regret I went in. I missed a spectacle I shall never see again. I heard words I shall often hear again—I left the real world and entered that of Reality.

At least, I thought I had, but I was mistaken in thinking of myself as a reversed Faust. There was plenty of the world inside. I passed along long corridors, under many arches, and supporting each arch were several police, and the soldiers of the heavy cavalry type and firemen. I shall return to the subject of the enormous number of firemen which guarded us later. I finally reached the Salla di seduti generale. My general impression is that of a huge hall, forming the drapery of the platform, and a regular garden of extraordinary hats; great numbers of pretty women—surely this cannot be the world of "Reality"—I do hope they are not philosophers; and then, vaguely, some drums heard outside.
The Unidea'd Fabian.

By J. M. Kennedy.

During the last twenty-five years the Fabian Society has made it its professed object to preach Socialism in England, under the guise of an Educational Society. For the last fifteen years of this period it has been in the front to-day. This cannot be denied by anyone who has his finger on the pulse of the public. It may be true that Socialism is more talked about now than it was ten years or so ago; but it was also very much in evidence in the early eighties, before the Fabian Society came into existence. The Fabian Society's distorted history and crude economics, "made up as we went along," as Mr. Pease ingenuously confesses in the magazine article to which I referred in The New Age a couple of weeks ago, would appear to have produced little appreciable effect.

There is thus evidently something wrong somewhere, and in seeking to know what it is, we must remember that the Fabians, in vaunting the virtues of Socialism, invariably made a point of showing that this new form of government would raise the status of the workers. This, indeed, is the main feature of any reform propaganda. The workmen are to have more money and fewer hours, in order that they may "get more out of life" and raise their standard of living. What, then, was one of the main features of the Fabian propaganda for the achievement of this end? In "T. P.'s Magazine," for March the secretary of the Society, Mr. E. R. Pease, lets us into the secret:

The Labour Party, which the Society asked for in 1894, when it urged that Trade Unions and Trade Councils should form a political party of their own, raise a fund, and run fifty candidates for Parliament, has come into being, has raised its Parliamentary fund, and ran precisely 50 candidates at the election of 1906. The astonishing success of 29 of them has made all England talking about Socialism, and the Socialist societies were flooded with new recruits, and their bank accounts laden with unexpected gold. The Fabian Society, which for a decade had had some 700 or 800 members, had in three years tripped in numbers, and spread out in all sorts of new ways.

So there you are. Socialism was talked about more, but its realisation was as far off as ever. The usual crowd of contemptible intellectual loungers and curiosity-seekers, the types who rush in one age to listen to the teachings of Plotinus, and who in another age take to writing learned pamphlets on free-will and predestination, naturally flocked to the Fabian Society, whose banking account was laden with unexpected gold. But what of the workmen?

Wages statistics, which are within the reach of everyone, show that workmen's earnings, fluctuating considerably during the eighties, rose steadily from about 1893 (when a Labour Department was formed under the Board of Trade) to 1899 or 1900, when they tended on the whole to remain stationary. From about 1902 or 1903 to the present date wages have either actually fallen or remained stationary, although the cost of living has increased in the meantime, and profits have also gone up. So that from about 1900 onwards the position of the workman in this country has steadily deteriorated. Why? Because, strange though it may seem to the casual reader, and inexplicable though it will assuredly seem to the Fabians, the Labour Party had not the force in politics—a force of no great weight, certainly; but an influence, nevertheless.

While it is true that a large number of Labour men had been returned at the 1906 election, their influence was felt in Parliament before then. Mr. Keir Hardie had sat in the 1892-3 House of Commons; but he did not count at that time, because neither Socialism nor Labour had become acute political problems. But in 1900 Mr. Keir Hardie returned to the House, where he was joined by another Labour member, Mr. Richard Bell, and shortly afterwards, I believe, by Independent Unionist Labour man, Mr. Sloan. As the Balfour Government drew to a close, I am under the impression that this small Labour party was slightly reinforced. It was from about 1900 onwards, therefore, that Labour men first thrust themselves forward in the House of Commons, and it was at this time that the question of Socialism arose. What, then, had the Labour leaders been doing previously to 1900 to account for a steady increase in wages from 1892 to 1897?

This is no very recalcitrant question. In the nineteen the Labour leaders had been paying attention to their proper duty, namely, the organisation of Trade Unions, Trade Union Funds, and, more important still from the workmen's point of view, Trade Union agitation. When the Labour leaders left their Unions for Parliament a spirit of apathy fell over the entire Trade Union movement. Inexperienced as these well-meaning but uninstructed Labour leaders were, they did not know, and they were slow to recognise, that what the House of Commons, or rather the Government, gave with one hand it could take away with the other.

If this statement be questioned, an instance or two will suffice to prove it. Take the Bills for the Feeding of Necessitous Children. There were certain districts around London where, when these measures were applied, wages were owed a decided check. On one occasion, too, the House voted £200,000 for the relief of unemployment. This sum was duly distributed, and in the localities where it was distributed wages fell. It would be possible for me to take several similar measures, only possibly more conclusive, which I have not space to give, and to show that they really left the poor poorer. It would not be such a difficult task, either, to show that this result followed from Labour interference in Parliament, whereas Labour agitation through the former Trade Union channel would most probably have had quite the reverse effect.

Who, however, were foremost in recommending that Labour should be represented in Parliament, and who, therefore, are directly responsible for the impoverishment of the poor? Why, the members of the Fabian Society.

If we pursue our enquiry a little further and endeavour to ascertain why there should have been such a colossal blunder on the part of the Fabians, we shall not have far to seek for an explanation. The Fabians have never had any conception of what the State should be. They never appear to have doubted for a moment that the State must necessarily be the result of an economical system—i.e., economics first, politics second. Apart from this, the Fabian Society has always been of a crude variety, we may see here how they made an egregious blunder at the very start. Knowing nothing of political science, they began their work at the wrong end. Nay, if someone had ventured to mention political science to them they would doubtless have answered in a unanimous chorus, that they could make it up as they went along—and call it Pragmatism, in accordance with Mr. Pease's jocular confession.

There are one or two other points in Mr. Pease's article which may have an opportunity of dealing with again. Why, for instance, when the portraits of so many nonentities are put in, is the portrait of Mr. Hubert Bland, the treasurer himself, left out? Why is Mr. Granville Barker on the executive? Because of length of service, or of his bountiful subscriptions to the society, or merely log-rolling? And why, again, does Mr. Pease lay himself open to attack by referring to the fact that the "Fabian women have their mysteries, like Greeks of old, which no man is permitted to profane"? After all, the arrant trumpets of scholars like Bell, Meister, and Stengel, I think Mr. Pease would find it difficult to name a Greek mystery in which both men and women did not take part, setting aside, of course, those confined to men only. Let it be remembered, too, that the Greek mysteries were far more limited in the number of their members, and that we have never had any conception of what the State should be. They never appear to have doubted for a moment that the State must necessarily be the result of an economical system—i.e., economics first, politics second. Apart from this, the Fabian Society has always been of a crude variety, we may see here how they made an egregious blunder at the very start. Knowing nothing of political science, they began their work at the wrong end. Nay, if someone had ventured to mention political science to them they would doubtless have answered in a unanimous chorus, that they could make it up as they went along—and call it Pragmatism, in accordance with Mr. Pease's jocular confession.

There are one or two other points in Mr. Pease's article which may have an opportunity of dealing with again. Why, for instance, when the portraits of so many nonentities are put in, is the portrait of Mr. Hubert Bland, the treasurer himself, left out? Why is Mr. Granville Barker on the executive? Because of length of service, or of his bountiful subscriptions to the society, or merely log-rolling? And why, again, does Mr. Pease lay himself open to attack by referring to the fact that the "Fabian women have their mysteries, like Greeks of old, which no man is permitted to profane"? After all, the arrant trumpets of scholars like Bell, Meister, and Stengel, I think Mr. Pease would find it difficult to name a Greek mystery in which both men and women did not take part, setting aside, of course, those confined to men only. Let it be remembered, too, that the Greek mysteries were far more limited in the number of their members, and that we have never had any conception of what the State should be. They never appear to have doubted for a moment that the State must necessarily be the result of an economical system—i.e., economics first, politics second. Apart from this, the Fabian Society has always been of a crude variety, we may see here how they made an egregious blunder at the very start. Knowing nothing of political science, they began their work at the wrong end. Nay, if someone had ventured to mention political science to them they would doubtless have answered in a unanimous chorus, that they could make it up as they went along—and call it Pragmatism, in accordance with Mr. Pease's jocular confession.
Only a Halfpenny!
By William Poel.

The contents of a costermonger's barrow on a Bank Holiday afford, to the casual observer, a curious study in economics. It is difficult to realise how food is supplied so cheaply to hundreds of day-trippers who spend the whole of their pastime on a public common some miles from home. The margin of profit to be made from this kind of trading is extremely small, and but for the cheapness of the raw material the costers' occupation would cease altogether.

Those who are in the habit of watching, year by year, a Bank Holiday incursion upon a suburban common may have noticed the gradual improvement taking place in the habits of the people, and this is especially noticeable in regard to their dealings with costermongers. Perhaps education is at last beginning to influence even the poorest and least provident, with the result that Bank Holiday is becoming less of an orgy than formerly. Besides, it is dawning gradually upon holiday-trippers that money, if not spent in the public-house, can go further in other ways. With more halfpennies to spend, a larger business is done off the barrows, and in this way new tastes are formed, while the supply of provisions exposed for sale on the barrows on the spot with fresh lemons and sold for a halfpenny to make you laugh. Pineapple, taken out of tins, a halfpenny, cocoa-nuts, twopence each, or a glass. Conspicuous upon the sweet-stalls is the bottle, the wholesale manufacturers driving their common to distribute what is wanted there to the bar for another quart when the quaffing is repeated as before. But the Bank Holiday workman little realises what an unprofitable bargain he is making for himself and his fellows in thus spending his money. Out of every twenty shillings which crosses the publican's counter in exchange for beer, the amount that goes to the workman who brews it does not exceed eighteen pence, whilst with other manufactured articles the proportion spent on wages is far less. Admitting that a "roaring business" is done in the public house from morning to night on a Bank Holiday, and that the money-takings quadruple those obtained by the whole of the costers, yet in the distribution of labour the profit to the coster is not more than a fraction of the fifty odd toilers at work on the other side of the road. Thus the British workman unconsciously puts wealth into the pockets of those who give him the least in return for it. But the advent of the Tea-stall on public commons will, before long, effect a revolution in the profits of the beer trade. The most casual observer must realise that to spend three halfpence on tea and a slice of excellent cake and keep fourpence halfpenny in the pocket to spend elsewhere, is more worth having than is six pennypo of stout.

Perhaps the comestibles on the barrows do not look particularly tempting to the fastidious, nor do the low prices inspire confidence in "purity and cleanliness," still, with no flour tax and a reduced imposition on sugar there is a reasonable probability that the articles are genuine. In time it is hoped the Government may realise the need of having women inspectors employed on Bank Holidays to warn children, in the parks and public commons, from buying or eating unwholesome food. A quite small child was seen eating the rind of a melon. The regulation, too, with regard to children and public houses is very little observed on these occasions. Parents who are hardly in a fit state to understand what they are doing should not be allowed to give their children beer.
An Englishman in America.

By Juvenal.

Dr. Aked has shaken the gold dust of Fifth Avenue off his feet and has betaken himself to the Golden Gate, which is just as good, if not better, while some people here are asking what difference exists between the Church in New York and the Church in San Francisco. There is a difference, which I know from actual experience. It is this: In New York Church religion is a "pose"; in San Francisco it is a half between dogma and spiritual nescience.

* * *

The denizens of the religious barnyards of 'Frisco are quite satisfied with crumbs, but they sometimes peck at the fruits of the spirit. At a pinch they will swallow the pips of repentance, as they did after the earthquake and the fire, but the ostriches of Wall Street are not debonair enough for mere crumbs, or the seeds of faith, or anything of the kind; they feed on nuggets mixed with nails from the Steel Trust on week days and digest them while listening to the Sunday sermon and the music.

* * *

In New York the rich like to be seen at church. In San Francisco people are too independent to care about religious appearance. Dr. Aked will run against a wall of agnostic spiritists which will astonish his orthodox prejudices if he happens to have any left. The 'Frisco people, both rich and poor, slip through the cracks of creeds like eels through the fingers. They revel in freedom of conscience as they revel in sunshine and balmy airs from the Pacific. A Simon Pure English preacher in California would give the impression of an interesting relic from the "Old Curiosity Shop," and people would go out to see a reed shaken by the wind.

* * *

On the Pacific Coast religious pretence is played out. Nowhere are religious 'isms so fatal to effective work. San Francisco contains only 12,000 Protestant Church members out of a population of 500,000. Dr. Aked experienced an awakening in New York; in San Francisco he will be knocked down by crude facts, spumed off by the bottle holders, picked by the pew holders, and ignored by the vast majority of the inhabitants, who bask, not in the "sunbeams of divine righteousness," but in the sunbeams of a blue sky.

* * *

The second volume of the Collected Works of Ambrose Bierce has now appeared. The climate of San Francisco had much to do with the development of the incomparable verve and wit displayed by Ambrose Bierce in his "Prattle" column which appeared every week for several years in the San Francisco "Examiner." Senator Hearst, the millionaire owner of the paper, had much to do with the free hand of the Bierce wit. It takes genius to know genius. The whole secret lies there. Dull editors create dull scribblers, who are read by dull readers. If Senator Hearst never did anything but print the "Prattle" of Bierce the Senator would have covered himself with glory.

* * *

The portrait of Ambrose Bierce which has appeared makes most other portraits that one sees in the papers and magazines look like back numbers of temperance weeklies. Such a head takes the shine off the Roosevelts or the Joe Cannons, who, in comparison, look as if they knew only a little about most things and not much about anything in particular. The eyes in the Bierce portrait make one think of two electric lights attached to a charge of dynamite. Among the public men in England John Burns has such an eye.

* * *

Take the Senators and Members of Congress at Washington; how cousinly the majority look! Yet they come from some of the oldest parts of America. Some of the Republicans look like traps baited with cheese for Democratic rodents. Some of the Democrats look like bear-traps yawning for Wall Street varmints. The portraits of the political bosses make exceedingly interesting studies. The hardness of the eyes rivals the hardness of the mouth in most cases, and it is a question which part of the face is the more forbidding, the hard slit between the jaws, or the two staring eyeballs which look, in many instances, as if they had seen the ghosts of divorced wives, angry constituents and indignant mothers-in-law. The stare is concrete. When frozen stiff it will bear skating.

* * *

The weakness of the American man is specialism. If he is a financier he knows nothing but the ups and downs of the money market. If he is a lawyer he can only talk or write on law. If he is a politician he is an expert in politics. These specialists are, as a rule, quite ignorant of anything outside their particular hobby. One cause of divorce is the general superiority of the American women over the men. As a rule the women know from three to four times as much as the men. The wife soon begins to tire of the platitudes of the husband. She tires of his hardness, his routine existence, his unromantic sentiments, his lack of art. The average New York husband seated among a company of New York women is like a porpoise out of water.

* * *

The pretensions of the typical scientist surpass comprehension. On one hand there is a shallow realism, on the other dense ignorance of the first principles of science. Even on this ground the women know more than the men. Indeed, when one sees the portraits of some of these wonderful scientists one is reminded of nothing so much as a gallery of Mormon elders. Dense fanatical superstition with intellectual viciousness added. Every day some member of this amusing tribe does his best to palm off on the public a new freak-theory of insanity or so-called degeneration. According to these gentry the whole community is made up of degenerates excepting themselves.

* * *

But for the American women, America might be swallowed up by the machine-brain specialist, the calculating human thinking clock, and everything that pertains to human machinery. When you see an American who knows three or four things, he is an editor or an artist, or a cosmopolitan author. The concentration which many of the politicians, financiers and business men bring to bear on one idea is astounding and appalling. Nowhere in Europe, not even in Berlin, are such money-mania faces to be seen. In Berlin the successful business man relaxes during a good part of the day. In the evening he becomes like other human beings; he has feeling and sentiment like the great majority around him. Not so with the typical machine-thinker in America. He cannot escape from himself. He is always conscious of the thing that holds him with the grip of death.

* * *

The self-made financier, no matter how great his wealth, is never unique. Because all the others are just like him. When one dies another takes his place and all goes on as before. It is an error to talk of the machine money-makers as great personalities. They are not original. It is the artist who displays originality. Even the people know this, for they cease to talk of the big wire-pullers and railroad kings as soon as they are dead, while the writers and artists of genius are continually discussed, living as well as dead.
Take the late David Graham Phillips. His books and his genius are being discussed as never before. He was creative in a sense in which no great financier of our day is. The Banker and the Trust makers cause a lot of gossip and talk. But they cannot set going "waves" of thought. To use the words of the witty Editor of "Current Literature," such people may be "masters of meed" but they are not masters of ideas."

There is a movement beginning in New York which will prove as epoch making as that of the French Encyclopedists in 1751. Even now this movement has the upper hand. It is going to force the financiers to stop and take stock in the wave which, if they are not mindful in time, will sweep them off their feet. One need not be a prophet to predict what is on the way. Up to the present New York and all the other great cities have been dominated by the intellect of finance. The time has come for the domination of philosophy, art, literature, and reason. This movement will not be tied to the apron-strings of any fixed party or any set of cut-and-dried principles. It will extract the best from everything, while avoiding the provincial and the insular.

Uncritized Opinions.

A Ventured Commentary.

That was a remarkably beautiful poem The New Age published last week.

I fancy that neither all its beauty nor all its meaning appears on a single reading, and who nowadays reads a new poem twice?

I have read it myself many times already, but I confess there are still several passages and phrases which have so far refused to yield up their meaning.

Have you sufficiently considered what used to be called the Argument, do you think? An Ode, you know, is a lyrical discourse and must be as rigorously articulated as an Oration. Wordsworth's famous Ode, for example, might almost be reduced to syllogisms, so strictly reasoned is it. He falls away, at the last, into sentiment perhaps, and there is not enough drama in it to suit my liking. But both he and Dryden knew so strictly reasoned is it. I have read it myself many times already, but I confess there are still several passages and phrases which have so far refused to yield up their meaning.

Have you sufficiently considered what used to be called the Argument, do you think? An Ode, you know, is a lyrical discourse and must be as rigorously articulated as an Oration. Wordsworth's famous Ode, for example, might almost be reduced to syllogisms, so strictly reasoned is it. He falls away, at the last, into sentiment perhaps, and there is not enough drama in it to suit my liking. But both he and Dryden knew so strictly reasoned is it. I have read it myself many times already, but I confess there are still several passages and phrases which have so far refused to yield up their meaning.

Certainly. And now can you throw some light on the darker passages? For example, I do not doubt that the introduction of the classical stories by name is quite deliberate; but I would like to be sure that I have not missed anything. The Ariadne and Dionysos episode, for instance?

You realise, of course, the place of the classic stories in the Ode as a whole, since it is from them that the poet expressly derives her inspiration. The Ariadne and Dionysos story is particularly appropriate, and this accounts, no doubt, for the space and importance given to it. For Ariadne sleeping on Naxos Isle and believing herself to be abandoned is a perfect image of the soul newly imprisoned in flesh and feeling itself forsaken. Then you will observe that Ariadne is not really forsaken. First there are the symbols of the coming god which Proserpina lays about her couch; green ivy and a vine-wand. These, if we translate them into the language of the Ode, are the "fair books" and "gracious lore" which for human souls are the symbols of the Cherubim, that is, of Imagination. Finally, there is the coming of the god himself, Dionysos, who, as you know, is the initiating god, the god who breaks the ring of Time. No sooner has Dionysos leapt to the shore for the deliverance of Ariadne than the poet's own inspiration is similarly released. The island ring of Time in which the poet's soul believed itself to be imprisoned is broken, and the visions of the celestial life appear.

Yes, that is all very harmonious, and my impressions agree with your own. Have you the same view, I wonder, of the nature of the beneficent over-rulings which the poet discovered? The "guardant sceptres" referred to are, I take it, the limitation of our capacity for pain and mortality itself.

Exactly. For one could conceive a world in which the capacity for pain had no limit and a suffering life no end. There is no reason, in fact, why our world should not be made in this fashion. Milton's "Hell" was so conceived—why not the earth so created? That limits are fixed both to pain and to mortal life is a gift, as it were, of divine mercy. The natural state has been over-ruled in these things; what might have been simply hell has been redeemed. And this is the poet's assurance.

The conclusion appears to me very fine, namely, that the noblest literature forms the bridge to the imagination.

So it is, and no higher praise of literature can be given. But what cherishing care is necessary to the preservation of these fair books that contain the echoes of the songs of the Cherubim!

I was much delighted, too, with the passage beginning: "A golden bell at early morn." The fancy that a golden bell might tinkle in the morning sun is, I think, not merely picturesque, I think, but true symbols. I mean that if the celestial life could be truly represented these images would be found to be nearest reality. In relation to the Cherubim of music they are represented these images would be found to be nearest reality. In relation to the Cherubim of music they are represented these images would be found to be nearest reality. In relation to the Cherubim of music they are particularly appropriate, more appropriate in my opinion than Yeats's well-known description: "there morning's all a glimmer, and noon a purple glow, and evening full of the linnets' wings."

Why linnets? Exactly. There is nothing inevitable or even very natural about linnets in the evening. However, we need not enter into comparison. All poems are unique.

Some of the phrases in the Ode struck me as being most wonderfully happy: "So near me streamed the Dance Celestial;" "classic bridge"—what a condensation of meaning in that!—"tutelary rhyme," "sceptic day." By the way, did you gather the meaning of "vintaged oar" and "dolphined prow" as applied to Dionysos' boat? "Vintaged," I presume, refers to the fact that the oar of Dionysos was wreathed with vine; and the prow of his boat, you remember, was guarded by symbolic dolphins. But if you are discussing phrases, I cite "sagacious pinion" as a masterstroke. The intelligence of the swallow is in its wings.
Books and Persons.

By Jacob Tennyson.

PURSUING my remarks about the renewed agitation against "The New Machiavelli," I am able to state that the circulation has been greatly increased thereby. The daily sale has risen from twenty copies a day to a hundred copies a day, which is not so bad for a novel over four months old. Seventeen thousand copies have now been sold altogether. The anti-Wells campaign in Manchester has fallen particularly flat. Dr. Moulton, principal of the Theological College at Didsbury, had the misfortune to mar a long and honourable career as a controversialist by a very regrettable letter to the local "Manchester Guardian." He was attacked in his turn, and was wise enough not to stick to his guns. Mr. Wells has nearly finished another long novel. Its title is "Marjorie: A Marriage," and it will be published by Macmillans, probably next January. I believe that the plot turns chiefly upon the question of house-management. The libraries will have no excuse whatever for not selling it; the circulation has been greatly increased thereby.

More than once publishers of the highest rank have suggested to me that I might write a novel dealing with prostitution in London (which proves that not all publishers are afraid of the circulating libraries). And I have been tempted to deal with the theme, which is, in my opinion, a first-class theme, despite the view often expressed to the contrary by mandarins: whose knowledge of the subject is limited to their pessidamoles. But I have not yielded to the temptation, and I do not think I ever shall. The British public is not sufficiently educated, in an artistic sense, to be able to accept such a novel on its merits. A hundred years ago it was, and a hundred years hence it may be again; but at the present time its attitude towards art is, in the main, simply barbaric. Why should we attempt to deceive ourselves? Its attitude towards art is, in the main, simply barbaric. However, every novelist, I am glad to see, has not felt my hesitations about the theme of prostitution. In "A Bed of Roses" (Frank Palmer, 6s.), Mr. W. L. George has written the story of a harlot in London. He does not, as I am glad to see, have felt my hesitations about the theme of prostitution. Mr. George (whose first novel this is) tells his tale with the utmost simplicity and directness, and he cannot be accused of any clumsiness, literary or otherwise. In fact, the book is throughout very skilful. Upon such aspects of the affair as the British public obviously would not understand, Mr. George keeps silence. But then his heroine was much above the average, both in luck and in intelligence, if not in spirit. It is probable that she did not suffer from any of the three great material plagues of her profession—disease, brutality, and blackmailing policemen. She did not launch herself in the said profession until she had honestly tried and honestly failed to make a decent living and retain her health in suadry others. She did not go into it for money; and she emerged from it, scathless and with a competence, after having conscientiously wrung every cent she could out of every man she met. She never lapsed, in her professional relations, from the most perfect egoism, and she did not become averse here again and that was unusual. Nevertheless, the type drawn by Mr. George does exist. "A Bed of Roses" is a very sad novel. Save for a few artificialities of dialogue, it is nearly faultless in its rendering. No woman, harlot or not, ever addressed her servants in such language as this: "From the dizzy heights of trained domesticity, experts in your own line, you are justified in looking down upon me as an unskilled labourer." (By the way, Victoria spoke perhaps truer than she knew, being English!) The fault of the novel is negative. It lacks emotion. And perhaps the reason is that Mr. George has not written from his theme. There is no paramount critical situation in the book; no supreme scene the anticipation and the realisation of which might have enfevered his pen. The central motive is only sordidly financial; had it been passionately financial it might have served adequately. But Victoria was not avaricious.

Nobody with a taste for pure and ingenious literature ought to miss Mr. Ramsay Colles' "The New Machiavelli." It is a mine of delights, quite worthy to be ranked with Professor Gant's unforgettable "Perfect Woe" (Digby, 2s. 6d.), and quite as funny as "The Diary of a Nobody," though infinitely more ingenious. I must quote from it. On July 6, 1891, Mr. Colles, having purchased two bottles of whisky in Clonegall, retired early to bed; I was so mercilessly persecuted by midnight visitors in the shape of agile agitators of whom, one has not derived the verb to flee, that in despair I arose, poured all the whisky into the wash basin, and proceeded to soak my pyjamas in the pure spirit. . . . with the happy result of a total rout of the foe. But it is Mr. Colles' literary reminiscences that deserve the laurel for charm. In his enthusiasm for Wordsworth he 'paid a visit to Lakeland,' and passed a week under the roof of Miss Christpherson. "Miss Christpherson had purchased at a sale a large grandfather's clock, once the property of Wordsworth, and this clock she, to my great delight, permitted me to wind! It was one of the old-fashioned kind. . . ."

Again: "In August, 1902, I contributed an article on Mr. Swinburne's early dramas and poems to 'The Gentleman's Magazine,' a copy of which I left with my card at 'The Pines,' Putney Hill, a deliciously situated residence which has been fully described in his graphic manner by Mr. James Douglas of 'The Star,' newspaper in his fine volume on the life work of our greatest living critic (and as Swinburne himself declared, possibly the greatest of all time), Mr. Theodore Watts-Dunton, B.A., retired to Wimbledon, Thomas Wright, to whom we are indebted for lives of Pater, Edward FitzGerald, Burnaby, and Sir Richard Burton, told me that, calling at 'The Pines' about this time, his hosts mentioned my name, and expressed some interest in 'The Diary of a Gentleman.' Later, Mr. Watts-Dunton, having met me at a sale of the tenants of the delightfully situated residence. "I was shown into a room richly furnished with Chinese carved cabinets and rare old furniture. . . . Mr. Watts-Dunton was the first to greet me, and a little later Mr. Swinburne glided in. Both poets shook hands, Mr. Watts-Dunton with vigour, but Swinburne's hand lay in mine with the pressure of a butterfly." But, "As I am not one of those who jot down other men's utterances in order to make 'copy' of them, I feel there is little I can record here of our conversation. . . . Since that memorable evening in May I have had the honour and pleasure of dining many times at 'The Pines' with both poets, and have partaken of afternoon tea on Sundays."

And I cannot omit this: "Sir Robert [Ball] after a lecture on the stars delivered before a provincial audience, turned to a lad near him (who happened to be my nephew, Robert Beare, now, alas, gone where there is none), "It is a pity that Mr. Colles, who usually gives every detail, should have omitted to state whether it is in heaven or hell that there is no beer, and his authority for the positive pronouncement that in one of these places beer is not found. This solitary carelessness is the one fault of the book, which contains 314
Music.
By Richard Haigh.

My camp was in a rather wild and lonely spot in North-East native territory. There were no other white men about; the nearest village was seventy miles away, and had it not been for my native post-runner, who arrived and left once a week, I might have counted myself out of all touch with the civilised world.

The days were very hot! Work was carried on in the early part of the day and in the evenings—while the sun was high every living thing sought shade and cool—but the nights were all the more enjoyable, and, when there was a moon, there were taken full advantage of. Even on dark nights one would hear the singing of native boys and girls right up to midnight from the kraals dotted about in the hills. Many and many an hour have I sat out at the side of the hut comfortably smoking and listening to the sound of the voices as they were wafted from different ways, and thinking and wishing that amongst the whites—the civilised, advanced people—anything approaching the content and lightness of heart of these natives was to be found.

One moonless night I was sitting at my door and, being quite alone—my native servants had asked permission to attend a beer-drink at a kraal and I had let them go—I was quietly touching the strings of a guitar when an old native came up and saluted me. In answer to my question he told me he had come a long way and was going further and, saying simply that he was tired, asked if he might rest awhile.

"If you are not hungry? He said he was, so I took him to my room andsat down on an empty candle-box and fell into conversation with him.

When he mentioned the name of the village from which he came I was immediately interested. This tribe had, some ten or twelve years earlier, disputed some matter with the whites and had fought to maintain their right. They were defeated, and, the old chief being killed, the victors had taken the young heir, with a few of his juvenile companions, and placed him close to a town where the boy was to be educated in the ways of the white people. Little more than twelve months since the young chief had been sent back to take his place as head of his tribe.

The whites had done their work well—there was no doubt of it! The sprightly, promising little lad that had been christened Daniel by the missionaries—had openly forsaken the ancient circle and had laid the foundations of a four-cornered house; he had also cleared a space in the middle of his village for the erection of a church.

"My father's son—as the upholder of the rites and customs upon which the tribe had grown to being and upon which its welfare as a whole depended. It was common knowledge in those parts that his people had been disappointed in their hopes. Taken young as he had been, the boy was now about twenty years of age, and the years of careful schooling and reputation appeared to have entirely obliterated every trace of the open, free, dignified native air. He was now glib and pert, inclined to look sightingly upon the indunas and men of the council and condescendingly upon the rest of his people. The preachers, while expressing every respect for the old chieftainess and the headmen of the tribe, took good care to advise and direct the young chief in such a way as to make their position always more secure, and, being the teachers appointed by the government, they were supported by the native commissioner of the district. Within a month of his return T'labodi, son of Sefogoli—who, by the way, had been christened Daniel by the missionaries—had openly forsaken the ancient circle and had laid the foundations of a four-cornered house; he had also cleared a space in the middle of his village for the erection of a church.

All this, as I have said, was commonly known through that part and was a subject of much debate and concern amongst the natives.

"Are you not Makalooti?" I asked the old man, "of the house of Sefogoli?"

"I am," he replied, "and I know when you came and asked Magatook's permission to examine and dig in the hill, Latana."

"Which?" I remarked, "you indunas advised the chieftainess to refuse."

"I hope you are not still offended," said my guest; "but I think we were right to refuse. Had you found gold then should we have had no more peace.

"No, no!" he answered, "you don't understand! "At the time I was angry, but I have long since looked at the matter from the top. You were wise in your decision."

The old induna smiled curiously. "You whites are a strange people," he said, thoughtfully.

"But I broke in on his reverie," "what is the news? I have heard that T'labodi has returned and it is said that your brother's child has forgotten his father. I hope there is no trouble in your land."

My visitor finished the meat he was eating and slowly rubbed his fatty fingers on his bare legs before replying; then he spoke as follows, and sometimes with the deepest bitterness:

"Trouble! Yes, there is trouble in our land. You are a white man and you let me rest here and I have eaten your meat, but trouble has come. It travels with him and stays behind him. Although you also came to us with honey on your tongue promising great riches it wanted not a keen eye to see the trouble that was your companion and that would remain with us if we gave you house. When your commissioners and police visit us we know they have not come to bring us anything good; they want money or they want us to work or they have come to punish someone. We have fought and lost and so expect these things, and it is openly done. But now, when your long black-coats have come, your talkers and singers, your wheelers of women and children—ho! this has surprised us. Your guns have shot us down, your generals have divided up our people, but all this could not break up the tribe. It has remained one, and wherever they have been the people have remembered the chief and looked to him. But now our tribe is quivering like a wounded buck. We are divided and uncertain, and when Sefogoli's son is known to be walking the better road he said to the people to fight! It is done by these humming things, these loud talkers!"

It was common knowledge in those parts that his return was taken as a sign that the white man was about to launch the final blow. This thing was regarded as an illusion, a thing that would not last long. It was the last thing that the indunas advised the chieftainess to refuse. It was the last thing that the indunas advised the chieftainess to refuse.
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pointed upwards with a forefinger, shaking his hand in a way common to preachers—and we must not kill them; but to drive them away, as we did you, because the government has sent them with T’labodi and the commissioner has warned us that they must not be molested, and we can no more fight the government. Ah! your government is bitter! It is long since we shook our spears, but it has forgiven nothing. We are to be broken up and scattered and the names of our fathers must be forgotten. We are helpless against such cunning—and mad! but what can we do?

They have sent these teachers with words like the bowing of mild winds to say that we can live in peace and may till our lands without fear. We hear the government is our father and has sent these ministers to give the children schooling and to tell us a new thing where each will sit in his own place and be happy. The snake! The jackals! They cannot talk to men; we see the twisted tongue and prove them liars. No! they work with women and children. They sing with them and make them ashamed that they are not covered all over like white people. They teach the children to put their faces against the ancient rites of our fathers—the circumcision and the way at the sowing. This is our peace—when our children are set against us and our fathers must be forgotten. We are helpless against them, we cannot even drive them away, as we did you, shook our spears, but it has forgiven nothing. We are to be molested, and we can no more fight the government. And the commissioner has warned us that they must not because the government has sent them with T’labodi and the commissioner has warned us that they must not.

Government is our father and has sent these ministers to give the children schooling and to tell us a new thing where each will sit in his own place and be happy. The snake! The jackals! They cannot talk to men; we see the twisted tongue and prove them liars. No! they work with women and children. They sing with them and make them ashamed that they are not covered all over like white people. They teach the children to put their faces against the ancient rites of our fathers—the circumcision and the way at the sowing. This is our peace—when our children are set against us and our fathers must be forgotten. We are helpless against them, we cannot even drive them away, as we did you, shook our spears, but it has forgiven nothing. We are to be molested, and we can no more fight the government. And the commissioner has warned us that they must not because the government has sent them with T’labodi and the commissioner has warned us that they must not.

Three wives were to come to T’labodi; a daughter of Solapi, a daughter of Pheladi, and a girl from the house of Maloneng, chiefs all and men of great standing. It was spoken by Sefogoli while T’labodi was yet a child. And now we have held many councils with the boy and the mother of the young chief has not neglected the many seen the wisdom of our fathers; and have we not thought of the honour of our house and people ever these teachers have come between us and his church wife has persuaded him against us until we are like to become a scorn in the eyes of these chieftains.

"This is the peace the government has sent us! Already the people are murmuring, and those of the best families will not long sit to be spit upon. Magatook, the boy’s mother, may keep the people together, for the kraals will drift apart; each man will be concerned only with his own house, and when the goats are scattered they become easy prey for the wolf.

"Our house of Furui can be named back from fathers to great-fathers until both hands are finished. We have fought many wars, we have been broken up and tumbled down by families; and the chief has left the children with a few bony men and women of his people, but the tribe has grown again. It has, after every blow, gathered to its chief and become proud and powerful. And now, through our own chief our tale is to be told. We have reached the end and I shall see it, for I am still tall and strong. Blood is not to flow; there is to be no fighting, we cannot defend ourselves. No! we must just sit and watch these babblers, these teachers, break the ties that have held the people together for centuries, and sit as I was don’t know how I jumped at all, for in an instant I took a step towards where we had been standing and sitting as I was don’t know how I jumped at all, but I must have beaten all records, for in an instant I was standing by the wood heap fifteen feet away, guitar still in hand, straining my eyes to the ground about me.

"Light the lamp on the kitchen table," I called, and then, moving very gingerly indeed, I felt for a block of wood.

The position was a ticklish one. Of course we knew that we had a puff-adder to deal with. These reptiles when surprised or alarmed move slowly or lie quite still, and we were sure that our gusty friend was somewhere near about and we could expect to hear from him at any moment.

Keeping my legs quite still I bent over and, peering around, satisfied myself that the creature was not within reach; then I took a step towards where we had been sitting. Straining my eyes through the gloom again I fancied at first that I saw something dark stretched out about five feet from me. I waited a moment, then, as the lamp was not yet forthcoming (the old man had to blow the fire to a flame to light it) and I thought I detected a movement in the shadow before me, I took careful aim, threw the block with all my force, and jumped backwards immediately. I could not see what had happened, and stood very uncomfortably where I landed. A moment after Makalooti came out with the little lamp flickering.

We saw the snake stretched, to our immense relief. I had not been mistaken, and my aim had been true. The brute lay with its back broken and was dispatched by the old man striking it on the head with his stick. It proved to be a full-grown puff-adder—certainly a very ugly customer to have to do with in the dark.

I was wondering a bit when the induna expressed my thoughts by saying, "It came to the music of your strings." "Yes," I said, "it must have been a good way off when we heard it first," for the whishing sounds we had heard had been made by the reptile as he slowly approached us.

We discussed the incident for a while, then having shown my guest where he could sleep he drew his blankets round him and ended the conversation with rather a meanly customer to have to do with in the dark.
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Drama.

By Ashley Dukes.

“The Fanny’s First Play” (Little Theatre).

Criticism, it would seem, has been forestalled. “Fanny’s First Play” is at once a drama and a comment. It is a sermon and a topical revue, a manifesto and an impertinence, an apologia and a revenge. A drama for the emasculated, a lampoon for the curious, a sermon for the elect, an impertinence for the dull, an apologia for the author and a revenge upon the critics of the day. The whole, with its induction, three acts and epilogue, is presented in sandwich form; as complete a meal and as unsatisfying. (A vegetarian sandwich, it may be noted.) The critics who discussed the play upon the stage during the epilogue were quite illuminating from their various standpoints, although upon the whole a trifle inclined to leniency. They remarked, for example, that it was vastly amusing and intolerably wearisome; that it was undeniably original and dreadfully hackneyed; that it showed feeling and lacked passion; that it was brazen and timid, earnest and flippant; and so on. All this is so true that there remains little to be said. Four critics took part in the debate, and the breadth of their generalisations exhausted the subject. The rest can do no more than adapt themselves to the new part of showman-guide, and, like Mr. Trotter of the “Times,” “record an impression.” So be it. Let us enter the museum of dramatic curiosities. The visit shall be personally conducted.

How to begin? “Ahem! Ladies and gentlemen, we have here a remarkable specimen of contemporary drama. It is described upon the playbill, you will observe, as an easy play for a little theatre. ‘Easy’ may be taken to mean facile; the ‘little theatre’ refers to the limited audience. But such limitations cannot perturb the indirection of intellectual nourishment, which exhibits to the West End the manners and customs of Denmark Hill. Bad manners? Perhaps. That, again, matters little. I need hardly remind you that the suburb of Denmark Hill has already been immortalised in “The Madras House.” If the nourishment is forthcoming, we need not enquire into its source. The present work is manufactured from ideas of guaranteed freshness. How fresh? I cannot tell you precisely, madam. They have been gathered within the past fifteen years. I beg your pardon? Yes, a little salt has been added. It conceals the flavour. The anonymous author.

But stay. This tone must cease. The anonymous author may himself be one of the immortals. Such lapses have been known. And, in any case, “contemporary drama” will never do. The epilogue and the morning newspaper have summed up the effect of “Fanny’s First Play” upon the public mind at the moment. The critic as showman-guide must try to realise its effect upon posterity. Impartiality can only be achieved when a truth has ceased to be labelled. Impartiality may be taken to mean facile induction, epilogue and all, is an immensely entertaining practical joke; that if we test it by measuring the volume of laughter it creates, as the author insists that we must, it is far more successful than “Getting Married” or “Misalliance”; that with all its vices it is never in the least pretentious; and that it is, in fact, a pleasant, easy little play for a little theatre. It calls for no denunciation, for it is all as benevolent as the good footman Juggins or his counterpart, the waiter in “You Never Can Tell.” Requiescat in pace.

Art.

By Hunly Carter.

Men are busy adding one more chapter to the Book of Prophecy which lies open on the threshold of the new age. This may be the meaning of the two noticeable things connected with Blake at the present moment. One is the bewildering output of works on the poet-painter; the other the fact that it is no longer fashionable in enlightened circles to regard Blake as an entertaining fanatic. It may be prophetic. In the present, revaluation of all forms of human thought and action it may be that the race is placing a new value on art and poetry, on imagination and symbolism, on the heroic and inspiring, on the ideal as the ecstatic form of the idea. It may be that we are living under some remission at his treatment by the dramatic critics. References to the authority of Aristotle, coupled with the name of a Mr. Trotter, support this conclusion. This Mr. Trotter seems to have had a counterweight among the critics of the day and to have laid down some rules of drammaturgy with which the author very naturally disagreed. He appears, with three other critics, Mr. Vaughan, Mr. Gunn, and Mr. Flannery, as a personage of the induction. These gentlemen have been summoned to the country house of a romantic nobleman, in order to attend the private performance of a play written by the nobleman’s daughter Fanny. Fanny is a member of the Cambridge University Fabian Society, an offshoot of a body to which frequent references are made in the dramatic literature of the day, apparently for the sake of advertisement. Her play deals, somewhat weirdly, with a family of supermen, with the suburb of Denmark Hill has already been immortalised in “The Madras House.” The critics of the day and to have laid down some rules of drammaturgy with which the author very naturally disagreed. He appears, with three other critics, Mr. Vaughan, Mr. Gunn, and Mr. Flannery, as a personage of the induction. These gentlemen have been summoned to the country house of a romantic nobleman, in order to attend the private performance of a play written by the nobleman’s daughter Fanny. Fanny is a member of the Cambridge University Fabian Society, an offshoot of a body to which frequent references are made in the dramatic literature of the day, apparently for the sake of advertisement. Her play deals, somewhat weirdly, with a family of supermen, with the suburb of Denmark Hill has already been immortalised in “The Madras House.” The critics of the day and to have laid down some rules of drammaturgy with which the author very naturally disagreed. He appears, with three other critics, Mr. Vaughan, Mr. Gunn, and Mr. Flannery, as a personage of the induction. These gentlemen have been summoned to the country house of a romantic nobleman, in order to attend the private performance of a play written by the nobleman’s daughter Fanny. Fanny is a member of the Cambridge University Fabian Society, an offshoot of a body to which frequent references are made in the dramatic literature of the day, apparently for the sake of advertisement. Her play deals, somewhat weirdly, with a family of supermen, with
realities (so-called). That [Blake] was inspired by heroic ideals and lived in an age when artists were not bound to scrappy productions, but sought to carry out monumental conceptions, is clear from the reprint of Mr. C. Heron's "Willow Blake" (Duckworth's Library of Art, 5s.). The artist that drew the many marvellous designs which this book contains could have only been the centre of an heroic movement, inspired by the Greek as his contemporaries, Flaxman, Fuseli, and the rest, were inspired, and as he appears to have inspired men that came after him.

Blake's soaring imagination, feeling for big form, amazing sense of life and movement were the outcome to have inspired men that came after him. Judging by some of his designs, especially the aspiring form of artistic work might he give a new valuation? Scenery may be gathered from the designs to Thorn- tion of Blake as an artist of the theatre. His volume is impressive and unique.

Mr. de Selincourt is not concerned with the resurrection of Blake as an artist of the theatre. His volume is designed to criticise and value the eighteenth-century author maintains, Blake was mad then his mystical imagination and weirdness, and places them before us, thoughts must be placed to the account of insanity, and the experimenting with light and colour—was not understood in Blake's time? But Blake would do nothing so foolish as to hate Impressionism, or if he did he would simply hate himself. He was just as great an Impressionist as the post-Impressionists. Blake put down what he saw, and his constant words were, I did so because "The spirit told me." Like the post-Impressionists, he had his impression of life. Like Swedenborg, his field of impression was heaven. He saw deities and angels and recorded them in Greek and Hebrew forms. Was not Blake an Impressionist when he went out into the field and saw Beelzebub or somebody sitting on a tree? Of course, Mr. Chesterton from his point of view of art and sanity would call Blake mad just as he would worthy dreams of some late visitors. Nor is Mr. Chesterton more convincing where he speaks of the lasting influence of Blake on Blake, "who remained a Flaxmanite to the day of his death," who followed the "principles of the artistic vision" and "a fanatic on the subject of the firm line," But at least in one thing Blake did not follow Flaxman. If we are to believe Mr. Chesterton; that Flaxman avoided "perspective really is the comic element in things," Blake did not avoid them. On the contrary, Blake owed everything to perspective and foreshortening, all the life and movement of his drawings. Let Mr. Chesterton look at "The Eagle," a magnificent drawing full of everything that one wants; there is nothing else but foreshortening. Let him turn to "The Selfhood of Deceit" and note the foreshortening in the central figure, the bigness of the body, and the comparative smallness of the arms and head. And if Flaxman had been little or nothing he would have shortened how did he manage it if "he would admit no line into a modern picture that might have been on a Greek bas-relief." But there is no need to continue. The value of the little book is in its really fine selection of illustrations. The text is merely an example of Mr. Chesterton's exercising his powers of paradox and contradiction. It never rises with Blake's aspiring spirit "To the Evening Star," and one never hears the voice of the inspired poet who sang:

Smile on our loves, and whilst thou drawest round,

The curtains of the sky, scatter thy dew
On every flower that closes with the sun.

In timely sleep. Let thy west wind sleep on

The lake; speak silence with thy glimmering eye

And wash the dusky with silver.
In Hospital: A Revere.

By Herbert Hughes

It is a whole month since I have been to a concert or a play; the Sister has just now reminded me how long it is since I came in. Even now confused memoirs of concerts and anesthetics and plays and visitors' teas play pitch-and-toss through my brain, and this house has become one vast epic operation and this room one long unfinished symphony. . . . My green-painted room is on the ground floor and past my windows with their close-drawn muslin curtains moves part of the motley procession of life. I cannot see much of it—only the dim outlines of mysterious unknown figures, of phantom cars and carriages, moving swiftly and nervously anywhere and nowhere. Now and then a ponderous wagon lurches itself with a curse out of the way of some shrill, important taxi, and the irrelevant knock of a postman at the door of a house opposite is the only comment. . . . It may be because I can see so little of the life that passes by me that I can hear in this street the motifs of a thousand operas. Errand boys pass my window whistling phrases that remind me at one moment of the abrupt music of "Till Eulenspiegel" and at the next of some impulsive rhythm in "Carmen"; and someone evidently cleaning windows or airing a room across the street moves the reluctant sashes up and down every day since I have been here to a tune that has been borrowed from "L'Apres-midi d'un Faune." It is not every window that is so fastidious in its taste; but we are in the neighbourhood of Portland Place, and the Queen's Hall is only a few yards away. Here the pin迢red servant-maid's, shrieking at the street-doors for cabs, employ the phrase the "walkûrï" repeat so often on the uncomfortable heights of Walhalla; and the very milkcans this morning, each tuned to a different pitch, rattled out the motif of the "Flying Dutchman"; and I wondered if the flying Dutchman were again prowling the highways of the world in search of a bride. Or perhaps he is on the seas once more trying to round the Horn, for he only did that in rough weather, and to-night it is very stormy. . . . Someone told me it has been raining—I did not know; but I can hear the great crescendos of the wind with the sudden lulls that Beethoven was so fond of. An hour ago, before the wind became so fierce, a poor man was singing at the corner of the street. He was only a few yards away and I could hear that he was singing some air out of "Maritana." His voice was once beautiful, but he must have been an oldish man, for nobody sings with a theme from "Till Eulenspiegel" nowadays. And he must have known it well, for I can see it in all the horror of its last journey, feeble and debauched, glowering at virtue with a still lascivious eye, and reeling its drunken way up the rocky slopes of some Irish shore? For it is then that the ancient oligarchy of Aran will sit in judgment of its career will be passed in review, its qualities will perish miserably. And on the seventh day I know the last irrevocable will be defiled by rude contact with human life, when I know that its progress is a Rake's Progress, when I can see it in all the horror of its last journey, feeble and dejected, glittering at virtue with a still lascivious eye, and reeling its drunken way up the rocky slopes of some Irish shore? For it is then that the ancient oligarchy of Aran will sit in judgment; it is then that its career will be passed in review, its qualities and defects as a law-abiding song discussed with lofty seriousness, opposed and defended as in a court of law. And on the seventh day I know the last irrevocable sentence will be passed: that it may never again be sung by mortal lips. And then, and not till then, it will perish miserably.

The table beside my bed there lies a gift that has been my most faithful distraction during many tedious nights and days. The friend who has provided me with chrysanthemums and lilies for my mantelshelf provided me with this. It is a little grey plush elephant, the tail of which you turn like a handle. It knows only one tune, the name of which was scrawled across the label of the box it came in. The hand-writing on the label was foreign, but the song is English, of the music-halls, and to-day the exultant rhythm of its refrain is echoed in the streets of a thousand cities. The tune itself—no son of man knows the third line of the words—is of such popularity that in two or three years it will have found its way into the cottage fastnesses of Aran; there it will in all probability remain, in its last painful metamorphosis, one week and perish miserably.

It is because I am deeply conscious of the ultimate fate of the little tune that so faithfully keeps me company; it is because I feel sorry for it; it is perhaps because I am sorry for myself that I cherish the simple, delicate ribaldry of its first incarnation. When I have been tired of reading second-rate novels and have been bored with anything better, it has never failed to dispel my ennui. Its high-pitched energy stimulates me, and the old familiar fragrance of its melody (for indeed it has had many aliases) gives me a pleasure that nothing else gives me; a pleasure that uplifts and thrills my whole being, and lasts—until I am tired turning the handle. . . . And is it any wonder that I turn the handle so frequently, that I cherish the sweet simplicity of the song when I know that in the world it is already being defiled by rude contact with human life, when I know that its progress is a Rake's Progress, when I can see it in all the horror of its last journey, feeble and dejected, glittering at virtue with a still lascivious eye, and reeling its drunken way up the rocky slopes of some Irish shore? For it is then that the ancient oligarchy of Aran will sit in judgment; it is then that its career will be passed in review, its qualities and defects as a law-abiding song discussed with lofty seriousness, opposed and defended as in a court of law. And on the seventh day I know the last irrevocable sentence will be passed: that it may never again be sung by mortal lips. And then, and not till then, it will perish miserably.

And in that day I shall take down the grey plush elephant from its hiding place, and I shall think of these things; of the mutability of all things in this world but the ancient oligarchy of Aran.

THE CRY OF THE CREATURE.

Almighty God! you knew full well,
When first you formed your plan,
That you but fashioned Heavenly Hell
In which to torture Man.
You gave us joy of life, O Jove,
To watch our sand-glass run:
You bound our hearts with thongs of love
To snap them one by one.
How strong soe'er you be,
First Great Cause of Thought and Thing,
In which to torture Man.
A garden sweet with flowery breath,
With song and rainbow-light,
Yet spread for Love to strive with Death,
And endless mournful fight.
O! First Great Cause of Thought and Thing,
How strong soe'er you be,
Not all your might shall ever wring
One word of praise from me.

HELMINTHION.
LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

S. VERDAD AND HIS CRITICS.

Sir,—I agree with Mr. Otto Bucht that the Reichstag meeting to the cause of arbitration after the Chancellor had made his famous speech. And Mr. Bucht is also quite right in thinking that I am "above taking notice of such trifles as the opinion of the German Rejection of the Grand Chancellor for the reason that the Chancellor represents the official views, and is responsible, not to the Reichstag, but to the Kaiser himself." Furthermore, the Kaiser, the German Army, and the nation are really responsible for the present position. Therefore, I want to know what Germany is likely to do in the future. Will she render certain lip-service to the cause of arbitration after the recent success? Will she prove her good intentions by giving up the idea of universal peace? Will she adopt a democratic country behind it? Look how well the German people have backed up the autocracy on three separate occasions: against Denmark, against France, and against the Russian war, who was boasting how soon they will "lick the little Japs." Autocracy can war if the whole nation sets its face against it, because the absence of the army when it is engaged in operations may make things unpleasant at home.

England, of course, belongs to the category of autocratic country that is not responsible to the nation, the autocracy will not wage war unless it can rely upon the country behind it. Look how the German people backed up the autocracy on three separate occasions: against Denmark, against France, and against the Russo-Japanese war, who was boasting how soon they would "lick the little Japs." Autocracy can war if the whole nation sets its face against it, because the absence of the army when it is engaged in operations may make things unpleasant at home.

As far as South Africa is concerned, I am obliged to Mr. Riordan for supporting me in regard to some points, while contradicting me on others. Now, let me fix my position on one thing: the dream of universal peace is an absurd delusion, and that none who has given any consideration to the subject will deny.

May I suggest that THE NEW AGE endeavour to learn what Mr. Verdad and the German Chancellor, or who permit themselves to believe that war, being contrary to the spirit of "Enthusiasm for Humanity" wakened by evolution's perfect work in the heart of conscious existence, must presently cease?

Pray let Mr. Huntly Carter, who conducts these symposia so admirably, endeavour to learn whether indeed philosophy and psychology have changed the imagination. Last manifestations are with Mr. Verdad. He asserts that the dream of universal peace is an absurd delusion, and that none who has given any consideration to the subject will deny.

Is this the case? One always admires the picturesque force and splendid virility of Mr. Verdad's outlook; but so much of the spirit of "Enthusiasm for Humanity" is it to be regretted that he takes so primitive a view in this connection. Does he really?

* * *

EDEN PHILLPotts.

THE TRAINING OF TORIES.

SIR,—In a letter to THE NEW AGE for July 28, 1910 (Vol VII., No. 15), Mr. J. M. Kennedy wrote as follows (page 328):

"Are the Tories being trained to think, how to develop any philosophical and psychological insight they may have. This presupposes an acquaintance with the writings of certain foreign thinkers, not all of whom have yet been translated into English, such as Nietzsche, Papini, Sera, Schopenhauer, and so on" (including, of course, Niccolo Machiavelli).

I write to thank Mr. Kennedy for "A Statesman's Mind," and to express the hope that he will continue with the greatest of all tasks, to change the Tory mentality of to-day by the publishing of similar extracts from the works of similar authors. As Nietzsche observed, "There is no harder lot in all human fate than when the powerful of the earth are not at the same time the first men. There (in England to-day) everything becomes false, and warped, and monstrous." * * *

H. F. STEPHENS.

THE LABOUR PARTY AND THE PARTY SYSTEM.

SIR,—In your issue of April 6 Mr. Cecil Chesterton asks: 1. Can a single Labour Member of the present Parliament be named who does not owe his seat to the support of the Liberal Party, or could retain it if the Liberals were to stand against him?

In Scotland we have two Labour Members who have won their seats without Liberal support: Mr. George N. Barnes, M.F., won Blackfriars in 1910 in a three-cornered contest; D. A. Provan was the Liberal candidate and Mr. Bulteel the Conservative. Since then Mr. Barnes has held the seat against all comers.

Mr. Wm. Adamson, M.P., won West Fife from the Liberals in December, 1910. This election was a straight fight between Labourism and Liberalism. West Fife had been a Liberal stronghold previously. In Govan and Cambachie the Labour Party unsuccessfully fought both Liberal and Tory. The same remark applies to Mid- and North-East Lanark.

Mr. Wilkie, M.P., represents Dundee in conjunction with Mr. Winston Churchill. But there as elsewhere in Scotland the Labour Party are looking forward to the day when they will fight both Liberal and Tory. What would have happened at a bye-election in 1908 he was opposed by the Labour Party, whose nominee was second in a three-cornered contest. Other Scottish constituencies, fought by the Labour Party against Liberal and Tory were North Ayrshire and North-West Lanarkshire. In Cambachie the Labour Party have put candidates who have lost five successive contests against Liberal and Tory. And they console themselves with the knowledge that they have kept the Liberal out each time. It is common knowledge that the parties have lost the right to waive seats to Mr. Robert Smillie and Mr. John Robertson they stood as Lib.-Labour candidates in each instance the offer was refused.

I think this is sufficient proof that in Scotland at any rate the Labour Party owes nothing to the goodwill of the Liberal Party.

PATRICK J. DOLLAN.

PHILOSOPHY AND WAR.

Si,—Mr. Verdad continues to believe with Wordsworth that Carnage is God's Daughter, and implies that all important thinkers are of the same opinion. Without citing the rationalists who, like myself, would willingly bow out both daughter and parent, I venture to believe that your correspondent has mistaken when he claims for the prevalent philosophical class his own convictions. Psychology and Continental thought, we learn, are on Mr. Verdad's side, while only pedants and idealists suffer from the peace fever, which May I suggest that THE NEW AGE endeavour to learn what men and women from the ranks of thought have "preserved their sanity" in their "Enthusiasm for Humanity" wakened by evolution's perfect work in the heart of conscious existence, must presently cease?

Pray let Mr. Huntly Carter, who conducts these symposia so admirably, endeavour to learn whether indeed philosophy and psychology have changed the imagination. Last manifestations are with Mr. Verdad. He asserts that the dream of universal peace is an absurd delusion, and that none who has given any consideration to the subject will deny.

Is this the case? One always admires the picturesque force and splendid virility of Mr. Verdad's outlook; but so much of the spirit of "Enthusiasm for Humanity" is it to be regretted that he takes so primitive a view in this connection. Does he really?

* * *

EDEN PHILLPotts.
THE FABIAN SOCIETY.

Sir,—I should like to criticise Mr. Kennedey's "final word" in his remarks on the Fabian Society which appear in This Week's NEW AGE.

He says: "I may recall that the waiting game played by Fabius was not at all to the taste of the Romans, so they recalled him and appointed Marcus Minucius Rufus in his stead."

To begin with, this statement is quite incorrect. The Romans did not recall Fabius and appoint Minucius in his stead; they merely equalised the powers of the dictator and his master of the horse. Well, what happened? Hannibal laid an ambush for Minucius, who promptly fell into it and was captured. But after seven days only say that I have studied. Mr. Fabian Minucius—the story is most touching and eminently moral—makes full confession of his error before the whole army, salutes Minucius as his "more than father," lays down his lately acquired powers, and submits to Fabius' wise counsels a saddler and a wiser man.

When Fabius retired from power his tactics were abandoned. One measure which led to the disaster of Cannae. Fabius appears on the scene soon after, to retrieve the Roman fortunes, takes Cerustumum and Tarentum after patient sieges, and by these acts like tactics drives Hannibal to bay in the S.E. corner of Italy, from whence he has to retire to Africa.

TheFabian, as a member both of the London and of the Cambridge University Fabian Societies I dare to believe that they are perfectly correct. I am not prepared to say that the Fabians are all wrong. Of course I may be mistaken. But I fear that I will consider the question irrelevant what he thinks would have happened to the Romans but for the "inactivity" of Fabius which he seems to despise so much.

* * *

SIR,—Several interesting points are raised in "Fabian's" letter. Dealing with his prologue, I did not say in my note that Moses or anyone else indulged in heights. I said that certain thinkers indulged in rambles in the same height, quite a different thing. Most grammarians divide sentences into simple, compound, and complex. I presume that the Fabian sentence is compound. (Or perhaps they may consider it as they go along, in the same way as Mr. Pease assures us they make up their history, mathematics, and so forth.)

(1) One of Mr. Webb's typical failures was in connection with the Railway Conciliation Bill. This Bill established Conciliation Boards for six years, and in a letter to THE NEW AGE (issue of December 7, 1907), Mr. Pease, on behalf of the Fabian Executive, stated that this Bill went beyond the men's wildest dreams. Yet from the men's point of view the Bill has been a complete failure. For it has ever since been given rise to a considerable amount of unrest. Nevertheless, the Fabians profess to act in the interests of the workers. I submit from the evidence of this that Mr. Webb and his friends were quite unable to foresee the results of what they themselves recommended.

As for the propaganda of the Fabian workers as a whole upon the working-men of this country, I refer to this matter in my second article, which you publish on another page.

Apart from Mr. Belloc's relative speeches in Parliament, see his two articles in THE NEW AGE of April 14, 1910, and May 26, 1910, in which he deals specifically with the Prevention of Destitution Bill. Other articles of Mr. Belloc's less specific, it is true, but dealing nevertheless with points raised on various Fabian tracts, appeared in THE NEW AGE of December 17, 1908 (see also Mr. Wells's comment on Mr. Belloc's article in the same issue), November 19, 1908, May 2, 1908, and October 7, 1909.

(3) I have not the slightest objection to young Fabians meeting for self-education. But—and this may also serve as an answer to "Fabian's" last question, in which he seeks to know the cause of my annoyance with the Society—I object to these confessedly immature people trying to lead where they ought to be content to follow at a distance. Mutual criticism is good enough in its way; but first of all there must be something worth criticising. Mutual criticism is nothing. To produce ideas, try Mr. Belloc's last work. An idea should not be taken as the job of the gabblers. It is a five-inch book, and submitted them together with your proposals to my committee on Friday evening. I am sorry to say that they took a very strong view of the preface by Mr. Hyndman and directed me to write a purely editorial note on the subject of the book for the Fabian News. I think it is a pity you allowed your book to be prefaced by so bitter an opponent of Burns, as I do not imagine that there is anything else that could be taken, and apart from the preface I have no reason to suppose the committee would have been unwilling to promote its sale.

I am, yours sincerely.

EDW. R. PEASE.

THE FABIAN SOCIETY.

Sir,—In view of the protests prominent Fabians have made against the libraries boycotting books by H. G. Wells and A. Neil Lyons the following letter seems to be a bit quer.

(Copy.)

The Fabian Society, 3, Clement's Inn, Strand, London, W.C.

April 10, 1911.

Dear Mr. Burgess,—I received the proofs of your book and submitted them together with your proposals to my committee on Friday evening. I am sorry to say that they took a very strong view of the preface by Mr. Hyndman and directed me to write a purely editorial note on the subject of the book for the Fabian News. I think it is a pity you allowed your book to be prefaced by so bitter an opponent of Burns, as I do not imagine that there is anything else that could be taken, and apart from the preface I have no reason to suppose the committee would have been unwilling to promote its sale.

I am, yours sincerely,

J. M. KENNEDY.
SOCIALLSM AND INDUSTRIALISM.

Sir,—The man who preaches a principle is always in danger of being asked for a detail; and his exhaustion is the result of this. His questions are relatively insignificant and are the more creditable as he takes such a gloomy view of their "superman"?

C. J. WHITBY, M.D.

NIETZSCHE AND WOMAN.

SIR,—The views of Mr. V. W. Eyre, March 9, headed "Nietzsche and Woman," appeal to me in so far as I hope some comments may still be permissible. The evident kindly feeling towards women collectively which Mr. Eyre evinces is one of the reasons why I wish to add something; and is the more creditable as he takes such a gloomy view of their future.

I wish to draw Mr. Eyre's attention to some facts which may perhaps be consoling:—

1. He fears that men will suddenly cease to admire woman as beautiful, and will, in consequence, degrade them more than in the past.

The main fact of the psychology of beauty is tersely expressed in the proverb: "Beauty is in the eye of the gazer." Therefore there is no one single standard: Mr. Eyre thinks the feminine more beautiful than the masculine. So do I, and so do many others, but many men think the contrary. Hence thinking the masculine more beautiful than the feminine, I and many others think the contrary.

A further important point is unnoticed: that most people lack the finest feeling for beauty in any form, except perhaps a transitory attraction to "a pretty girl." Any fairness or favour that women may obtain from men does not depend on the precarious tenure of masculine perception of visual beauty. Mr. Eyre says he is disappointed with the university girl, though she "goes forth into the world often with great enthusiasm in the cause of disease. Mr. Eyre has usually not even a borrowed culture! She "clings to some authority" and "becomes a hack." Does she? There could not be a truer description of the universitites themselves—following in old grooves, with no power to give, in any adequate measure, of the boundless wealth of human knowledge which they keep locked up, and without any excuse of a "preference of persons."

How little do the men who govern—or sleep and luxuriate—in universities do to inspire the nation's teachers, or to enable simple persons to grasp the broad principles of modern humanity and social science, and as much detailed knowledge as will guide them in their own career and open their eyes to the enjoyment and beauty of life?

What can we say of the "public schools," whose very name is a lie, deceiving some into the belief that the democratic intentions of their founders are carried out? These schools are officered by university men who have not even learnt that to educate the young is a highly skilled work, and needs trained teachers, such as are insisted on by women in schools for girls. Their discipline exhibits almost as brutal mis-education as that of a thousand years ago.

What are the laws of education, whether as distinguished from home life, or from the work of the artist, which the older generation might have learnt to the good sense of the Royal Horticultural Society to promote colour discrimination, and its use in the arts, by purchasing copies of the French Repertoire des Tailleurs, which they kindy sell to colour-students, no, English ones being obtainable?

Is not the colour of the dress in the dress of English gentlemen traceable to university influence? Is not the absence of piety and of the enthusiasm of conviction in English churchism due to the same? And, to add one more query out of many, why has not the university made the enormously valuable study of psychology attractive and intelligible to Mr. Eyre? Mr. Eyre is not a bigot in support of his statement that "every year weakens the force of our primitive instincts?" [Havelock Ellis (note, page 73 of "Man and Woman").] He directly repudiates the idea of "a future of humanity" in which . . . . the sexual emotions have almost disappeared."

DORA FORSTER.

"SHAVIANA."

SIR,—Shaw-baiting seems a favourite diversion of the clever young men of the day, and the NEW AGE is one of their happiest gratifying grounds.

Mr. J. M. Kennedy, with a note of admiration, sends a terrific review from a New York yellow journal, written by a mere man of letters, and his月底 of a stupid party bias. Apart from the writer's naive references to Socialism, it is well to remember that "blasted Britshers"—from pugilists to poets—seldom get fair treatment in the New York papers.

Personally I regard Oscar Wilde and Shaw as the most
THE PREROGATIVE OF MERCY.

Sir,—It is about time someone protested against the abuse of the prerogative of "mercy" which was witnessed in the Morrison case. Everyone knew what was going to happen, but the mercy was withheld till the date fixed for the execution was sufficiently near to make the intervention of the Home Secretary dramatic. It was not a sequence of the police inquiry, which led to nothing, and which led to nothing, but the condemned man was allowed to go through all the anticipatory emotions of death (and if death is unnecessary in the case of anticipatory emotions); then mercilessly sentenced to lifelong servitude as well. Two such punishments for one alleged crime are a fairly heavy penalty, and redound to the glory of Churchill.

VANCE PALMER.

SACREDOTAL PRIVILEGES.

Sir,—I am pleased to have at length extracted from the "Eclectic Philosopher" an acknowledgment of the sources from whence he has drawn his charges against convents. They appear to be as follows: (1) Scott's poem "Marmion," a mere romance which these anti-convent people invariably quote as if it were history. With equal justice I might make the "peace of God which passes all understanding," are noumena; they may be felt, but not "explained" nor described. (2) As above, so below," may be a man's belief, but "as below, so above," is the corresponding principle on which he necessarily thinks.

J. JOHN ELLIOTT.

THEOLOGY.

Sir,—May I just say this? The Moderns may overestimate the utility of their emotions, but the fact remains that the emotions, although perhaps of relatively small "magnitude" in the cosmos, are of relative large "importance"; their "activities," constitute noumena, although perhaps more "superficial" noumena. Conceit, for instance, may be a bit of ink that mars a landscape painting, or writing. However, that part of the spiritual universe in which men live and move, and the interaction of the emotions constitute noumena of overwhelming significance.

A bearing false witness in a street brawl, out of spite, may be possessed of a very "large" and cunning devil,—the whole constituting a dreadfully significant noumenon. The "peace of God which passes all understanding," are noumena; they may be felt, but not "explained" nor described. "As above, so below," may be a man's belief, but "as below, so above," is the corresponding principle on which he necessarily thinks.

J. JOHN ELLIOTT.

Shakespeare or Bacon?

Sir,—Mr. Visiak requests me to substantiate my statement that "the diction, which leads me to the conclusion that the Venus monologue was not the English, but the Italian law in force in Venice in the sixteenth century," but as the trial in the play takes place at Venice, it states "the common law," and it is manifestly correct, and cannot possibly require any substantiation.

Respecting the question whether the Venetian law is correctly stated in the play, I would point out that the latter, as Mr. Visiak is doubtless aware, is founded on "Il Pecorone," a collection of Italian tales written by Ser Giovanni Fiorentino in 1526, and that the law, with the rest of the story, is taken from that work, which had not been translated at the time the play was written. Bacon's mother, it may be mentioned, not only knew Italian, but she also translated Italian literature, and in particular Barnerd's "The Pickwick Papers" the basis of a charge against the Nonconformist clergy.

I would point out that the "sugred sonnets" referred to by Francis Meres in 1598 were no doubt the two included in the "Passionate Pilgrim" in the following year, and possibly a few others circulated in manuscript, but it seems more probable that only the two in the "Passionate Pilgrim" were all that had been so circulating, as otherwise more would have been included in that lying anthology of empty dooms which B. Griffin, Marlowe, Raleigh, and other authors, were published as having been written by W. Shakespeare.

With reference to Mr. W. H. Smellie's interesting letters respecting the geography of the plays, I would point out that Coriat, writing in 1610, stated as regards the river at Verona, "alas, they may not answer to what the publisher,—unless, indeed, he sent them through Mr. William Hall, who, according to Mr. Sidney Lee, was the person described in the dedication as "Mr. W. H." and being the "only begetter" (procure) of the Sonnets. But "Mr. W. H." may have been Bacon's friend William Herbert.

The "sugred sonnets" referred to by Francis Meres in 1598 were no doubt the two included in the "Passionate Pilgrim" in the following year, and possibly a few others circulated in manuscript, but it seems more probable that only the two in the "Passionate Pilgrim" were all that had been so circulating, as otherwise more would have been included in that lying anthology of empty dooms which B. Griffin, Marlowe, Raleigh, and other authors, were published as having been written by W. Shakespeare.

With reference to Mr. W. H. Smellie's interesting letters respecting the geography of the plays, I would point out that Coriat, writing in 1610, stated as regards the river at Verona, "alas, they may not answer to what the publisher,—unless, indeed, he sent them through Mr. William Hall, who, according to Mr. Sidney Lee, was the person described in the dedication as "Mr. W. H." and being the "only begetter" (procure) of the Sonnets. But "Mr. W. H." may have been Bacon's friend William Herbert.

SIR,—As your weekly is the single literary journal in which such a letter as this from a perfectly obscure person—though a student of literature—has the faintest chance of appearing, I beg leave to protest against Mr. Grubbe's latest addition to literature, in which all the discordant stories in the life of the great tragedienne "Racel" are reeled up and served for those who love these sweepings in a great burden, yet it carrieth pretty bargains of convenient quantity, wherein great store of merchandise is brought into the city both out of Germany and from Venice itself.

S. CUNNINGTON.

MODERN BIBLIOGRAPHY.

Sir,—As your weekly is the single literary journal in which such a letter as this from a perfectly obscure person—though a student of literature—has the faintest chance of appearing, I beg leave to protest against Mr. Grubbe's latest addition to literature, in which all the discordant stories in the life of the great tragedienne "Racel" are reeled up and served for those who love these sweepings in a great burden, yet it carrieth pretty bargains of convenient quantity, wherein great store of merchandise is brought into the city both out of Germany and from Venice itself.

S. CUNNINGTON.
LECTED THE REVIEWS, NOT ONE HAD A SUFFICIENTLY INDEPENDENT OR COMPLAINTutory, OR, AS I HAVE SAID, SUFFICIENT CARE FOR LITERATURE TO CRITICISE THE BYRON RECHAUFFÉ AS IT DESERVED, AND AS THE "RACHEL" FLAT LIKELY DESERVES.

OF COURSE, THE STOCK.My TWO CENTS FOR THE DAY ARE:

"WHAT ON EARTH DOES IT MATTER TO LITERATURE?"

THE PEOPLE WHO THUS ARGUE MIGHT JUST AS WELL SAY THAT IF A MAN DESERTS WESTMINSTER ABBEY HE DOES NO HARM TO ART. THE MEMORY OF A MAN OR WOMAN OF GENIUS SHOULD BE PRESERVED AS RELIGIOUSLY AS THE GREAT CATHEDRAL, AND THOSE WHO DREAD OR DEGRADE OR SOIL IT ARE EVERY BIT AS GREAT PHILISTINES AS HE WHO DEFACES A TEMPLE.

THEY TELL US "IT SHOWS THOSE UNIQUE THINGS TODAY: COURAGE, INDEPENDENCE, KNOWLEDGE, AND JUDGMENT," AND IS NEITHER RABIDLY DEMOCRATIC NOR INSANELY ECLECTIC.

STERN.

MODERN LOVE.

SIR,—WOULD YOU FIND ROOM FOR THE ENSOLED TRUTHFUL NARRATIVE?

THERE WAS A CHILL IN THE WET WIND, THE MOON WAS DIM AND SMALL AS DISSOLVING PEARL, THE ELECTRIC LAMP WHEN IT WAS LIKE A PIG, AND I WAS WALKING LONDON WITH MY GIRL.

HER FEET WERE HEAVY WITH A SHOP-DAY'S LOAD, IT WAS THE HOUR OF LOVE; MY EYES WERE DIM WITH Crying FIGURES; LOVE WAS LIKE A POOR, WE WERE TOO WEARY TO RAKE UP A WHIM.

I LIVED NORTH, AND SHE "LIVED IN," AND SO JUST BEFORE TEN O'CLOCK WE SAID GOOD-NIGHT, IN A BACK-STREET; THEN TO THE DOOR DID GO, THE DOOR WHERETHROUGH SHE VANISHED FROM MY SIGHT.

ANOTHER HOUR AND I WITH DEADENED BRAIN WAS WHIRLED BY ROWS OF WINDOWS AS THE TRAM (WHENCE LIFE AND ALL SEEMED LIKE A CHILLY RAIN) HOWLED LIKE A FIRE-EYED FIEND THROUGH TOTTENHAM.

* * *

A FEW EPIGRAMS ON READY CASH.

SIR,—IF WE WERE TO PRINT THE FOLLOWING-TYPICAL APOPHYRSIS WHICH I HAVE TRANSLATED FROM THE FRENCH OF SACHA GUITRY,

"WHEN I CAME TO LONDON WITH MY GIRL, I WANTED A PLATINUM BALLET, A DIAMOND COLLAR, AN EMERALD RING; BUT I SAW ONE OF THE PRECIOUS LADIES HAVING HER FASHIONABLE LUNCH ON A COFFEE-TABLE, AND THAT WAS THE END OF MY DREAMS.

"WHEN I RETURNED FROM PARIS I TOOK A CAB TOakening STAFF, AND I TOLD THE CONDUCTOR TO TRAVEL THROUGH LONDON AS QUICKLY AS POSSIBLE, AND TO STOP AT NO CAFE. "I HAVE DECIDED TO LIVE SOLELY ON MY INCOME, "I TOLD THE CONDUCTOR, "AND I WOULD RATHER TRAVEL IN A CAB THAN IN A CARRIAGE.""

D. W.

THE MOST IMPORTANT THING ON EARTH IS MONEY. WITHOUT MONEY EVERYTHING IS IMPOSSIBLE. ONE OUGHT NOT TO HAVE TOO LITTLE MONEY, NOR TOO MUCH. BECAUSE THOSE WHO HAVE TOO MUCH TRY TO IMPRESS OTHERS WITH THE IDEA THAT THEY HAVE TOO LITTLE. AND IF THEY SHOULD REMAIN UNIMPRESSIONABLE THEY MIGHT BECOME A PHILISTINE.

IT IS PERFECTLY EVIDENT THAT ROCKEFELLER IS NOT THE HAPPIEST MAN, AND THE RICHEST MAN IS THE UNHAPPIEST MAN.

IT IS THIS APPARENT THAT THE POOREST MAN IN THE WORLD IS THE unhappiest man in the world because he is the richest.

IT IS EQUALLY UNAPPARENT THAT THE POOREST MAN IN THE WORLD IS THE unhappiest man in the world because he is the richest.

IT IS TRUE THAT THEY COULD NOT HAVE VALUED MONEY HIGHLY TO HAVE LENT SOME TO ME.

THEY HAVE SPEAKLED ON THEIR GRATITUDE. THEY DOUBT TO HAVE THAT I WOULD NOT BE DEBTS THEM ETERNALLY.

POOH! IT IS SO MANY OF THEM.

I NEVER WISH TO SEE THEM AGAIN.

CONCERNING "THE NEW AGE."

SIR,—PERHAPS YOU WILL PERMIT ME TO USE YOUR COLUMNS TO REPLY TO A NUMBER OF QUESTIONS ADDRESSED TO ME BY READERS OF THE NEW AGE, WHO ARE SOLICITOUS FOR ITS WELFARE.

(1) IT IS FREQUENTLY SUGGESTED THAT THE NEW AGE SHOULD SEND OUT MORE ADVERTISEMENTS. NOTHING WOULD SUIT ME BETTER. WHATSOEVER YOU, AS EDITOR, MIGHT SAY; BU'T REALLY THE MATTER DOES NOT REST WITH THE MANAGEMENT. IT IS OBVIOUS THAT THE MEDICINE SELLERS WHO KNOW THEIR BUSINESS WILL NOT ADVERTISE IN A PAPER THAT CIRCULATES AMONG THE INTELLIGENT; AND THE SAME MAY BE SAID OF THE REST OF THE CIRCULATION, WHO ARE BASED UPON IGNORANCE AND CREDIBILITY. PUBLISHERS ARE IN A DIFFERENT CLASS, NO DOUBT; BUT, HERE AGAIN, COMMONSENSE WOULD SUGGEST AN EXPLANATION OF THEIR REFUSAL TO ADVERTISE IN A JOURNAL WHICH CRITICISES THEIR WARES SO FEARLESSLY AS THE NEW AGE. ONLY THE MOST LITERATE AND PUBLIC-SPIRITED WOULD THANK YOU FOR PUTTING THE INTERESTS OF LITERATURE BEFORE THEIR INTERESTS AS TRADERS. PERHAPS, ALSO, YOU COULD BE A LITTLE LESS CRITICISING IN THIS MATTER. I HEAR OF MANY WHO BUY BOOKS FAVOURABLY REVIEWED IN YOUR COLUMNS WHO NEVERTHLESS NEVER MENTION ITS NAME WHEN ORDERING FROM THE PUBLISHER.

I REPEAT THAT WE DO OUR BEST TO OBTAIN ADVERTISEMENTS ON HONOURABLE TERMS. ON ANY OTHER THE NEW AGE IS GLAD TO BE WITHOUT THEM.

(2) WHY IS THE NEW AGE NOT ON THE BOOKSTAND? FOR THE SIMPLE REASON THAT THIS WOULD INVOLVE PRINTING TEN TIMES AS MANY COPIES AS WE SELL; THE DAILY MAIL CAN SO DO; BUT WHICH POPULAR JOURNALS DO? BUT THEY COULD ALSO AFFORD TO GIVE AWAY THEIR WHOLE ISSUES. THEIR REVENUE FROM ADVERTISEMENTS IS SUFFICIENT TO MAKE MORE THAN COVER THE DONATION THEY MAKE TO THE NEW AGE, THE OTHER HAND, RELIES UPON CIRCULATION ALONE. NO OTHER PAPER IN ENGLAND DOES. BUT WE CANNOT PRINT MANY MORE COPIES THAN WE SELL WITHOUT CERTAIN LOSS.

(3) WHY DOES THE NEW AGE ADVERTISE ITSELF BY MEANS OF POSTERS? AGAIN THE QUESTION IS ONE OF COST IN THE FIRST PLACE, AND A SPECIAL CIRCULATION IN THE SECOND. THE COST OF EXHIBITING POSTERS IS ENORMOUS, AND ONLY JOURNALS SUBSIDISED BY ADVERTISEMENTS CAN AFFORD IT. SECUNDARY, NOT MORE THAN ONE IN A THOUSAND OF THE GENERAL PUBLIC WOULD BUY THE NEW AGE TWICE EVEN IF IT WAS ADVERTISED LIKE SOAP.

(4) WHY DO NOT THE NEW AGE PUBLISH MORE OF THE IMPORTANT ARTICLES WHICH THE NEW AGE PUBLISHES? BECAUSE THE NEW AGE IS A SORT OF "OPEN SECRETS" WHICH EVERY JOURNALIST KNOWS AND NO JOURNALIST MENTIONS. ALSO IT MIGHT BE REMEMBERED THAT THE NEW AGE HAS MANAGED TO ESCAPE A TAXATION WHICH IT MUST BE CALCULATED THAT SOME OF ITS OPINIONS OR THEIR VALUE.

(5) ON WHAT DOES THE NEW AGE, THEN, RELY FOR INCREASING ITS CIRCULATION? FAR BE IT FROM ME TO SAY THAT TO INCREASE CIRCULATION IS NOT THE FIRST BUSINESS OF A JOURNAL; BUT THE DIRECTORS OF THE NEW AGE HAVE LESS-MATERIAL VIEWS. APART FROM THE MERITS OF THE PAPER ITSELF, THEY RELY UPON THE GOOD-WILL OF THEIR READERS, AND IN ADDITION TO INCENTIVES TO INCENTIVE READERS. THEY MUST KNOW BY THIS TIME THAT THE SUCCESS OF THE PAPER IS LARGELY IN THEIR HANDS, AND IT IS THEIRS TO MAKE OR Mar. THEY, INDEED, DO KNOW, BUT THEY RECEIVE DAILY POSTERS TO THE WIDEST EXTENT POSSIBLE TO THE PEOPLE, AND THE PEOPLE, AS THEY REACH THE END OF THE PAPER, HAVE TO REACH THE END OF THE TALENT.

SOME, IT IS TRUE—but I SHOULD BECOME CONTROVERSIAL.

(6) WHY DOES THE NEW AGE RETAIN ITS 1d. PRICE PER COPY AND ITS ORIGINAL PRICE OF A PENNY A WEEK? THE BUSINESS-SALES OF THAT PENNY PERIOD CONTAIN THE ANSWER TO THIS QUESTION. THE NEW AGE LOST OVER £1,000 A YEAR. IF IT WOULDN'T BE PROFITABLE TO DELIVER THE NEW AGE IN A PENNY A WEEK, WE SHOULD NOT BE MORE LIKELY TO RAISE THE PRICE TO SIXPENCE.

THE BUSINESS MANAGER OF "THE NEW AGE."

April 27, 1911.
The Simple Life in the City

Even if you cannot get a sun-bath in Cheapside you can get a simple-life, pure-food, non-flesh luncheon at the Home Restaurant, balanced in food-value, appealing to eye and palate, attractively served in restful surroundings. Come, see, taste, enjoy and give thanks—at the cash-desk.

JUST PUBLISHED.

Unobtainable at the Libraries.

AN APPEAL FOR JUSTICE

would be an alternative title for

A BED OF ROSES

By W. L. GEORGE.

Cloth 6s.

A Novel of passion and suffering that stirs heart, mind and soul.

"This is a novel of remarkable insight and considerable literary skill."—The Times.

A severe attack on the world of desire. The author is troubled because the world is a wilderness of economic errors which drive women into the arms of flesh and of sentiment and of false and unprofitable friendships. A powerful and most earnest 'novel of ideas'...a book for serious people, addressed to the younger generation. At Home Daily Review.

"A sincere author and earnest observer, and has made a vivid picture of parasitic life. He is a public benefactor who has discovered that he could write that valuable book, as well as all his other books, if the Sociological Society will promise that he will write nothing more than it's work..."—The English Review.

"An intensely painful, arresting study of humanity's facts, and if we could pity and horror in the one book it is power to certify connoisseur. It favours and it terrifies by its merciless exactness, and its truthfulness that might. Here there is no glamour or mannerism. No relief from the given presence of painful truth. There is truth enough in 'A Bed of Roses' to make the delusion of its Suicide. "—Manchester Guardian.

"It is not a proper book for everyone to read, though it is quite a proper book for people of the reputation capacity to enjoy. With that warning, let us say at once that it is interestingly interesting, admirably done, likely to please the best of good modern readers, and undeniably to do any moral harm to any intelligent person... Full of the deepest interest, and, though it tackle all through, there is not a dull line in it... We must allow that Mr. Gee, among many other excellent qualities, has once been a charmer, though he is thoroughly unskilful, and one which holds the interest at the first page of his sincere work to the last. —Daily Telegraph.

Obtainable at all principal booksellers, but not at Libraries, or from the Publishers (by post 4½ d.),

FRANK PALMER,

14. RED LION COURT, FLEET ST., LONDON.

CONCENTRATE.

Workers in every sphere need concentration. The mind that flies from one topic to another is soon a bore. To be enabled to work continuously, through all day to toil her duties and study, you must have the power of concentration. At Home will make your power determinate and habitual; it will develop Attentiveness, Observation, Memory, and will enable you to work with ease and power.

INVESTIGATE. Send 2½d. for Free booklet to the

CONCENTRATION Co., St. George Buildings, Wallasead, Newcastle-on-Tyne.

ANNUAL CATALOGUE, 1911.

GLASHER'S NEW ANNUAL CATALOGUE OF PUBLISHERS' REMAINDERS is now ready, and will be sent on application.

Comprises a great variety of books in all departments of literature at special BARGAIN PRICES.

WILLIAM GLASHER & SON, Ltd., 365, High Holborn, London.

Libraries should apply for this useful Catalogue.

DELICIOUS COFFEE

RED WHITE & BLUE

For Breakfast & after Dinner.

JUST PUBLISHED.

THE NEW GOD

AND OTHER ESSAYS.

By RALPH SHIRLEY.

Crown 8vo, cloth gilt, 248 pp., 3s. 6d. net.


Dr. Alfred Russel Wallace, writing to the author, characterises this book as "excellent both in style and matter."

Mr. Havelock Ellis writes to the author: "I have read your brilliant and stimulating volume of essays with much interest."

"The highly controversial matters of which he treats are dealt with in an exceptional style. They are interesting and are handled with suggestive and thoughtful, and written in a clear and illuminative style."—The Gibson Review.

"Marked by very considerable literary ability."—Scottsman.

"Twelve brilliant and striking essays."—Liverpool Daily Post.

"Essays...combine brightness of expression with considerable depth and originality of thought."—Birmingham Daily Post.

"Mr. Shirley illuminates his subject with a pleasing humour; and his book is readable and interesting as well as instructive."—The Yorkshire Observer.

London: WILLIAM RIDER & SON, Ltd., 104, ALDERSGATE STREET, E.C.

MISCELLANEOUS ADVERTISEMENTS.

Reminisces and orders should be sent to the MANAGER, THE NEW AGE, 38, CURATOR STREET, CHELSEA, LONDON, S.W.

NATIONAL BARGAIN HOUSE.

The Home Restaurant

31, Friday Street, Cannon Street, E.C.

between Cannon Street and Queen Victoria Street.

Sensible Meals for Brainy Men.

FRANK PALMER, 14, RED LION COURT, FLEET ST., LONDON.