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NOTES OF THE WEEK.

Much of the excitement of the last week has been a feigned madness. We do not say that vital political principles have not been at stake or that their safety is even now completely assured. As we shall see, indeed, in the course of these Notes, some serious questions have been thrown up by the recent controversies, one or two of which must sooner rather than later be answered if we are to know where we are going as a nation. Of the two main centres of present discussion, however, neither the coup d’état said by the Unionists to have been attempted by the Government in Ulster, nor the military crisis, declared by Mr. Bonar Law to be of the greatest importance. About both, moreover, the Press as usual have been alleged the usual State reasons for the suppression or distortion of the facts by the politicians. The theory of an intended coup d’état in Ulster, for example, is consistent neither with the past nor with the present circumstances of the Home Rule controversy. To believe it we should have not only to flatter the Government with more resolution on the subject than its members possess, but to ignore, as the Press in general has done, the obvious explanations. When Sir Edward Carson left Parliament in a huff some days ago and betook himself to Ulster with the remark that he proposed to stay there until he was fetched, it naturally occurred to the mind of the Government that mischief might immediately be begun. As a matter of fact, Sir Edward Carson found on his arrival in Belfast that mischief of a certain kind was actually in contemplation by some of his volunteers, for the talk was of capturing the stores of Government ammunition and rifles lying at the comparatively undefended depots at Omagh, Carrickfergus and other places. Over the regal signature of plain "Edward," Sir Edward Carson therefore issued an appeal to his Army to refrain from any such action; but in the meantime the Government, having been informed by its spies (of whom, of course, there are many in the ranks of the Ulster volunteers), thought it wise to anticipate the worst and to be prepared for the possible raids. There followed the "precautionary" movements of troops, of which so much fuss has been made; and, lest these precautionary movements should prove also provocative, there naturally followed the preparations, military and naval, for supporting them. It was at this point that the officers were addressed by General Paget. In the absence, however, of any public knowledge of the rumours that had set these events in train, the Unionists attempted to throw the onus of the initiative upon the Government. It was not, they said, Ulster that had given any provocation, but the Government, inspired by Mr. Churchill in particular. In short, a coup d’état had been intended. * * * But the foregoing plain facts are not the only evidence that the Government had and has no intention of initiating active operations against Ulster. In the first place, it is inconceivable that if ever such a proposal could find an entrance into their minds, it would not have done so long ago. Where else in the wide world but in these islands would a Sir Edward Carson have been given a two years' run for the purpose of gathering an army to oppose the National Executive? It should be concluded that the Government that permitted it had reasons for so doing, and would be unlikely to act in a panic contrariwise at the moment when its policy was culminating. In the second place, the theory was essentially on the face of it, for why should a coup d’état be initiated when ex hypothesi not only Ulster was motionlessly peaceful, but the Home Rule Bill is not yet finally passed? After all, the Government is not mad! In the third place, the theory was obviously better designed to suit the purposes of the Unionists than to cover the facts. On the supposition that by editing their material and ignoring the simple explanation they could persuade the public to accept the coup d’état theory, the Unionists would have succeeded in their design, which is not by any means the relief of Ulster, but the defeat of the Parliament Act; for a General Election would have been immediately forced, and on the alleged crime of contemplating war on Ulster the Government would...
probably have been defeated. This intention jumped too well with the rumour of the coup d'état to be separable in any cool mind from it. Lastly, the impudence of the attempt to throw the onus of provocation upon the Government is too apparent to deceive anybody after the first blush. A hundred thousand Ulstermen have been arming and drilling for months, the whole situation is in tinder, Sir Edward Carson leaves Parliament breathing fire and threatenings, and a belated attempt to move the House of Commons is denounced as provocation! It is too thin for history, whatever Mr. Balfour may say. Besides, we have narrated the sequence of events, which carries its reason with it.

About the military crisis also there has been a good deal of deliberate lying. Some of it has been, no doubt, patriotically even though mistakenly designed, for the object proposed, how can that be said to be premeditated? It is too thin for history, whatever Mr. Balfour may say. Government is too apparent to deceive anybody after the first blush. Besides, we have narrated the sequence of events, which carries its reason with it.

The bearing of this upon the current controversy ought to be the more obvious considering the fact that at this moment the Cabinet really controls the Parliament by a Cabinet majority. Under the best of circumstances, when the Cabinet owns and controls its Parliamentary support, its right to carry out its instructions to the party letter. The dictation of national government by a Parliamentary majority would involve, in fact, a despotism no less complete than the dictation of Parliament by a Cabinet. In all these things there must be a give and take between the majority and the minorities if either the Cabinet is to be representative of the nation or the Constitution is to be preserved.
making for a port of which the nation has no real knowledge or interest; or is it to be argued that even a shipwreck or against reaching a wrong port? If the Cabinet is admitted to be entitled to do what it pleases and to employ any means of carrying out its designs; if, at the same time, no Constitutional veto, either by the Crown or by the Lords, is operative and the only possible remaining check, namely, that of Parliament, is removed by the subservience of the caucus, the absolutism of a Cabinet would be any less fatal to liberty than the absolutism of the Crown or the Aristocracy? For this reason we can well understand that amongst both Unionists and intelligent Liberals there is now a good deal of uneasiness in regard to greater problems than that of Home Rule merely. Suppose that Home Rule were really unpopular and yet commanded the support of the Cabinet and its majority, what means exist of impressing this fact upon the Cabinet? At the present moment none whatever of a constitutional character; for the Lords have no longer the power of veto, and the King by long disuse has lost his power of veto as well. What, therefore, should be done? The Referendum, as we know, has been suggested; but, apart from the fact that its employment must needs be in the discretion of the very power its operation is designed to check. No Cabinet, in fact, would adopt the Referendum unless it was prepared to commit political suicide for that of the House of Lords seems to be a subject almost of pride with them. But what folly it was, as they must have discovered by this time! For there is not the smallest doubt that had the Government cared to go to the country on the issue, the Unionist Party would have been shattered once more to fragments. The defence of their action in the matter was, if anything, worse than the action itself, and at least as ruinous to themselves and the Army as it could possibly prove to their opponents. Think of Mr. Garvin, for example, charging the Government with provocation for levying even a few companies to defend stores for the same Mr. Garvin who when a million miners were on strike advised that every mining village should be surrounded by troops and placed under martial law. Think again of a party that commended General Botha as the strong man in South Africa and yet squeals against his little finger in Ulster. Or compare the Unionist attitude on the action of Mr. Tom Mann and Mr. Crawley in imploring soldiers not to shoot their brothers with the Unionist appeals to officers to refuse to obey Liberal orders. It is obvious, we think, that every argument of the Unionists is a boomerang; and, since they are not skilful in dialectics, the return is more fatal to themselves than the attack to their enemies. But are we on this account to claim that the duty of the Army is unconditional obedience? Not at all, for the doctrine is both monstrous in itself and contrary to the laws of England. There exist no circumstances when a sane man can be absolved from personal responsibility, be his position that of a private, an officer, or even a commander-in-chief. The conclusion is that there are no circumstances when either officers or men can be commanded to obey unconditionally; and since this provision is made explicitly in the Army Act itself, the further corollary is that it is the duty of the Government to put an end to the suspense. The doubt, as we say, is manifest in the Cabinet there is a sticking place. To return to the question of the popularity of Home Rule. While affirming, as we do, that Home Rule for Ireland is the settled demand of the nation, and that no reasonable doubt may exist on the matter that it is the duty of the Government to put an end to the suspense. The doubt, as we say, is manifest in the action taken by Sir Edward Carson, by the Unionists, by the King and by the Army Executive. Everybody imagine that one of these would have moved unless they had or thought they had grounds for supposing Home Rule to be unpopular? It is obvious that whatever their despondency or fear, it has been the fancied opportunity afforded by an appearance of popular apathy on the subject of Home Rule could have induced them to risk finding themselves opposed by the nation. And for this apparent apathy the Government more than anybody else is responsible. They have, in fact, national demand, at the same time that we think its conclusion the natural under the circumstances that even excusable all things considered, the form was as unfortunate as we expect the moment will also prove to be. The Government has only to follow good advice, in our opinion, to arouse and demonstrate the popular support for Home Rule, and it is a fact, we believe, that the mind of England is made up upon the subject. The King's doubts, in short, can easily be set at rest. Not so easily, however, can the spectres raised by the Unionist tampering with the military be laid in a country which has been broken of late; and we are likely to hear still more of the same Mr. Garvin who when a million miners were on strike advised that every mining village should be surrounded by troops and placed under martial law. The doubt, as we say, is manifest in the Cabinet there is a sticking place. To return to the question of the popularity of Home Rule. While affirming, as we do, that Home Rule for Ireland is the settled demand of the nation, and that no reasonable doubt may exist on the matter that it is the duty of the Government to put an end to the suspense. The doubt, as we say, is manifest in the action taken by Sir Edward Carson, by the Unionists, by the King and by the Army Executive. Everybody imagine that one of these would have moved unless they had or thought they had grounds for supposing Home Rule to be unpopular? It is obvious that whatever their despondency or fear, it has been the fancied opportunity afforded by an appearance of popular apathy on the subject of Home Rule could have induced them to risk finding themselves opposed by the nation. And for this apparent apathy the Government more than anybody else is responsible. They have, in fact,
brought these troubles upon us and themselves as a consequence of their neglect both of English and of Ulster opinion. Look, first, at their treatment of English opinion—of English national, as distinct from Parliamentary opinion, we mean. Having at two successive elections secured from us a mandate to initiate a policy of Home Rule, they have consistently pursued that policy not only without further reference to public opinion out of doors, but in so bewildering and unintelligible a fashion that not even any point has the public been able to realise what was doing. How can enthusiasm be expected on these terms? What but apathy can be induced by the spectacle of the Government furiously hunting a slipper which all the time is in full view of the body? If there is the Bill, there is the Parliament Act to pass it, and there is the Parliamentary majority to see the Government through—what more is wanted or what difficulties unknown to the public and at present visible exist to delay the execution? There are difficulties the public is ready to conceive—but, in the first place, what exactly are they: and, in the second place, surely the public might assist in overcoming them if they were made known. But no, Mr. Asquith says Wait and See; and in the meantime let the Imperial reasons for even forcing Home Rule into your confidence. Let us know where matters stand and how Ulster may be brought home to Ulstermen that in accepting Home Rule she has not only from the outset assumed a purely negative position (in no sense the feeblest as well as the most foolish form of resistance), but Ulster has allowed herself to be used as a cat's-paw by the Unionist caucus politicians. In addition to this, Ulster has shown no appreciation either of the difficulties that the Empire and her attitude is producing or of the difficulties from which Home Rule would alone deliver us. On the other hand, it is useless to blame Ulster for being no more politically intelligent than her English rulers, or for failing to see what it was their duty to make her see. Ulster presumably is not populated by complete fanatics. Ulster is to be won by reason even if at first she is disposed to try force. What means has the Government taken to win her? No more, at most, than, say, Mr. Lloyd George employed to persuade the position that the opposition is producing. Surely, with some such case to present, the resistance of Ulster must be overcome. At present her attitude is permitted to appear patriotic. She loves us so much that she will not be shaken off—and who can be so cruel as to push her? But given that Home Rule is offered to her as her job, her service, her duty to the Empire, the pathos of her situation would speedily be dissolved, and we should see her compelled to choose between selfishness and sacrifice.

The alternative, however, is, not that Nationalist Ireland must govern itself (for we do not believe it possible), but that Ulster must govern Ireland for us. That, in fact, is the service we have the right to demand of Ulster; it must be her contribution to the practical ideal of the Empire. For this task Ulster is better placed in every way than England is or is ever likely to be. She is there on the spot, she has an intimate interest and concern with her Nationalist fellow-countrymen, she has a disproportionate share of the ability, wealth, character and prestige of the country, she is dominant by tradition and exclusive by habit, she hates herself to be governed by England as much as she would hate to see Nationalist Ireland govern herself. In short, Ulster has every motive and advantage for governing Ireland and every opportunity under the Home Rule Bill for doing so. This, indeed, as we have hinted, is the deep design of the English mind in consenting after all these trial years of Union to the re-establishment of Home Rule—it is that Ulster may succeed where we have failed, and rid us and the Empire of a political burden and a Parliamentary nuisance. Surely, we say, with some such case to present, the resistance of Ulster must be overcome. Ulster has not only without further reference to public and at present invisible exist to delay the execution; make her see. Ulster presumably is not populated by complete fanatics. Ulster is to be won by reason even if at first she is disposed to try force. What means has the Government taken to win her? No more, at most, than, say, Mr. Lloyd George employed to persuade the position that the opposition is producing. Surely, with some such case to present, the resistance of Ulster must be overcome. At present her attitude is permitted to appear patriotic. She loves us so much that she will not be shaken off—and who can be so cruel as to push her? But given that Home Rule is offered to her as her job, her service, her duty to the Empire, the pathos of her situation would speedily be dissolved, and we should see her compelled to choose between selfishness and sacrifice.

We will conclude what we have to say upon the subject with some advice to the Government. In the first place we would say: Stop all this backstairs business of intrigue and secret conference and take the country into your confidence. Let us know where matters stand and what are the present difficulties of the situation. In the next place: Take Sir Edward Carson's advice and win Ulster, as well as England, by frankly exposing the Imperial reasons for even forcing Home Rule upon Ireland. Thirdly: Put a limit to the concessions you will make and stick to it even at the cost of compelling poor Mr. Law to fail to form a Government. What on earth is gained by climbing down a ladder rung by rung at the bottom of Ulster, led by the Unionists, when all that is certain is that each rung leads to the lower one? Nobody can guess at what point the Government will decline to budge unless an arbitrary limit is made and manifestly meant. Next: Have done with the notion of a General Election until the Bill is seen through and the Parliament Act is secure. You were not entrusted with the responsibility of passing these measures—at your own solicitation, too—in the expectation that you would need to be confirmed in your resolution or relieved of the difficulties you ought to have foreseen. It would be a thousand times worse on your part to resign at a critical moment than it was on the part of the officers. They, as we have seen, had the excuse of an unsought as well as disagreeable task thrust upon them. Yours may be disagreeable, but you sought it. Finally, we repeat that it is your duty to go on, but to make sure that England is actively with you and Ulster not, at any rate, actively against you. If it be possible to pass the Bill as it stands with no temporary division of the unity of Ireland (for that would spoil our scheme for establishing Ulster in control), pass it so by all means. If it is too late to win Ulster or to arouse England, pass the Bill with the provisional exclusion clauses and postpone the operation of the whole until after a General Election in the late spring of 1915. Then fight the Election on the Federal issue and settle once and for all what England expects and what even Ulster, we believe, would respect.
**Current Cant**

"If I were Beethoven."—"Everyman" Advertisement.

"A hint on saving money."—"Everyman".

"The woman's question."—"Everyman".

"A real cure for consumption."—"Everyman" Advertisement.

"Advertising the Army has met, at all events, with initial success."—"Everyman".

"Learning music without a teacher."—"Everyman" Advertisement.

"Mr. A. G. Gardiner is too susceptible not to register a many-sided impression. Then he has the artist's gift of vision and the artist's faculty of thinking in forms and colours."—"Everyman".

"Science applied to music."—"Everyman".

"It is impossible to read a page of the 'Pillars of Society' without realising that the author is a man of the widest culture."—"Everyman".

"The 'Times' is still a great newspaper. Let us hope that its future may partake of something of its past power and distinction."—"Everyman".

"A free course of art training."—"Everyman" Advertisement.

"At the moment of writing there is so much that is ambiguous in regard to the sensational events of the past week that it is impossible to arrive at a just conclusion."—"Everyman" ("Notes of the Week").

"Sir Oliver Lodge stretches out welcoming hands across the abyss of doubt. To those who dower the human race with truth, posterity will say, 'Well done, thou good and faithful servant.' Sir Oliver Lodge will be one of these."—J. L. Jaworski, B.A., in "Everyman".

"The editors of the 'English Hymnal' were alone in recognising that a new star had appeared on the horizon of hymnody. Perhaps if Mr. Robert Bridges had been made Poet Laureate fifteen years ago it would have been different."—Dr. Percy Dearmer, in "Everyman".

"Well, to begin with, the 'A. G. G.' who drew these portraits in 'Pillars of Society' (the title bears its characteristic ironic significance . . . )"—"Everyman".

"A reader of 'Everyman' has culture, literary taste, and a discriminating knowledge of the value of words."—"Everyman" Advertisement.

"Music is ceaseless to be, on the one hand, a mere 'accomplishment' for young ladies . . . it is actually becoming a part of life."—Percy A. Scholars, in "Everyman".

"The new pianist is not one who undergoes a daily grind at the keyboard, but one who, freed from all the usual drudgery, can devote himself entirely to the spirit of music, unhindered by any technical difficulties."—"Everyman" Advertisement.

"How to play at sight."—"Everyman" Advertisement.

"Once again the 'curse of competition' turns out to be a blessing in disguise."—"Everyman".

"We have pleasure in announcing one of the most novel and interesting competitions ever placed before the readers of a literary journal. The Directors of that well-known and progressive institution, the Practical Correspondence College (which has already earned the respect and esteem of so many readers of 'Everyman') have decided upon a novel test of latent literary ability. Briefly, every reader who believes that he, or she, possesses natural aptitude for short-story writing (which we need hardly remind them is possibly the most lucrative branch of the literary or journalistic profession) is invited to work the outlines of a plot (given below) into a short story of not more than 2,000 words."—"Everyman" Advertisement.

**Foreign Affairs.**

By S. Verdad.

Once again Paris is in the midst of a financial scandal. Following upon the scene in the Chamber which I referred to last week, Parliament simply had to appoint a Commission of Inquiry into the Rochette affair, and the evidence given by ex-ministers and the highest legal officials in the capital shows conclusively that Rochette, by having his trial postponed from the spring to the autumn, was enabled to carry on his financial operations for six months longer than he might have done—it may be recalled that he was out on bail—and that in due time he escaped. It was, we are now definitely told by the people who actually took part in the affair, M. Monis, the Prime Minister of the time (1911) and M. Caillaux, the Finance Minister, who were instrumental in securing the postponement of the trial.

One result of these proceedings is the discrediting of the particular section of the Radical Party to which M. Caillaux and the present Prime Minister, M. Doumergue, belong. The Cabinet took up. Once months ago, on the defeat of M. Barthou, pledged to pass an income tax bill and to "modify" the three years' service plan. As it was found impossible to pass an Income Tax Bill in the form proposed, and especially to tax Rentes in the manner suggested by M. Caillaux, short loans were resorted to for meeting the deficits; and the three years' service, once the Cabinet was installed, was hardly even mentioned. Still, the official group—if one can still speak of such a group in the scattered Radical Party of French politics—is apparently determined that the Government shall go to the country pledged to reduce the present term of military service to two years. This policy is not favoured by many influential men who call themselves Radicals and profess themselves unspecifically willing to follow M. Doumergue; and it is decidedly opposed by the Radicals, including M. Barthou, who have allied themselves with M. Briand’s new group, the "Republicans of the Left."

* * *

Up to the time of the Calmette affair most people who had been following French politics were inclined to think that the Doumergue Government would come back—i.e., the Radicals led nominally by M. Doumergue, but in reality by M. Caillaux, who had rather the personal supporters in the Chamber. M. Caillaux’s resignation completely alters the outlook for the Radicals and greatly improves the chances of M. Briand’s moderate Radical-Republicans. For, although officially the Radicals will vote on the 3 years’ service and the Income Tax Bill, they will almost certainly take advantage of the General Election to show their disgust at the financial scandals in which the Republic, as I emphasised last week, seems to be becoming more and more involved every year. In the present state of French politics it is not at all easy for the electors to show exactly what they think by means of the ballot-box; but they can at least vote against M. Caillaux’s friends. It must not be forgotten, however, that in France the outgoing Government has always a great advantage, for it controls the prefects and sub-prefects throughout the country, and all the official influence which it is possible to exert is exerted on its behalf.

* * *

One naturally hesitates to prophesy anything about French Parliamentary affairs. I venture to mention the most plausible view I have heard or read so far. It is that the disappearance of M. Caillaux means, sooner or later, the emergence of M. Briand and the formation of a Cabinet containing M. Delcassé. I have heard it suggested that M. Delcassé’s mission to Russia for a month, when he acted as Ambassador, was a failure. (I say was; for M. Delcassé’s chief work in Russia is at an end.) After what we have just heard of the great development of the Russian army, however, I cannot
bring myself to agree. Not all that was hoped for came
to pass as a result of the change in the representation of
France at St. Petersburg; but the great increase in
the Russian army which I outlined two or three weeks
ago was due to the efforts of M. Delcassé.

Assuming that M. Briand's influence is once again
strongly felt—as, with M. Caillaux out of the way, it
almost certainly will be—something else is likely to
happen that may concern us more intimately than even
the increase in the Russian army. M. Briand, with M.
Barthou and M. Poincaré, has always been in favour of
a more definite understanding with this country. As
I have often said in these columns, and as M. Pichon
confirmed in the Chamber of Deputies a long time after
I first mentioned the matter, we are at present guaran-
teeing certain military aid to France in the event of a
German attack; and more recently this understanding
has been supplemented by one whereby France lends
us support, which is now very necessary, in the Mediter-
nanean. If M. Briand were returned to power it is quite
possible that by the end of the year—or next year, after
the inevitable General Election—the French Foreign
Office may suggest that the agreements at present in
force between the two countries should assume a more
definite and comprehensive form.

What definite form any such agreement might take,
if we entered into one, I have already indicated from
time to time. M. Briand, like all practical politicians
in France, realises the necessity for the three years'
time to time. M. Briand, like all practical politicians
in France, realises the necessity for the three years'

I do not suppose that these opinions will be shared by
the ultra-professional opinion of the British War Office,
whose training has not been such as to enable it to
realise the formalised nature of the recent Anglo-
Russian Agreement regarding Persia, for instance
when driven by a real spirit of fanatical determination,
though French and German officers, educated in the
traditions of the Revolution and the Prussian War of
Liberation, will not be slow to realise it. Still less do I
expect to be shared by the crowd of Liberal and
Labour doctrinaires, whose lack of any military reading
or experience leads them to place excessive confidence
in the superiority of regular soldiers. The contempt of
these gentry for the professional in time of quiet is only
surpassed by their blind reliance upon him in time of
trouble. Let us thank God that they have not had their
awakening. Meanwhile it will be of advantage to con-
sider the several lessons which the crisis has afforded
us.

The first lesson is the utter impotence of the adminis-
trator when unbacked by armed force. The automatic
working of the English law and the complete absence of
dangerous revolutionary movement for over a century
has blinded many of us to this. The modern English-
man has come to look upon the machinery of Govern-
ment as something at once blind and irresistible, so that
the passing of a law in Parliament is followed by its
execution in the country in an automatic sequence which
nothing can interrupt. Now our modern bureaucracies
have something of this automatic character, and I think
that it was upon this that Churchill and his fellow
incompetents relied in hoping to force Home Rule upon
Ulster even as they have forced the Insurance Act upon
England. But Ireland contains what England does not
contain—a warlike population with a grip upon the
reality of things. In face of this the bureaucratic bluff
collapsed. It has been seen clearly that the enforcement
of the law depends in the last resort on the forces. As
in the case of some vast modern building, the trimmings
and trappings of wood and concrete being stripped from
it, the framework stands revealed to those who had for-
gotten its existence. It is made of steel—like a sword.

I hope Ulster will not cause us all to overlook Albania.
I refer to that part of Southern Albania from which
the Greek troops have not been withdrawn. The evacua-
tion was to be complete by the end of March, it
will be remembered; and a few weeks ago THE NEW AGE
was, I believe, the first paper to announce the de-
cision of the Italian Government: viz., to take forcible
action if Greece, within a reasonable period, did not
show an evident intention to comply with the wishes of
the Austro-Italian coalition respecting Southern
Albania.

Military Notes.

By Romney.

I write this at Aldershot on Wednesday, March 25.
At this moment there appears little doubt that the re-
calcitrance of the 3rd Cavalry Brigade frustrated a pro-
jected coup de main against the Ulster Volunteers.
Some are glad of this, some sorry, and each for
different reasons; but I have not yet seen the real
reason for thankfulness placed on paper. It is this,
that the coup de main would probably not have come off.... I do not believe that 100,000 half-hearted officers,
by half-hearted officers, would have disarmed or even
intimidated 100,000 determined fanatics—fanatics led
by military men of no little distinction and by no
means without the elements of a sound military educa-
tion. If the Cavaliers had marched, I believe that
we should have seen the beginning of a determined
and, at first, successful resistance, which it would have
taken the greater part of our Expeditionary Army to
suppress. In addition, our consequent military im-
portance would have had the most serious international
consequences. The consequences of the 3rd Cavalry
Brigade's mutiny will be sufficiently serious, as I hope
to show. The consequences of obedience would
have been more serious still.

I do not suppose that these opinions will be shared by
the ultra-professional opinion of the British War Office,
whose training has not been such as to enable it to
realise the formalised nature of the recent Anglo-
Russian Agreement regarding Persia, for instance
when driven by a real spirit of fanatical determination,
though French and German officers, educated in the
traditions of the Revolution and the Prussian War of
Liberation, will not be slow to realise it. Still less do I
expect to be shared by the crowd of Liberal and
Labour doctrinaires, whose lack of any military reading
or experience leads them to place excessive confidence
in the superiority of regular soldiers. The contempt of
these gentry for the professional in time of quiet is only
surpassed by their blind reliance upon him in time of
trouble. Let us thank God that they have not had their
awakening. Meanwhile it will be of advantage to con-
sider the several lessons which the crisis has afforded
us.

The first lesson is the utter impotence of the adminis-
trator when unbacked by armed force. The automatic
working of the English law and the complete absence of
dangerous revolutionary movement for over a century
has blinded many of us to this. The modern English-
man has come to look upon the machinery of Govern-
ment as something at once blind and irresistible, so that
the passing of a law in Parliament is followed by its
execution in the country in an automatic sequence which
nothing can interrupt. Now our modern bureaucracies
have something of this automatic character, and I think
that it was upon this that Churchill and his fellow
incompetents relied in hoping to force Home Rule upon
Ulster even as they have forced the Insurance Act upon
England. But Ireland contains what England does not
contain—a warlike population with a grip upon the
reality of things. In face of this the bureaucratic bluff
collapsed. It has been seen clearly that the enforcement
of the law depends in the last resort on the forces. As
in the case of some vast modern building, the trimmings
and trappings of wood and concrete being stripped from
it, the framework stands revealed to those who had for-
gotten its existence. It is made of steel—like a sword.

The next lesson is the divorce of the British officer
from the body of the nation. There is no doubt that,
outside the upper and upper middle classes, no one in
England was particularly troubled about Ulster. But
the British officer was. Living a life apart, frequently
in India and the Colonies, always in somewhat secluded
quarters, he still takes very seriously a number of things
that the British public scarcely notices. It
must also be remembered that the Protestant Irishman possesses an influence disproportionate to his numbers in the British officer-corps. He is an exceptionally able soldier: he is found in large numbers in the higher posts. He is the energetic minority which leads the Army by the nose, and those who would have employed the Army in the interests of his political opponents would have done well to have remembered it.

If the officer lives apart from the nation, a certain element in the nation is even more out of sympathy with the officer. Had the Liberal doctrinaires spent one day a month in talking to Army men in messes or service clubs, they could never have made the astonishing mistake of that eventful Friday. But they did not, and that because the Liberal doctrinaire lives as much apart from the British officer as the British officer from the baboo in Bengal. They eat, drink, and talk apart. They read different papers. They spring from different classes of the population. Each has his own world, and it is hard to say which is the more incapable of appreciating the world of the other. The Territorial Army and the Special Reserve form a valuable link between the professional army and a certain portion of the population. Each has his own world, and how to be relied upon is not the man who joins the Army through the medium of these, is not the man who joins the League of Young Liberals. There is quite a number of chapel-going, "Daily News" reading Englishmen who are as ignorant of soldiering as of China: and conversely I do not suppose that those who are Regular or Irregular, have read a word of, say, H. G. Wells or any other populariser of "Social Reform"—or ever seen a Fabian.

The last lesson is this. What is sauce for the goose, is sauce for the gander. I doubt whether it will ever be possible for the Government to really count upon the Army again. The spell of discipline has been broken. A large proportion of officers and men have deliberately refused to march because you are ordered to do so, whatever your feelings and convictions may be. The men so addressed have only to reply with "Ulster!" and authority is at an end. Many officers realise this. The possibility of that retort has formed a main subject of conversation in dozens of messes during the past two weeks.

It is also to be remembered, as revealing how human the modern soldier is at bottom, and how to be relied upon for automatic obedience, that the regiments who refused to march were composed not of Ulster Irish nor Presbyterian Scots, but of agricultural Englishmen, and were especially chosen with a view to their supposed indifference to the Irish quarrel. And so, very likely, they were indifferent before they reached Ireland. It was when they arrived there that the trouble began. I myself am a Home Ruler, and can scarcely be accused of sympathy, either sentimental or intellectual, with Ulstermen: yet I very much doubt whether my Home Rule convictions would survive my witnessing the spitting on the British uniform or the elaborate insults to the British flag which are a feature of Nationalist Ireland. It is too much to expect soldiers, educated in a superstitious reverence for both these symbols, to feel any sympathy, either sentimental or intellectual, with Ulstermen: yet I very much doubt whether my Home Rule convictions would survive my witnessing the spitting on the British uniform or the elaborate insults to the British flag which are a feature of Nationalist Ireland. It is too much to expect soldiers, educated in a superstitious reverence for both these symbols, to feel any sympathy, either sentimental or intellectual, with Ulstermen: yet I very much doubt whether my Home Rule convictions would survive my witnessing the spitting on the British uniform or the elaborate insults to the British flag which are a feature of Nationalist Ireland. It is too much to expect soldiers, educated in a superstitious reverence for both these symbols, to feel any sympathy, either sentimental or intellectual, with Ulstermen: yet I very much doubt whether my Home Rule convictions would survive my witnessing the spitting on the British uniform or the elaborate insults to the British flag which are a feature of Nationalist Ireland.
means; in general, by reducing its necessity in production—as by its more economic (that is, sparing) use, by increasing its efficiency, and by substituting machinery for it.

Cannot trade unions determine the Supply of Labour?

Trade unions cannot determine the total or general supply of labour; they can only determine a particular supply.

Cannot wages be raised then by this means?

By controlling a particular supply of labour, a trade union can raise the rate of wages of its own members, but not the wages of the proletariat in general and per unit.

What is the meaning of these various terms?

The rate of wages is the price paid per man employed. Wages in general is the total sum of wages paid to the proletariat class. The wage-unit is the amount each proletarian man, woman and child would receive if the total wages were divided equally among them.

If trade union or economic action cannot raise the wage-unit but only the wage-rates of particular sections of workmen, cannot Parliament or political action raise wages?

Parliament cannot raise wages in general, because Parliament cannot compel employers to increase their demand for wages nor prevent them from reducing their demand. A high minimum wage, for example, would only stimulate employers to adopt more labour-saving devices.

If wages cannot be raised either by economic or by political action, can they be prevented from falling?

Wages must tend always to fall, since the object of capitalist production being profit, all employers must seek to reduce costs, the chief of which is the cost of labour, or Wages.

Is there not a limit below which wages cannot fall?

None.

But can Wages fall below the subsistence level of the proletariat?

Yes, they both can, do, and will continue to do so. At this moment the total wages paid to the proletariat would not, even if equally divided among them, provide sufficient to keep them all in health.

Then how do the proletariat as a whole continue to live?

By the additions to their total Wages of the gifts of charity.

What forms of Charity?

The charitable supplements of the wages of the proletariat are (a) private and personal, as in tips, patronage, gifts, etc.; (b) semi-public, Christian, etc., by means of charitable organisations (of which there are a thousand in London alone); (c) State charity in the form of free schooling, feeding, pensions, workhouses, hospitals, etc., etc.

What must be the end of this degradation of Wages?

As charity supplements and supplants wages, the freedom of the workmen to spend on their own initiative will be more and more curtailed. Who pays the fiddler will call the tune; and, in the end, the proletariat will be no better than kept slaves.

But is this culmination inevitable?

Provided that the Wage-System remains, the Servile State is inevitable.

Apart from reducing the proletariat to slavery, what other objections are there to the Wage-System?

There are moral, economic and practical objections as well to the Wage-System.

What is the moral objection?

The moral and philosophical objection to the Wage-System is that it makes of one class of men merely a means to the end of another class.

What are the economic objections?

The Wage-System limits useful production by limiting the purchasing power of the proletariat; it wastes production by competition, necessitating advertising, salesmen, duplications, etc., and by stimulating the production of foolish luxuries; it coarsens production by creating an extensive cheap and nasty market.

What are the social objections to the Wage-System?

The Wage-System debases the major part of society by mean poverty, over-work and insecurity; and corrupts the minority by luxury, idleness and brutality. It directs production to profit instead of utility and beauty.

What are the practical objections?

The main practical objection to the Wage-System is that it cannot last.

How and by what means can the Wage-System be abolished?

The Wage-System can be abolished by one of two means, a worse and a better.

What is the worse means of abolishing the Wage-System?

The worse means is by the re-institution in an improved form of chattel-slavery under the direction of the capitalists.

By what means could this be made possible?

The restoration of chattel-slavery may be made possible by (a) the formation of great capitalist trusts which in return for unconditional life-service will undertake to provide the proletariat class with security for life; or (b) by the institution of State Capitalism (otherwise called Collectivism) which will undertake the same.

Which is the better means of abolishing the Wage-System?

The better means is what is known as Emancipation. It consists in the establishment of National Industrial Guilds.

What is a Guild?

A Guild is a self-governing brotherhood of producers having a complete monopoly of the labour-power of their industry.

What is a National Guild?

A National Guild is such a Guild chartered by the State to carry on an industry nationally.

By what means can National Guilds be formed?

National Guilds can be formed by the co-operation of men of political, moral and social intelligence with the existing trade unions.

What is the difference between a Trade Union and a Guild?

Unlike a Guild, a Trade Union does not exist and is not organised to carry on an industry but to keep up the wages of its members; it includes only the wage-earners of its industry, and excludes the salariat; in consequence, it has not a complete monopoly of the labour-power necessary to its industry.

How can a Trade Union become a Guild?

A Trade Union can become a Guild only by a series of steps, of which the first is to make itself blackleg-proof, and the second is to be prepared then to demand, not higher wages, but superior status.

What is implied by superior status?

Superior status for the proletariat would mean that they were ceasing to sell their labour as a commodity in the market and were becoming partners in the direction and control of their industry.

Would not effective resistance be offered by the capitalists?

The capitalists would resist, but their resistance would not be effective if blacklegs could not be obtained.

Could not the State with its Army break the attempt of the proletariat to emancipate itself?

No, for the Army is useless against folded arms and loaded pipes.

Would not the salariat side with the capitalists?

At first, yes; but the interests of the salariat being with the industry, if the Union could hold up industry, the salariat would have no choice but co-operating with the Union.

If this should appear probable, what would the capitalists be likely to do?

So soon as a Union is practically blackleg-proof, the capitalists of the industry will approach its leaders with
offers of profit-sharing and co-partnership, and in two successive forms.

What are these two forms?

The first form is profit-sharing and co-partnership with the men, not collectively as a Union, but individually by units.

Is there any objection to this form?

Yes, for every man so singled out is spiritually transferred from the side of Labour to the side of Capital. His entire life is no longer to abolish the Wage-System for himself, his fellows and the nation at large, but to obtain all the profit he can extract out of it.

What is the probable second form of the Capitalists' offer?

The second form will be offered as a rule only when the first form has been rejected by the men. The capitalists will offer partnership to the Union as a Union.

Are there any objections to this form?

There are several. (1) The Union would remain a union of wage-earners. (2) Relations between itself and the salariat and capitalists would be unstable, since in the same industry there cannot be two masters, and one of the parties would constantly be attempting to encroach on the privileges of the other. (3) And if they combined, the greatest objection of all would arise.

What is that?

Together they would form a Trust, including the monopoly of Capital with the monopoly of Labour, by means of which they could exploit society without check.

What could be done to prevent the formation of such an anti-national Trust?

Provided that while the Trade Unions were winning to their emancipation, the intelligent public were with them, at this point the public, through its organ the State, might substitute itself for the capitalists.

What steps could the State take for this purpose?

Its first steps should be to "buy out" the capitalists of an industry by offering them a reasonable sum or, better, by guaranteeing them an income for a period of years. Its next step should be, while retaining nominal possession of the so-acquired capital, to charter the Union (now become a Guild by the inclusion of the salaried) to carry on the industry on terms mutually fair and favourable.

What, generally, would such terms be?

In return for a Charter guaranteeing the Guild the privileges of national monopoly and industrial self-government, the Guild would undertake certain responsibilities relating to quality and quantity of industry—and also on behalf of its own members, other Guilds, the public at large and the State itself.

Has such an arrangement ever been known in history?

Not exactly after this pattern, perhaps, but arrangements of the same character have been made between the State and political, professional and industrial organisations.

Name any political parallel.

Home Rule in the Dominions subject to the suzerainty of the Crown; the Chartered Companies of Rhodesia and British East Africa.

What professional precedents are there?

The legal, medical and ecclesiastical professions in England have each a Charter from the State guaranteeing them certain privileges in return for the acceptance of certain responsibilities.

What industrial precedents are there?

The nearest and most recent is the Canal Commission entrusted by the American State with the construction of the Panama Canal.

What formal are the Guilds take?

If the Guilds would fall into three main orders—State or Civil Guilds; Professional Guilds; and National or Industrial Guilds.

What are State Guilds?

State Guilds would consist of the existing Civil Services, the Army, the Navy, the Post Office, etc.

What are the Professional Guilds?

The Professional Guilds consist of the existing professions already nationally chartered.

What are the National Industrial Guilds?

The National Guilds include the various existing industries mainly as already outlined in Amalgamated or National Trade Unions.

Would everybody belong to one or other of these Guilds?

Outside the Civil Services, the professions, and the National Industrial Guilds would be a number of occupations insusceptible of organisation; journalism, art, literature, etc.

How would the members of these callings live?

They would live as they do now, by their wits.

Leaving aside the Civil and Professional Guilds, of the two parties to the contract or charter establishing National Guilds, would not one or the other prove the more powerful in the long run; and, if so, what would result?

If the State became more powerful than the Guild, Collectivism would result. If the Guild over-ruled the State, Syndicalism would be established.

What is to prevent one or the other result?

The necessity of each party to the other, and the relative equality of their powers.

What is the necessity of the Guild to the State?

The Guild possesses a monopoly of the labour and skill of its own industry.

What is the necessity of the State to the Guild?

Without the State as the organ of the whole and the Association of all associations, each of the Guilds would be an unco-ordinated unit. And as the Manchester doctrine of laissez faire applied to the individual broke down and required State action to regulate it, so the same doctrine applied to groups would break down unless controlled by an organ representing the whole.

What sanction would the Guild have for its just claims if they were disputed?

The power to strike.

What is the sanction of the State?

The control of the State Guilds.

What are the relations into which a Guild might enter?

They are four; relations with the State, with its own members, with other Guilds and with the public.

What would be the relations of the Guild with the State?

On the one side the State would let on a renewable lease the initial capital required by the Guild on its formation. On the other side, the Guild would undertake responsibilities to the State, its members, other Guilds and the public.

What would be the responsibilities of the Guild to the State directly?

They would include an annual contribution to the national budget in lieu of rent; formal admission of the suzerainty of the State; the right of the State to be represented on its councils; the discharge of the duties of the industry; and the maintenance and improvement of the capital and industry committed to its care.

What would be the responsibilities of a Guild to its members?

These responsibilities would include provision for them in sickness and in health, in employment and in unemployment; the provision of conditions and means of carrying on their craft, and to acquire and employ their skill in it; of training for prospective members; and of opportunity for every member to hold any position in the Guild for which he is fitted.

What are the Guilds' responsibilities to other Guilds?

These could be best defined by an assembly of Guilds in occasional or permanent Congress. Having, under the supremacy of the State, the care of national industry in their hands, the associated Guilds will require of each component Guild a measure of common action.

What would be the responsibilities of a Guild to the public?

Among others, efficient, fair and general service; guaranteed workmanship and materials; a fair price.
By what means would disputes be settled as regards the four relations into which a Guild may enter? Excluding criminal and such civil cases as properly belong to law in general (for each Guild member would be also a citizen), the means of settling disputes with the State have already been defined.

How would members’ disputes be settled? Members would have the right of trial and appeal by a series of Guild courts, mounting through their own Guild to the general Guild Congress up to the State Guild Council.

How would disputes with other Guilds be settled? By joint conference, reference to Congress and by final appeal to the State in Guild Council.

How would disputes with the public be settled? By public opinion or by the State.

Besides abolishing the Wage-System and thereby saving the proletariat from a worse slavery, what other advantages has the National Guild System? The chief is the liberation of spiritual energy that would spring from the establishment of human equality. All other advantages are included in that.

Are there any disadvantages? Many disadvantages can be and will be urged against the National Guild System; but only by those who fail to realise the horrors of wage-slavery and the inevitability of its transformation into something much worse (the Servile State) for much better.

What is our duty? Each as best he can, and in his own most convenient place, we should educate ourselves and others in the principles and practice of the National Guilds.

New Statesmen.

A Bill Providing for an Economic Basis of Marriage. [Being a projected Fabian Tract, number 1001 (c.)]

Since the inception of our organisation we have worked along every route known to the social reformer, for the simplification and systematisation of life. We have heaped up facts, we have pulled wires, roped in young intellectuals, used up secretaries, instituted inquiries—impertinent were they not necessary—and woven nets to catch the national revenue. Burrowing deep, we are safe alike from the distant thunder of a German madman and his disciples, as from the violence of untutored man and his disciples, as from the violence of untutored

This is our warrant, this our safeguard, in a scheme on a sound economic basis. We know the first step is to introduce simple laws, the second is to introduce certain reforms. We have worked with the labourers, we have worked with the manufacturers, we have worked with the millionaires.

The best of them may, of course, be re-selected. The worst of them will be dismissed. The Model Congress will be responsible for the proper and just treatment of the working of the domestic arrangements, the prevention of favouritism, and the removal and subsequent disposal of weaklings. Financial provision will be made for the erection and maintenance of Lethal Chambers under the management of Dr. Saleeby.

The rise to an income of £350 should entitle a man to keep one wife; that the rise to an income of £4,000 should bring him the privilege of a second wife; and that every subsequent £2,000 added to his income should make it legal—and compulsory—for him to maintain a corresponding number of women.

On the same basis, an income of £200 permits a man to share a wife with one other man of equal income. An income of £100 entitles him to a fourth share in a wife. And six labourers earning £1 a week or less will be permitted to join in the support of one woman.

This system of connubial co-partnership necessitates the erection of blocks of model buildings. The housing problem solves itself.

The administration of the scheme, seemingly difficult, is made easy by the existing organisation of the Insurance Act and the Income Tax. The task of the officials under the new scheme is simply one of arrangement, regulation and supervision. We venture to suggest that employment will be provided for at least twice as many Government officials as now exist, all of whom, male or female, will naturally be exempt from the regulation of the Marriage Act. After the provision for the first re-arrangement of the new "family group", on the basis provided by the above scheme, the officials will inspect, and on the result of their reports, official notice will be issued to the family-groups, commanding or forbidding the addition of wives or children to each group; or in the case of financial failure, depriving the wage-earner of some or all of his wives, or share in a wife. Women and children thus set adrift will be provided for in State colonies set apart for the purpose. The best of them may, of course, be re-selected. The officials will be responsible for the proposed just working of the domestic arrangements, the prevention of favouritism, and the removal and subsequent disposal of weaklings. Financial provision will be made for the erection and maintenance of Lethal Chambers under the management of Dr. Saleeby.

Is it necessary to labour the incalculable benefits of the scheme? The human brain can hardly realise in one mental effort the vastness of the conception. Poverty is eradicated with the eradication of over-breeding and over-crowding. The six children of a poor man who has six husbands to support her and them, can be fed, clothed, and educated in every essential respect as well as the six children of the rich man by his six wives. With the disappearance of poverty, and of the diseases bred in our slums, urban and rural, the problem of race-degeneration vanishes. The State is provided with healthy men for its armies, its workshops, its police. The Woman Question will be no more, when marriage is thus made possible—nay, compulsory—for every healthy woman, under conditions which lift it to the ranks of the most honourable profession. Labour unrest and strikes are no longer possible. And as our Socialist principles permeate the governing classes, the condition of the lower-class family-groups will become more amenable.

Towards this culminating triumph we have toiled, struggling, for years. It is the consummation of the nation. Ours the conception, the initiative: to others, no doubt, will be the glory of the final consummation.

Storm Jameson.
Aesthetics and History.

By Arthur J. Penny.

It is extraordinary how the worshipers of facts seek to dispose of those who can see no solution of our troubles save by the restoration of the past. In "The World of Labour," Mr. G. D. H. Cole summarily dismisses such ideas in a couple of paragraphs, and then not by pointing out defects in the position, but by making assertions which he could not maintain. Thus he says in this connection, "There is no hope in solutions of the social problem which end in a false aestheticism, as they began in a false reading of history." When the idea is popularly held it is necessary to controvert it.

Now, so far from this statement being the case, the exact contrary is the truth. The revival of Mediævalism did not begin in a false reading of history; the revivalists were quite unconcerned about history, though antiquarianism interested them. The movement has not ended in a false aestheticism, but it may be said to have commenced in one. For it was in the sphere of aesthetics that the movement made its first conquests. As far as I know, the earliest attempt at a revival of anything Mediæval was made by Horace Walpole, who built a "Gothick Villa" at Strawberry Hill. But it was left to Sir Walter Scott in this country and the brothers Schlegel in Germany to arouse that interest in Mediævalism which continued unabated down to our day, in spite of temporary reactions against it. As such, it became eventually a many-sided movement which arrived at the emancipation of man from the tyranny of a pseudo-classicism. The movement, which in literature was represented by Byron, Keats, Shelley, Coleridge and Wordsworth, finally crystallised itself into three movements—the Oxford Movement in the Church of England, the Pre-Raphaelite movement in painting, and the Gothic Revival in Architecture. These three movements, that are so closely interwoven. The eyes of all were turned back out of consideration of the needs of the Arts. It was observed that his interest in sociology gradually grew, and his success and the artistic considerations may stand in the way of its widespread application to-day, but its fundamental truth is unquestionable.

Now the difficulty which faces the reformer in these days, where assumed that all that was necessary was for the movement to concentrate its energies on producing a supply of skilled craftsmen and that the demand for their work could very well be left to take care of itself. As such, it became eventually a many-sided movement which arrived at the emancipation of man from the tyranny of a pseudo-classicism. The movement, which in literature was represented by Byron, Keats, Shelley, Cole- ridge and Wordsworth, finally crystallised itself into three movements—the Oxford Movement in the Church of England, the Pre-Raphaelite movement in painting, and the Gothic Revival in Architecture. These three movements, that are so closely interwoven. The eyes of all were turned back out of consideration of the needs of the Arts. It was observed that his interest in sociology gradually grew, and his success and the artistic considerations may stand in the way of its widespread application to-day, but its fundamental truth is unquestionable.

Now the difficulty which faces the reformer in these days, where assumed that all that was necessary was for the movement to concentrate its energies on producing a supply of skilled craftsmen and that the demand for their work could very well be left to take care of itself. As such, it became eventually a many-sided movement which arrived at the emancipation of man from the tyranny of a pseudo-classicism. The movement, which in literature was represented by Byron, Keats, Shelley, Cole- ridge and Wordsworth, finally crystallised itself into three movements—the Oxford Movement in the Church of England, the Pre-Raphaelite movement in painting, and the Gothic Revival in Architecture. These three movements, that are so closely interwoven. The eyes of all were turned back out of consideration of the needs of the Arts. It was observed that his interest in sociology gradually grew, and his success and the artistic considerations may stand in the way of its widespread application to-day, but its fundamental truth is unquestionable.

Now the difficulty which faces the reformer in these days, where assumed that all that was necessary was for the movement to concentrate its energies on producing a supply of skilled craftsmen and that the demand for their work could very well be left to take care of itself. As such, it became eventually a many-sided movement which arrived at the emancipation of man from the tyranny of a pseudo-classicism. The movement, which in literature was represented by Byron, Keats, Shelley, Cole- ridge and Wordsworth, finally crystallised itself into three movements—the Oxford Movement in the Church of England, the Pre-Raphaelite movement in painting, and the Gothic Revival in Architecture. These three movements, that are so closely interwoven. The eyes of all were turned back out of consideration of the needs of the Arts. It was observed that his interest in sociology gradually grew, and his success and the artistic considerations may stand in the way of its widespread application to-day, but its fundamental truth is unquestionable.
Towards the Play Way.

By H. Caldwell Cook.

Playing "The Dream." - VII.

It was only to be expected that the Littlemen, once they had been given enough instruction in the amusing farce of Pyramus and Thisbe, should find great fun in playing it, even of their own accord out of school. But the other parts of this fairy play, except for those tedious love-passages, have also been thoroughly appreciated. In "A Midsummer Night's Dream" there is not much characterisation, but when a boy is cast to play any person, he certainly will not fail to make as much of the character as he can. Puck has, of course, proved a great favourite, and the "rude mechanicals" were individualised well enough by tricks of voice and behaviour for any of us to know which a boy was playing even after a 'general post' in the cast. But what of Titania? It is difficult nowadays for the average man in reading or looking on at a Shakespeare play to realise that the women's parts were really acted at that time by boys with unbroken voices. Everyone knows this well enough as a fact, but few can ever have convinced their imaginations of it. It is of course only possible to understand how it could be done when you see them do it. The Children of the Chapel—whose playing was successful enough to send the King's players on travel—had no scenery to speak of, but they had the most elaborate costumes; and their dress was of course a great aid to the illusion of the audience. But the playboys is the classroom to-day are not in the same position at all. In the first place, the setting and dress of a play in school, even on a stage, are in the nature of things so poor as to be rather a hindrance than a help. In the classroom, scenery is out of the question, and any costume possible would be so absurdly inadequate that it is best let alone altogether. In the second place, the Elizabethan playboy was coached and rehearsed and polished his part out of school. But the Littleman's experience, we may say at any rate help towards it through a series of negations. We can demonstrate to him that art is a necessary factor in social salvation; that large organisations are destructive of liberty; that modern machinery is the runner of social destruction; and that the financier is not the great man he has been taught to believe him, but a sordid person who understands how to extract profits from industry and nothing else.

And now a word about history. The Mediavalist movement did not begin in a false reading of history, but it has ended in the creation of Mediaval history. That is one of its most interesting by-products. It gave an impetus to archaeological research, and it is to archaeology that we owe our increasing knowledge of the past. Henry Hallana was one of the first English historians of importance to go to original documents for his material, and he first came to the front as a Mediaval historian. History, then, has not led to aestheticism, but aestheticism has led to history, as they have led to economics, and will one day to social reform. It reminds one of the saying of Tacitus, that "in every battle the eye is first conquered.

Finally, I would ask Mr. Cole when he writes his next book to let us have a little more gently. The Mediavalist movement is no mushroom growth. It has at least a hundred and fifty years of continuous tradition behind it. It has brought its influence to bear on many departments of modern life. And its influence must grow in the future, for it might think it worth while to consider the experience of those who have produced for use, instead of confining its attentions to such as produce for profit.

**Proof**

Provenance: This text is from the book *The New Age* published in April 1914. It discusses the differences between modern and medieval approaches to play, emphasizing the importance of individual interpretation and the role of the audience in the performance of Shakespeare's works.
logy is the subject of that chapter, "Its Walls Were as of jasper," in Kenneth Grahame's "Dream Days."

For home preparation in keeping with our doings in the classroom, an unkind critic might suggest "blowing bubbles or sliding down the stair-rail." But here is what Littleman actually does do at home. When in our reading we chance upon an image, a conceit, a simile—any phrase in fact which might suggest the hour of dismissal, Homework may be heard to say, "Write a poem or a poetical prose called 'The Woodland World' on the lines

I am a spirit of no common rate,
The summer still doth tend upon my state; or one called 'The Underwater World' on the lines, I'll give thee fairies to attend on thee. And they will fetch thee jewels from the deep."

I am afraid it sounds a little bit like the "Saturday Westminster"; but there is this notable difference. The Littlemen are not tied down to do as mother bids to the very letter. That may serve very well as a principle in conducting newspaper competitions, but it is no help to art. And so it happened that the aged Littleman we call Gaffer, who has ever been known to have a mind full of fairies, ignored the set work one evening. This stanza, however is rather pleasing. "The Mermaid on a Dolphin's Back." Here again there has been no remarkable achievement, but I beg permission to quote the following to show that Littleman keeps up a fair average in everyday homework.

A mermaid sat on a dolphin's back, And a mermaid fair was she; She sang a song as she sped along, All out on the deep blue sea.

There came a boat with a seaman bold, And this mermaid fair to see, And he stopped when he heard the maiden's song, All out on the deep blue sea.

So he left his boat and he left his oars, And this mermaid fair to see, And this was the end of that seaman bold, All out on the deep blue sea.

Competition of Religions in India.

By a Hindu.

If India can be said to be a congeries of nations, it is to-day also the confluence of many faiths. Besides giving to the world some of the greatest religious thinkers, Hinduism was never intolerant of other religious creeds; and when the fire-worshippers of Persia found their native land too hot for the practice of their own tenets, they found a ready home in Western India. With its vast resources in human ore in the shape of an enormous aboriginal population, and an equally submerged people of the backward castes among the Hindus, the great Indian continent has always supplied very good material for Moslem and Christian propaganda work.

With the Moslems, before the advent of the British rule, religious propaganda was part of their programme of political administration of Hindustan; and compulsion played a great part in matters of conversion. With the planting of the British flag in India, however, an era of perfect toleration in matters of faith has been ushered into existence. And now every religious creed is free to propagate its particular ideas among the Indian people, so long as its proselytising fervour does not overstep the limits assigned by law. Only the other day, a Moslem newspaper in Northern India was bound down under the Press Law on a security of Rs. 2,000 for having cast an aspersion on Christianity. And on its showing that the attack was provoked by a vernacular Christian Missionary organ, which had cast a slur upon Mahomedan country, the English journal also was bound down on exactly similar terms. But occurrences like this are very few and far between.

Hinduism proper, with its cast-iron inflexibility, does not allow any expansion of its folds from outside; so that the Hindu is not likely to be won over by any missionary enterprise among the Hindus. With the spread of education and culture, again, the Indian society is reforming itself on modern lines. And the sharp distinctions which the rigidity of the Hindu caste rules instituted, have begun to be felt as most galling at the present day by those who, though born in the despised classes in Hindu society, are now claiming some of the primary rights of humanity which are denied to them by the higher castes. A combination of these and other favourable circumstances has made the way easy for the Christian and the Mahomedan missionary in India.

According to the census of India held in 1911, whose report has been just published, the total population of India is 315,126,596, of which 217.3 millions, or more than two-thirds, are Hindus. The term Hindu, it is useful to remember, is remarkable in its comprehensiveness. "It shelters within its portals monotheists, polytheists, and pantheists, worshippers of the great gods Siva and Vishnu, or of their female counterparts, as well as worshippers of the divine mothers, of the spirits of trees, rocks and streams and of the tutelary village deities; persons who propagate their deity by all manner of bloody sacrifices, and persons who will not only kill no living creature, but who must not even use the word 'cut'; whose religious ritual consists mainly of prayers and hymns, and those who indulge in unspeakable orgies in the name of religion; a host of more or less orthodox sectaries many of whom deny the supremacy of the Brahman, or at least have non-Brahmanical religious leaders." The present number of Hindus represents an increase of 5 per cent. in ten years.

Buddhism, although it had its rise in India, and is still the faith of more than half of Asia, claims in India proper only one-third of a million people; but there are ten millions in Burmah and their number is increasing there.
The followers of Mahomet number 66.7 millions, or more than one-fifth of the total population of India, which is an increase of 6.7 per cent. in ten years.

Indian Christians number barely 3½ millions, or 12 per thousand of the total population. This figure stands for a cent. per cent. increase in thirty years.

Let us now have a glance at the causes that principally determine the increase or decrease of each particular denomination. We find that in the case of the Hindus, the system of early marriage, and the infant mortality consequent upon it, enforced and life-long widowhood of women even of child-bearing age, and restrictions in marriage owing to hypergamy, are responsible for a certain proportion of the set-off to the general rate of increase. Added to these, the stringent rules of caste and the unfavourable plight of the lower classes are not a little responsible for the defections from the ranks of the Hindus.

In the case of Mahomedans, we find that if their religion is essentially democratic and non-exclusive in character, its social system is as much favourable to a growth of population. And although there may be a small but continuous accession of converts, the main reason of the increase of Mahomedans is that they are generally more prolific, their social customs are more favourable to a high birth-rate, they have fewer marriage restrictions, early marriage is uncommon and widows remarry freely among them.

In the case of Christians, the remarkable rise in numbers must be set down mainly to the efforts of those devoted bands of missionaries who have done their best to let in light where there was darkness before, and are always the true helpers of the downtrodden people of the lower classes in their hour of misery and oppression. There is another very significant circumstance which contributes to the gradual increase of Christians in India. It is the fact that Hindus regard Christianity with no ill-will; indeed, instances are not wanting where they have displayed positive sympathy with Christianity. The hatred with which Mahomedanism is regarded by orthodox Hindus is the outcome of the aggressive nature of that religion and centuries of cruel campaigns which were led by Moslem rulers against Hindustan. Christianity, besides being a religion of peace and harmony, is the religion of the Sovereign of India—which in itself constitutes a claim to respect. Again the friendliness of attitude which the Christian missionaries have displayed to the native races, the way they have been welcomed and treated in the occupation of India, adopted towards Indians—whether in the matter of philanthropy, educational and moral progress, and improvement of the vernaculars, has removed much of the obloquy which might otherwise attach to an exotic religion.

But whatever the attitude of the people towards Christianity, it is very seldom that converts are actuated by a genuine religious prompting to embrace Christianity. The hatred with which Mahomedanism is essentially democratic and non-exclusive in character, its social system is as much favourable to a growth of population. And although there may be a small but continuous accession of converts, the main reason of the increase of Mahomedans is that they are generally more prolific, their social customs are more favourable to a high birth-rate, they have fewer marriage restrictions, early marriage is uncommon and widows remarry freely among them.

In the case of Christians, the remarkable rise in numbers must be set down mainly to the efforts of those devoted bands of missionaries who have done their best to let in light where there was darkness before, and are always the true helpers of the downtrodden people of the lower classes in their hour of misery and oppression. There is another very significant circumstance which contributes to the gradual increase of Christians in India. It is the fact that Hindus regard Christianity with no ill-will; indeed, instances are not wanting where they have displayed positive sympathy with Christianity. The hatred with which Mahomedanism is regarded by orthodox Hindus is the outcome of the aggressive nature of that religion and centuries of cruel campaigns which were led by Moslem rulers against Hindustan. Christianity, besides being a religion of peace and harmony, is the religion of the Sovereign of India—which in itself constitutes a claim to respect. Again the friendliness of attitude which the Christian missionaries have displayed to the native races, the way they have been welcomed and treated in the occupation of India, adopted towards Indians—whether in the matter of philanthropy, educational and moral progress, and improvement of the vernaculars, has removed much of the obloquy which might otherwise attach to an exotic religion.

But whatever the attitude of the people towards Christianity, it is very seldom that converts are actuated by a genuine religious prompting to embrace Christianity. The hatred with which Mahomedanism is essentially democratic and non-exclusive in character, its social system is as much favourable to a growth of population. And although there may be a small but continuous accession of converts, the main reason of the increase of Mahomedans is that they are generally more prolific, their social customs are more favourable to a high birth-rate, they have fewer marriage restrictions, early marriage is uncommon and widows remarry freely among them.

In the case of Christians, the remarkable rise in numbers must be set down mainly to the efforts of those devoted bands of missionaries who have done their best to let in light where there was darkness before, and are always the true helpers of the downtrodden people of the lower classes in their hour of misery and oppression. There is another very significant circumstance which contributes to the gradual increase of Christians in India. It is the fact that Hindus regard Christianity with no ill-will; indeed, instances are not wanting where they have displayed positive sympathy with Christianity. The hatred with which Mahomedanism is regarded by orthodox Hindus is the outcome of the aggressive nature of that religion and centuries of cruel campaigns which were led by Moslem rulers against Hindustan. Christianity, besides being a religion of peace and harmony, is the religion of the Sovereign of India—which in itself constitutes a claim to respect. Again the friendliness of attitude which the Christian missionaries have displayed to the native races, the way they have been welcomed and treated in the occupation of India, adopted towards Indians—whether in the matter of philanthropy, educational and moral progress, and improvement of the vernaculars, has removed much of the obloquy which might otherwise attach to an exotic religion.

But whatever the attitude of the people towards Christianity, it is very seldom that converts are actuated by a genuine religious prompting to embrace Christianity. The hatred with which Mahomedanism is essentially democratic and non-exclusive in character, its social system is as much favourable to a growth of population. And although there may be a small but continuous accession of converts, the main reason of the increase of Mahomedans is that they are generally more prolific, their social customs are more favourable to a high birth-rate, they have fewer marriage restrictions, early marriage is uncommon and widows remarry freely among them.

In the case of Christians, the remarkable rise in numbers must be set down mainly to the efforts of those devoted bands of missionaries who have done their best to let in light where there was darkness before, and are always the true helpers of the downtrodden people of the lower classes in their hour of misery and oppression. There is another very significant circumstance which contributes to the gradual increase of Christians in India. It is the fact that Hindus regard Christianity with no ill-will; indeed, instances are not wanting where they have displayed positive sympathy with Christianity. The hatred with which Mahomedanism is regarded by orthodox Hindus is the outcome of the aggressive nature of that religion and centuries of cruel campaigns which were led by Moslem rulers against Hindustan. Christianity, besides being a religion of peace and harmony, is the religion of the Sovereign of India—which in itself constitutes a claim to respect. Again the friendliness of attitude which the Christian missionaries have displayed to the native races, the way they have been welcomed and treated in the occupation of India, adopted towards Indians—whether in the matter of philanthropy, educational and moral progress, and improvement of the vernaculars, has removed much of the obloquy which might otherwise attach to an exotic religion.
3. John Carnforth, Esq., Secretary to the Lords of the Pensions, to Mrs. Willoughby Wheedleham, Dunham Place, S.W.  
   Dear Sally,—  
   Yours,  
   JACK.

6. John Carnforth, Esq., Secretary to the Lords of the Pensions, to Mrs. Willoughby Wheedleham, 17, Dunham Place, S.W.  
   Dear Sally,—  
   Yours,  
   JACK.

7. The Controller and Botherator General to John Carnforth, Esq., Secretary to the Lords of the Pensions.  
   Ref. No. L. 34000.  
   Botherations Board, London, S.W.  
   Nov. 20th.

8. Mrs. Willoughby Wheedleham to John Carnforth, Esq., Secretary to the Lords of the Pensions.  
   Ref. No. 18675. Pensionary Offices, Whitehall, S.W.  
   Yours ever,  
   SALLY.

9. John Carnforth, Esq., Secretary to the Lords of the Pensions, to the Controller and Botherator General.  
   Ref. No. T. 17650.  
   Pensionary Offices, Whitehall, S.W.  
   Sir,—  
   I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your communication of the 20th inst., and to inquire whether there is, in your opinion, any circumstance which might be held to justify an increase in Mr. Luckmaster's pension.

With reference to Messenger John Hoggins, Their Lordships have been pleased to raise Mr. Luckmaster's pension from £250 to £350 (two hundred and fifty) to £500 (five hundred) per annum, under 2 Edw. viii., cap. xvii. (An Act for the Better Remuneration of the Higher Branches of His Majesty's Civil Service, with provisions for corresponding Reductions in the Lower); and to request you to advise Mr. Luckmaster to that effect.

With regard to Messenger Hoggins, I am directed by Their Lordships to say that, in view of the great and increasing burdens upon the public, they do not feel justified in sanctioning the
increase of 6d. per diem "for distinguished services" as recommended by you. I have the honour to be, Sir, Your obedient servant, JOHN CARNFORTH, Secy. for Their Lordships.

"I agree." Arminius Akenside. 3rd Lord.

"I concur." James Attlebury. 2nd Lord.

"Noted." Robert Vaseytone. 1st Lord.

To Mr. Jones to File and Copy. Filed and Copied. J. Jones, Boy Clerk.

Certified True Copy.

Vincent Tucker, Senior Clerk.

PLXXIii876/4. Transk.


It is observed that this pensioner is already in receipt of 4d. per diem Military pension from the War Office (including 2d. per diem "for distinguished conduct on the field of battle"). It would therefore appear by the provisions of 4 Edw. vii. cap. iii. (An Act for the Better Diddling of Helpless People), that his Civil Pension should be reduced by that amount.

12. Mrs. Willoughby Wheel-dale to Lord Mosenthal, President of the Imperial Alliance for the Preservation of the Purity of Municipal Administration.

Dear Lord Mosenthal,—

If you people get in on the L.C.C. elections, can't you find a job for Charley Luckmaster? He is such a nice fellow, and so unfortunate! Come round to my place next Monday evening, and I will introduce you. Please remember me to Lady Mosenthal. I might be able to do something for her in the matter she wrote of.

Yours very sincerely,

SARAH WHEELDEHAM.

Mr. John Hoggins, Pensioner, of Hoxton, to The Lords of the Pensions, Whitehall. (On a half-sheet of notepaper. Very dirty. Undated.)

Dear Sirs,—

Received yours telling me you have reduced my pension. This to you and others Responsible for Good Order and Discipline of His Majesty's subjects. Gentlemen: What have I done? Behaved myself always correct And proper no complaints. Good God Gentlemen do you take me for a fool? I am a man and a soldier! I served in Egypt Afghan-stan before you were born. What I say is: Give me back my pension As I have earned it and sign my- Yours respectfully

JOHN HOGGINS.

14. John Carnforth, Esq., Secretary to the Lords of the Pensions, to the Director of Pensions, War Office, S.W.

Ref. No. U5687. Pensionary Offices, Sirs,—

I have the honour to submit to you the following letter from Pensioner J. Hoggins, which is of a violent character and threatening grievous bodily harm to Their Lordships.

I am directed by Their Lordships to inform you that in consequence of the same they have decided to deprive Mr. Hoggins of the balance of his pension accruing to him from Civil Sources, viz., 3d. per diem (under the Diddling Act of 1904), and are bringing the matter to your notice in case you may desire to take similar action with regard to his Military pension.

I am also to inform you that Their Lordships are taking legal action against Mr. Hoggins under 8. Cap. ii. cap. iii. (An Act for the Prevention of Oppression). I have the honour to be, Sir, Your obedient servant, JOHN CARNFORTH, Secy. for Their Lordships.

"I concur." Arminius Akenside. 3rd Lord.

"I agree." James Attlebury. 2nd Lord.

"Noted." Robert Vaseytone. 1st Lord.

To Mr. Jones to File and Copy. Filed and Copied. J. Jones, Boy Clerk.

Certified True Copy.

Vincent Tucker, Senior Clerk.


15. Extracts from the "Daily Suppress."
Readers and Writers.

The little pile of German almanachs, which I have watched accumulating for some months, makes me regret that English publishers do not take a leaf or two from the books of their active and intelligent colleagues. Here is the "Xenien-Almanach"—214 pages, with illustrations, twenty-four additional pages of separate illustrations, and another 104 pages consisting of an illustrated and annotated catalogue of works produced by the "Xenien-Verlag." The price of this volume is sixpence, and among the contents I find extracts from Goethe, Beethoven, Alfred de Musset, Taras Shevchenko, Knut Hamsun and F. Mistral. Paul Friedrich's essay, "Nietzsche and ourselves," and T. Kröger's "Recollections of Liliencron," also a Xenien-Almanach by R. Piper and Co. of Munich (1 mark). Here again I find the same breadth of outlook and dignity of taste such as I have often praised, and accustomed me to look for in these publications. The price of Bierbaum's "Staackmann of Leipzig during the past year, and a similar annual performs the same service for S. Fischer of Berlin. But the best of the set, both from a literary and artistic point of view, is, in my opinion, the almanach issued by R. Piper and Co. of Leipzig (1 mark). Here again I find the same breadth of outlook and dignity of taste such as I have often praised, but not accustomed me to look for in these publications. The drawings, sketches and photographs in this particular example, I can only say that they are numerous and interesting. I am reduced to the same banality of phrase spoken of the literary section. But what else can be said? Schönpenhauer, Dostoyevski, Merezhkovski and Anatole France are represented, and, what is more to the point, by writing which is worthy of their names. I have space only to touch on Merezhkovski's contribution, which consists of an autobiographical sketch. The following is specially worth quoting:—

"In 1880 my father made the acquaintance of Dostoyevski and subsequently took me to him. I still remember the small dwelling in the Kolokolnaya St., the narrow ante-room, filled with copies of "The Brothers Karamasov," and the equally narrow study where Fyodor Mikhailovitch sat correcting proofs. First turning red, then turning pale, and stammering the whole time, I read my miserable verses to him. He listened to me in silent annoyance. I suppose we must have disturbed him in his work. "Bad, very bad. Beneath all criticism," he said, at length. "In order to write well, a man must first endure much and suffer much." "Then he had better not write at all, I do not want him to endure suffering," replied my father.

Merezhkovski, by the way, was charged in 1912 with "insolent disregard of the Czar's authority," and the manuscript of his novel, "Alexander I," was taken from him by the Russian officials at the frontier station of Wirbelen. However, it seems to have lived to tell its tale, but the occurrence is significant.

The same publishers have issued, in handy form, three essays on Dostoyevski by Hermann Bahr, Otto Julius Bierbaum and Merezhkovski (with four illustrations). I do not think that Hermann Bahr has anything particular to say on the subject. If I knew nothing about Dostoyevski, his lumpy and pseudo-philosophical sentences would very successfully manage to leave me in the dark. O. J. Bierbaum displays a good deal of wit, but not much sense, and is a confirmed jester. There is, for instance, some definite point in the contrast he draws between Nietzsche and Dostoyevski: "Perhaps Nietzsche is a sublime end, and Dostoyevski a gigantic beginning," and again, "Here the will to power, there the will to humility." And he very justly observes that the average popular humorists make the mistake of supposing that humour is identical with optimism. In this essay of Bierbaum's there are quite a number of passages which reveal considerable insight, and his views are developed without any of the syntactical fog which obscures the bulk of Bahr's observations.

But of course it is to Merezhkovski that we must turn for the last word on the subject. He draws a very effective contrast between Tolstoi and Dostoyevski, pointing out that "... everything for which Tolstoi always longed, after which he strove, and which may often have been very deep in his conviction, but when an accomplished fact had the appearance of trifling—abandonment of possessions, bodily labour, association with the common people—Dostoyevski experienced it all in reality, and indeed, with such an expressive harshness as can scarcely be imagined. Throughout his whole essay he emphasizes this difference, and also lays almost painful stress upon Dostoyevski's poverty, his physical infirmities, and those traits in his character which may be conveniently and decently summed up as pathological.

I must content myself with a mere reference to "Der Strom," a periodical which last January brought out a Dostoyevski number. It includes extracts from his stories and letters, together with articles on him by Stefan Zweig (I wish I had space for Herr Zweig's impressive notes on Dostoyevski's appearance) and by E. Pernerstorfer ("F. M. Dostoyevski as publicist and politician").

Meanwhile, the English translation of Dostoyevski proceeds of necessity so slowly, that I fear it will be some time before Dostoyevski's political and literary essays are reached. There seems some danger that the interest in him will not outlive the lengthy novels with which the translation is being ushered in. A few of his somewhat grotesque short stories would form a welcome and advisable variety in the solemn procession.

The Sova-Machar anniversary, to which I have already alluded in passing, deserves rather closer consideration. It is indeed curious that these two men, who have reached eminence in their national literature by widely different paths, were born within three days of each other. Although the divergence between Sova and Machar, the visionary, and Machar, the revolutionary, is so great as to justify a critic in calling them the antipodes of modern Czech poetry, yet their names may be fittingly associated by the fact that they have written the two greatest blank-verse poems in the Czech language. (I modify the superlative only after due consideration of Machar's "Art from the North" (1897), the "Art from the North" (1897), from Machar "A Meditation" (Confeitor, pt. 1, 1887):—

ANTONIN SOVA: "Art from the North." I heard the singing Northern Viols; Bent to the earth, some giant Being played In strangest anguish over living things, Inanges entangled in a scouring gale.
The South now slumbered. Nature's nursing staled After the Middle Ages. Fading forms. With slothful blood a dulcet Christendom Was liberating woeful indolence. The Spirit of the North now toiled, rose tall, A Pondering and Struggling spirit erst, Plucking its strings for discords like a squall. The South now slumbered. Nature's nursing staled After the Middle Ages. Fading forms. With slothful blood a dulcet Christendom Was liberating woeful indolence. The Spirit of the North now toiled, rose tall, A Pondering and Struggling spirit erst, Plucking its strings for discords like a squall...
THE NEW AGE

CARL BLEIBTREU

Carl Bleibtreu is the son of Georg Bleibtreu, a famous painter of battle-scenes, and once upon a time he himself used to specialise as a kind of high-class historical war correspondent. Many of the passages in his literary criticism are therefore appropriately passages of arms. Thus, sundry chapters might be headed: “C. B. wipes the floor with Count Platen” (of unsavoury memory), “C. B. makes mincemeat of Heinrich Mann” (“the Napoleon of the literary demi-monde . . . his critical works are amiable twaddle”), “C. B. jumps on Maximilian Harden,” “C. B. gives Schnitzler a drubbing” (“Reigen,” he says, “are ten dirty dialogues”), and so on.

But yet it seems as though he had made an honest endeavour to give even the devil his due. He certainly gives Wieland a go by. And his criticisms of Hauptmann, Sudermann, Dehmel and Lilienbroc are not aimlessly polemical. In them, he does not, as in some, splutter and become incoherent with rage, dragging in by the heels details which have little or nothing to do with literature. Even where he is obviously not in sympathy with a writer, he often manages to credit him with some achievement. Thus, Freytag he abhors, but Freytag’s “Bilder aus der deutschen Vergangenheit” he highly commends. Harden, who pops up in all kinds of unlikely places, only to be knocked down again, is accorded greatness as a political writer, in spite of stilistic and other shortcomings. Arno Holz comes off badly, but his “Buch der Zeit” (which, in a modest way, I have also appreciated in these notes) has “undoubted verve and linguistic efflorescence.”

In the more temperate portions of his book, Bleibtreu writes a vigorous style, full of artful little side-thrusts and subtle allusions. Sometimes, however, he calls for that saying of Talleyrand quoted indeed by himself: He has much wit, but too much, i.e., too little. For his plays on words and additions to the German vocabulary are somewhat heavy in the bulk. Still, I must regard this “History of German National Literature from Goethe’s death to the present day” as a remarkable piece of work.

P. SELVER.

VIRELAI A LA NOUVELLE MODE.

Briandiste ou Caillautin? 
Bun sens, où te niches-tu?
Alors qu’on clame chaque matin. 
“Briandiste ou Caillautin!”

Caillautin ou Briandiste? 
V’là une idée saugrenue!
Assassiner un journaliste 
Qui simplement fut Briandiste!

Briandiste ou Caillautin? 
Franchement, ça vaut pas la peine 
De se dire Républicain 
Briandiste ou Caillautin!

Caillautin ou Briandiste? 
On est maintenu là 
A se dire “Je-m’en-fichiste,” 
Ni Caillautin ni Briandiste!

Envoy.

O République à van’Yeu, 
Fais donc danser tes nannequins! 
Soit Briand, ou soit Caillautx, 
Ia ne danserent pas pour rien!

L. L. B.
Mr. Branford has invented a title comprehensive enough to describe the wisdom of God; but it is only a prefix to a reprint of a number of addresses to women's clubs, and similar organisations, on what is called "sociology." The book, therefore, needs all the apologies that Mr. Branford makes for it, and a good many more. It is a defect that a book of this subject should enunciate no principles, establish no law, prove nothing but the author's power of synthesis. The Co-operative Movement, clubs, and similar organisations, on what is called economics All this prevision and planning can only combine to save themselves from extinction, to the abolition of the wage-system. There is no other effective result because the people of this country are forced, and only within the last 50 years, to perform this function, thus to keep the English workman of his wages, to tie him to the ing-room and organise his little social function, thus to hold back the progress, and ignore the corollary idea of decadence. But the vital defect of the book is that the author seems to be ignorant of the history and nature of the place. There is scarcely an activity or an institution of the present system of society that does not merit and receive the censure of Mr. Branford; but the simple fact that the faulty structure is derived from the faulty economic base never seems to occur to him. It is true that he touches upon the question of real wages, but it is only to draw a ridiculous distinction between real and money wages, and to prove that women who are paid less than men are paid more, because they spend their money to better advantage. But the question of the economic base of society cannot be evaded by any serious reformer, more particularly by one who pretends to be superior to all other reformers. He possesses more current and comprehensive knowledge of the origin, nature, and history of social affairs. We have only to ask on what social forces Mr. Branford relies for the reformation of society, the people and the government that hold the position of his presumptions. If the history of England proves anything at all, it proves this fact, which I quote once again from Throrld Rogers: "I contend that from 1630 to 1824, a conspiracy, concocted by the law and carried out by parties interested in its success, was entered into, to cheat the English workman of his wages, to tie him to the soil, to deprive him of hope, and to degrade him into irredeemable poverty." If anyone wants to know what effect this has had on the nature of the English people, let him study the failure of the Parish Councils Acts to revive the local life of the country. If anyone wants to know whether the constructive genius of the working classes has been destroyed or only perverted, let him study the history of the Friendly Societies, the Trade Unions, and the Co-operative Movement. All these have the comparatively low ideal of making the best of things as they are; of securing the best possible wages, of expending them to the best possible advantage, and of safeguarding against financial loss caused by natural calamities. The poor people of this country were forced, and only within its limits could their constructive genius work. That they should have created these three institutions should remind us that their constructive genius has only been limited and perverted to the task of self-preservation; but the inference is that no trumpeting of social ideals, no sociological "surveys for service," no criticism or exhortation will avail that does not direct all efforts to the above aims. There is no other means of liberating the constructive energies of the people of this country; cut off from control of the instruments of production, lacking responsibility, they can only combine to save themselves from extinction, and all the sociological ideas, principles of social service, and so forth, must fail of any effective result because the people of this country are unable to put them into practice.

But the "sociology" preached by Mr. Branford does not rely on the constructive genius of the people of England; it relies on the munificence of Mr. Andrew Carnegie, on the imagination of Professor Geddes, and the dramatic work of Miss A. M. Buckton. Mr. Andrew Carnegie presented a country mansion and the sum of half a million pounds to the city of Dunfermline; and Professor Geddes was called upon to tell the town how to spend the money to the best advantage. He wrote a book, from which Mr. Branford selects one suggestion for particular praise. The suggestion was that a drawing room should be reserved in the country mansion for the use of all and every evening for a few hours, there to entertain at her own pleasure and in her own way. "Each plain working woman in Dunfermline, who chooses to claim her turn of this drawing-room and organise her little social function, thus for the time being, takes for it, social precedence of all else in Dunfermline. She thereby becomes, for the time being, the Lady of the Mansion House, the first lady of the city representing not only Trustees and Donors, but her own long line of predecessors to queen and reign." There is matter in this suggestion for a writer of "Pastiche," and with that hint, I leave it.

It is things of this nature that Mr. Branford regards as "tendencies"; and Miss Buckton's "Eager Heart" (which is really most pitiful drivel) seems to rank as the only sociological play. That the University Settlements (of London, of Manchester, of Glasgow, of New York) and schools for minor Government officials, that between themselves and the Charity Organisation Society they hold a monopoly of social reform, are facts known apparently to everyone but Mr. Branford. He regards them as most astonishing portraits, links between the University and the City (I expected the pun of "the Universe and the City," but was disappointed), symbols of a reconciliation between Town and Gown, and I know not what other examples of synecdoche. The schools, the university, the Church, Miss Buckton's "Eager Heart," the Settlements, the Eugenists, and the Great Civiliser, Woman, are all to be pressed into service to refute George Meredith's dictum that "the last thing to be civilised by man will be woman." Indeed, Mr. Branford seems to think that a knowledge of the Ordnance Survey maps, and of the Census of Population (both of which receive honourable mention as the basis of the sociological survey for service"), justifies him in telling a lot of what Iago called "fantastical lies" about things to women.

The fact is that Mr. Branford contemplates the imposition of civilisation upon the people by means of a conspiracy of culture. Some marvellous reformation of Whitechapel is to follow the teaching of slum children to play Shakespeare, and to be "knighted," and to have an "organised patch" during the major portion of their lives. Folk songs and dances, the Montessori method, the making of furniture out of packing cases, educational needlework, the painting of maps in railway stations in Pennsylvania, the market women who go to church in a South American town, all these are signs and symbols of the coming reformation of society. Sociology tells us to prepare the way for a Matriarchate (although the birth-rate is everywhere declining); we must be mothered by spinsters, I suppose, not to criticise Civics and Eugenics, to go to Church, to build Cathedrals, to revert from legitimate to morality plays, to admire Miss Buckton, Hurley Carpenter, Professor Geddes, and Mr. Victor Branford, and to insist on the amplification of the Census of Population. That the whole affair seems to be a farrago of nonsense is not my fault; I did not write the book; and I am not denying the value of social ideals when I say that Mr. Branford has made them ridiculous. We all enjoy the "Genteel Beautiful and the Gospel of a Good Race"; but the substitution of Civics and Eugenics for this vision is a parody. It is easy enough to ignore reality by calling it "Economic Obsession," but the reality will outlast the phrase, and will make impossible the realisation of the ideals even of the sociologist.

A. E. R.
On Scale.

By Walter Sickert

If we look at a painted study by Rubens at Munich for one of his larger pictures in Paris we shall find that the large paintings are aggrandisements as exact as possible of the smaller studies, down to the minutest particularities. When Puvis de Chavannes enlarged one of his designs to the scale of a decoration, you will find faithfully and mechanically enlarged, so as to hold the same space as it does in the design, in which, perhaps for some inscrutable reason, this flaw or blot, let us call it, produced a good effect. To cite moderns who have done hitherto by squaring up from a study or studies. With the progress of invention it is probable, but due precautions can be taken against distortions from the view of the artists' work, mechanical correctness is not only not essential, but even undesirable, it is important clearly to understand in what part of his work mechanical correctness is not only an excellence but a necessity.

In the rest of this article I propose to speak solely of the study from nature in line and light and shade, and my first duty must be to make a drastic clearance of certain errors that are almost universal nowadays. These errors can be traced to faulty methods of teaching, which latter have drifted from reasons that it is not very difficult to analyse.

Someone has said that when a society or organisation of any kind is founded, it soon tends, whatever the purpose of its foundation may be, to substitute for that purpose the aim or by-aim of its organisation. This aim becomes, in the nature of things, paramount. The most striking example may be found in politics. Governments come in, in theory, to carry out certain principles to which the members of the Government have given their adherence. But as time goes on, it is in the nature of human affairs that for this original aim is insensibly substituted the human factor, generally described as "loyalty" to colleagues, which amounts in practice to a complicity in maintaining the common hold of the members of an intimate coterie on conspicuous positions, and incomes larger than they have been accustomed to. The appalling chill that the shadow of a relapse into opposition casts over newly-acquired habits of luxury and importance soon reduces the problem of government to that of a mere party machine in office on any terms. Mere principles must tend to become somewhat remote and abstract conceptions to ministers whose women-folk foresee a sudden and perhaps permanent drop in incomes they have learnt to relish, and, what is almost more bitter, a diminution in the value as copy of their photographs at Court functions, or in the winter resorts of Switzerland and the Riviera.

There is no human organisation into which political vices do not to a great extent enter, since what we say "political vices" is only saying human nature. No intelligent critic sets out to change human nature. The function of criticism is rather to keep up a cold and abstract commentary on events in such a manner as to keep principles and aims under the eyes and in the memory of the public.

The faults of modern art teaching have never been sufficiently clearly attacked. I remember a chapter in Mr. George Moore's book on painting which contains an attack on the methods of teaching摄影 associated with the name of South Kensington, methods which, in essentials, are the same as those of all modern official art schools at home and abroad, and neither much better nor much worse. I do not remember the article very distinctly, but I remember the opinion I formed of it at the time. Mr. Moore chaffed the methods, without understanding in what respect they were wrong, and without having the remotest constructive criticism to oppose to them, that the attack had neither an original nor a convincing character, and even in that respect had not the merit of being entertaining.

Now it is unnecessary for me to say that there is none, the humblest drawing-master in any school, whose guidance would not be more useful to a student than anything that Mr. Moore has written about art. The interest of what he has written on art is purely biographical, and not critical. He knew and met some of the most interesting members of the Impressionist school, and his biographical sketches will always remain illuminating and stimulating in their incomparably unique hand-evidence from an interesting period. Critically, it may be said that Mr. George Moore, with his eyes shut, discovered Manet. He has not, and never will have, the remotest idea that Manet was neither an innovator, nor a revolutionist, much less an enemy to the institutions. He may be said, "C'est de la peinture," a sentence that is untranslatable.

I am obliged to make this point about Mr. Moore because, so far as I can remember, his is the only popular attack made by a considerable writer on the prevailing methods of art-teaching. Attacks of that kind are not only useless, but, if anything, rather injurious, as they tend, in so far as they have any effect at all, to shake the confidence of students in the only existing institutions, without doing anything to help the students or reform the institutions.

We must remind ourselves from time to time of the orgies of nonsense into which a habit of building their practice on what is called "the institution" has led some of our recent anarchists in art. Monsieur Matisse is said to have asserted, with his hand on his heart, that he had done three hundred studies for a certain large and empty composition. The number three hundred I cannot vouch for. At any rate, he claimed to have done an enormous number of drawings for the picture in question. "It is odd," said a cool and clear-headed listener, "that you should then have got the thumb of one of your figures on the wrong side of the hand. I should have thought it improbable that you could make the same mistake in three hundred studies, even if you had made it in one." An attitude of indiscriminate attack only succeeds in producing an atmosphere of folly and impatience in which it is impossible for art, a plant of slow growth, to thrive and develop.

Mr. Moore chaffs, I remember, our teachers, or for the matter of that, all modern teachers on two points. One is that they keep the students too long drawing from casts, and a great many others to the effect that it must be highly finished. Now neither of these practices, as here stated, is in itself wrong. The practice of drawing from casts is excellent, and would remain of utility to an artist, not only in his school years, but all his life. And the one kind of model which gives endless opportunities for the study of finish is obviously the cast. Mr. Moore has missed, as was only to be expected, the vital criticism that can be made of the usual school practice in drawing from casts.
Pastiche

LOVE.

I from sleep's embraces woke;  Sweet-voiced birds the morning spoke;  Pleasant sunshine in a beam.  From the smiling sky did stream,  Like a spirit in bright dress,  Kissed in me all happiness.

Rising up I stepped without  On the plain there lined about;  And I thought that I did hear  Sound of voices very near,  Startling me, for there below,  Far away I saw men saw.

Now the sun on me played hot  As I walked the vasty plot;  And the god within the sky  Shone his armour in my eye,  I to whom with lowest voice  Praised sang, and did rejoice.

In a forest I went deep,  Where his javelin could not sweep,  But I in and out the trees  Thrusting caught up many bees,  Which as if within the mind,  Murmured joys of peaceful kind.

Going from the sky the sun  Down or earth let darkness run;  Then a breeze of icy part  Passing through me froze my heart,  From me passed and let it thaw,  And I wept all that I saw.

All the night I wept and prayed,  Wept because the darkness stayed;  Weeping out my deadly pain,  Prayed that I might weep again,  Wept all that I saw.

Dawn abed now down the sky  Put her nightly curtains by,  Pulling aside her shining hair  From her face so bright and fair,  When, she rising up the while,  Earth shone in her lustrous smile.

CHARLES CUNNINGHAM.

WITH THE OLYMPIANS.

LORD SIMPER: I hear that you are deepley interested in the Poohah, Lady Smawled.

LADY SMAWLED: Yes. My doctah told me that if I continued to sweep along with the rushing rivah of High Society I should be swept out of existence altogethah. He advised me to interest myself in the Poohah, and so direct my life into a quiet back-watah. I am quite cured of dyspepsish since taking up this work.

LORD SMAWLED: Realeh!

LORD SMAWLED: My deeah Simppah, the matah has been fevah. Ah, ah

LORD SMAWLED: I'm afraid I neglected my studehs in my deea, although the Councils supply them with watbah, they nevah use it except for cold-watah bandages aftah a bout of drinking.

MAJOR PURPLISH: Good Ged!

LORD SMAWLED: It is a chariteh on our part mereleh to go amongst them. They realise that the superioritch of the bettah classes is a dispensation of the Almighty and they cease to malmah.

LORD SIMPER: I understand there are a numbah of intelligenf speakhahs in their favah.

LORD SMAWLED: Undoubteldely; George Lansbureh is quite a clever fellah. Rathah shane-faced and apologetic in good socieh though.

LORD SMAWLED: You must remembeh, Algeh, that he has not had opoortunitiehs; I think him quite propah and respectable.

LORD SMAWLED: He is exceelingleh propah. I understahd he grows side-whiskashah to covah his nakedness a little.

MAJOR PURPLISH: Good Ged!!
of well-doing. Still, it was undeniable that while the misunderstanding did last, it was the Labour man’s lot to suffer the criticism of the Rich. Littlebethel had passed through the period, and he knew it was trying.

Now, however, he was confronted with something entirely new and still more trying. He was being criticized by the workers themselves. To whom he had said so many burning words, and whom he had represented in Parliament these seven years with so much dignity, were becoming discontented, of course; it was that which had made him. But now they were discontented with him, their own Arthur Littlebethel, M.P., I., etc., etc. This was disquieting, alarming in fact. They were asking him what he had done for them in these seven years. Why were they no better off? Why did he not do something else for them besides plied with respect, and some of them accused him why, if he couldn’t do more for them than he had, he did not come out of Parliament like an honest man, and in this way save his own time and stop fooling them. Others, the ruder ones, suggested that he found his Parliamentary work much easier and better paid than the workshop. Others, ruder still, openly called him “traitor,” and told him that he had sold his class. All these questions and accusations made even the elastic conscience of Littlebethel unquiet.

It was his opportunity! Did he feel himself capable of rising to it? Yes, he did. The party members would scowl at him and denounce him in private. The official organ would publish it severely to the public. It was certain that the Cabinet Ministers would regard his action with grave displeasure. No more would he get approving nods and smiles from men in high places. And what of that secret dream of his, that breathless possibility that some day, somehow, he would be rewarded for all his diligence by a prominent under-secretaryship? A last hope that would be irretrievably blighted! It was a pregnant reflection, and Littlebethel wavered.

But it was only for a moment. Stronger forces stirred him, and he became full of fight. After all, why should he care about the party members. They were time-servers all, grown fat and slothful and indifferent in their soft places. They wouldn’t dare fight him much, for in the Truth, and they knew that it would get outside and be grateful, and he himself would probably experience a spiritual regeneration. It was an opportunity. He felt that secret dream of his, that breathless possibility that some day, somehow, he would be rewarded for all his diligence by a prominent under-secretaryship? A last hope that would be irretrievably blighted! It was a pregnant reflection, and Littlebethel wavered.

WAKE UP, BRITAIN.

Now rouse ye, rouse ye, slug-a-beds,
And pluck the nightcaps from your heads,
And shake the stairways with the treads
Of your awakened weight.

Too empty-silly is the boast
That Britain is the world almost,
When low she lies, a laughed-at ghost,
’Mid cobwebs of the night.

On every hand the orphan cries,
And fever slays the poor like flies;
Men mourn with sores that shake the skies
The ills they endure.

They tell me,
Sir Mammón-Soul, Miss Double-Chin,
They met upon a bed of sin,
And she in evil hour did twin
With babes of Greed and Woe.

Abroad the Empire’s banner dips
Beneath the blows that shock her ships;
No welcome cheers from stranger lips
Now greet their funnel-smoke.

The threat of British battle spears;
Who hears the voice of Freedom hears
An alien language spoke.

Where safety sits there honour lies,
And this base wisdom of the wise
Will make some robber-devil’s prize
Of us and ours and all;
If Britain fails, then Europe fails,
And nothing evermore avail;
But sackcloth, ashes, and the wails
Of those who fear and fall.

Owen Davies

THE CALM.

The ways of life were dark and grim to me;
And oft-times I have seen no mark at sea,
No sail, no guide,
On all the wide ocean.

There was a calm that made a mock at peace;
There was a stillness as a hollow mime;
When life crawled as the worm that cannot cease,
Beneath the noon-glare, in a sea of slime.

E. H. Visakh.
SIR,—The result of the parliamentary election at Liesbeek, South Africa, is well worthy the attention you devote to it in your column. One of the questions which I ask is whether the election was a free one. If it was, the result can only be rightly answered by a consideration of South African history of the not remote past.

To some extent you indicate the reason by use of the phrase, "the voice of the Jew was heard in the land," but now, as of old, this "voice" is only heard at second-hand. In the present instance it is speaking through the mouths of Smuts and Botha, where previously it was heard through Rhodes and Jameson, but it is the same "voice."

If we recall and consider the case of Kimberley we shall then understand what is taking place on the Rand, where Labour secures a sweeping majority, and why the electors of Liesbeek sent Maglumis to the Union House of Parliament.

The discovery of diamonds, in the early seventies, in Griqualand West, led to such a rush to the country that it had never been witnessed before except in the case of the Australian gold mines. The turbulent horde of adventurers who had been attracted here were so numerous that by July, 1872, they had fought, they drove out all the natives and pegged out the country between whites and half-breeds. Up to this time Griqualand West had been considered by the English Government simply as a sort of African province. But now, having acquired an unexpected value by the discovery of diamonds, it was annexed by Cape Colony.

After a time order was established on the diamond fields, and thirty odd companies were in working order. And now comes the inevitable Jew, not to work or serve like other whites, but to procure stolen diamonds in exchange for drink and trinkets from natives. This business of illicit diamond buying was carried on on a vast scale, and some of the practices of those who pursued it, as I heard them related in Cape Town, were as revolting as anything heard about the Sepoy mutiny.

Through the money acquired by their illegal practices it was not long before this Jewish scum, drawn from every sink of iniquity in England, Holland, Germany, and America, began to make their presence felt on the diamond fields. First, they obtained a holding in one company and then another till at last they became almost the dominant power in Kimberley.

In the meantime, on such a basis as diamonds Kimberley had naturally developed and attracted all sorts and conditions of men: doctors, solicitors, engineers, architects, bricklayers, masons, carpenters, merchants, mechanics of every class and occupation, and the Jews found employment as anything we have heard about Putumayo. The Jewish press was to be found in every town and city of Kimberley; and the Jews may retain possession of the Rand? That is what the present dispute means. That is what the present dispute means. That is what the present dispute means.

On that night, or rather the small hours of the next morning, Rhodes, the Imperialist, and Barnato, the Jew, three-parts drunk, over the last bottle of a can of champagne, agreed to amalgamate the diamond mines under the name of De Beers and drive the white man out of Kimberley without compunction or remorse.

When the news of this deal reached Kimberley, panic spread through the town. The Jews had invested money in hotels, lodging-houses, or dwelling-houses, the wholesale merchant and the retail storekeeper, the professional man, merchant, tradesman, publican, and workman were faced by a comino fate—ruin. They wisely sunk all differences in front of a common enemy, and—won. The electors of Liesbeek have adopted the same attitude and secured the same results. They, at all events, are not likely to forget Kimberley, for the effect of its ruin was felt amongst them for years. So they also return a Labour man at the head of the poll.

Some reader of these notes may think that I am unnecessarily bitter against the Jews. All I would advance in reply is this—55 per cent. of my regiment fell in three months of the war with the Boers, having imposed upon us an expenditure of ~O,000,000 lives and £250,000,000 of money, on the pretence of adding the Transvaal to the Empire, are now, having gained possession of the Rand, it is not necessary to relate here how the men who sneaked Kimberley eventually involved us in war so that they might sneak the gold in the Transvaal. The thing is too recent and the effects too acutely felt to need emphasising. What I do wish to do is to point out the analogy, how history is repeating itself, between the diamond fields of Kimberley and the gold field of the Rand.
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THE POSTAL UNION.

Sir,—The primary business of my article in your issue of March 19 was with principles, not with individuals, and the criticism that was levelled at the Postal Executives was quite incidental. Had I desired to attack anyone in particular, or a body of men in general, I assure Mr. Larsen I would have needed a nom de plume.

It will perhaps facilitate matters if I deal with his letter paragraph by paragraph.

I open with an expression of Executive desire to meet "A Postal Worker and his peers in the open," and regrets, on behalf of his brethren and himself, that they are not likely to get the chance. Quite recently I have challenged two prominent members of my Executive to debate; in each case the subject was to be "political action for Postal Unions," but in neither case was the challenge accepted.

Your correspondent takes exception to my phraseology on the Holt agitation, but he does not contradict my facts. My article is one of criticism, and in my article he will find that I stated "the Postal Workers were led as lambs to the slaughter," because "those factors which led to the 'Stanley' and 'Hobhouse' rebuffs remained unchanged." Those factors obviously were weakness of organisation and the lack of ideas. He surely agrees that the "findings" of a Committee of Inquiry were bad, and that the Holt Committee demanded if the results of the comparatively recent "Stanley" and 'Hobhouse' were satisfactory? He regards the procrastination situation fairly and dispassionately, I replied to the Executives. If the men's leaders really believed it better to postpone action until Parliament met in February, then deceitful is quite a mild term to apply to their attitude. Christmastide was, on the other hand, those utterances were not deceitful, then the "postponement" decision savours of something worse than procrastination.

As a matter of fact, the Executive Committee, and the general secretary, of course, agreed that the postal movement lacks strength and spirit. As one who during the last six years has been continually working for the postal movement, I know that I have realised this to the nethermost depths. I am not alone in saying that the spineless morale of the rank and file would long ago have entirely broken my spirit had I not been a close student of everything coming from an Executive pen or tongue for years. I am very much afraid that the membership justified the Executives in refraining from such an arrangement there will be a return to the present condition or worse. If, on the other hand, a "monopoly" be made the first business of the Postal Workers will speedily find themselves in a position to demand something far in advance of a "joint board"—on the department's terms.

I must express my regrets to Mr. Larsen that I am not on a Postal Executive. I would assure him, though, I have been a very close student of everything coming from an Executive pen or tongue for years. I am well acquainted with seven or eight of my own executive and I am mildly surprised at his statement that the majority of them have ideals equal to any advanced. Frankly, I doubt the idea, for in any case, to proceed with the scheme well in advance of a "Joint Board"—on the department's terms.

A Postal Worker.

Sir,—In your columns you have given full scope to an exposition of the situation as it now stands. I agree that the "postal movement lacks strength and spirit. As one who during the last six years has been continually working for the postal movement, I know that I have realised this to the nethermost depths. I am not alone in saying that the spineless morale of the rank and file would long ago have entirely broken my spirit had I not been a close student of everything coming from an Executive pen or tongue for years. I am very much afraid that the membership justified the Executives in refraining from such an arrangement there will be a return to the present condition or worse. If, on the other hand, a "monopoly" be made the first business of the Postal Workers will speedily find themselves in a position to demand something far in advance of a "joint board"—on the department's terms.
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Sir,—In your columns you have given full scope to an exposition of the situation as it now stands. I agree that the "postal movement lacks strength and spirit. As one who during the last six years has been continually working for the postal movement, I know that I have realised this to the nethermost depths. I am not alone in saying that the spineless morale of the rank and file would long ago have entirely broken my spirit had I not been a close student of everything coming from an Executive pen or tongue for years. I am very much afraid that the membership justified the Executives in refraining from such an arrangement there will be a return to the present condition or worse. If, on the other hand, a "monopoly" be made the first business of the Postal Workers will speedily find themselves in a position to demand something far in advance of a "joint board"—on the department's terms.

I must express my regrets to Mr. Larsen that I am not on a Postal Executive. I would assure him, though, I have been a very close student of everything coming from an Executive pen or tongue for years. I am well acquainted with seven or eight of my own executive and I am mildly surprised at his statement that the majority of them have ideals equal to any advanced. Frankly, I doubt the idea, for in any case, to proceed with the scheme well in advance of a "Joint Board"—on the department's terms.
the Executive Committee would not advocate such a course. The Executive made a straight declaration that the seriousness of the situation was such that it could not be met adequately except by a strike policy, many members would have supported such a policy because of its advocacy but had been forced to accept it by the Executive Committee, they voted against it. My second grievance is that the Executives never gave the membership a chance of declaring itself. They have guessed at the morale of the membership. The guess may be correct; but had a plebisicite been taken on the question of striking to enforce our demands, then there would have been no guesswork, but a definite indication of the desire to which the membership was prepared to go. As the Executives withheld the opportunity for the membership to express its strength in this fashion, to that extent do I hold the Executives blameworthy. And the members of my own Association cannot forget that the lead promised by Mr. Varley came at the occasion arise.

Though I am not in a position to impugn the integrity of the Executives, nor do I know anything of the inner history of the Holt campaign, I do think that at some stage or other the limitation of the membership was decided to cause the Report. In one case the expatriation was qualified, while in the last case rejection was decided by the Executive Committee of an organisation which meant a virtual acceptance of the resolution goes on to pray for this millennium by a statutory limitation of the hours of child labour. The only thing to do is to pass these things without discussion and get to the business that is to be found on the Agenda. Fity it is that something more fundamental could not be proposed by the Executive.

A dominant theme could not be parodoxically enough, by a policy of silence on most motions. Only thus can time be saved and the real work of Conference be accomplished on the field of the Executive. Lacking that backing, the Executive's motions there is no necessity to move at the proper place at Easter. The problem is to provide facilities for adult education in England. There are about 16,000,000 adult men and women workers who, after they leave school, receive no more "education". All that is available for them is the distortion of truth given by the sensational daily or weekly press, the picture shows, cr flights of speculating. To simplify the problem, reduce the number to one of the following. Mr. Kenney's propositions both as to (1) the institutions and means of providing the education and (2) paying for the same? I think he will agree that the solution of this problem lies in the education of the workers by the workers. Just so; thus the would-be dramatist heads a sheet of his manuscript, "Here follows moving scene." Let us have scheme in outline.

If Mr. Kenney accepts the new established usage of the word "revolutionary," we are agreed about that. The revolutionary aim would be monopoly of labour through organisations, but the object of speeding up the expropriation of the capitalist through the agency of the State, and (2) of the workers using their power in the community to eliminate all forms of exploitation of workers by the community and to secure for the workers, as and when possible, full partnership with the State in their industry.

** * *

THE TEACHERS' PARLIAMENT.

Sir,—The time is near when a Guildsman should arise in the ranks of the National Union of Teachers. I believe there are many signs of the required atmosphere in which a true Guildsman could work. Let him arise from the hundreds of teachers in the National Guilds and lead the gathering at Lowestoft during Easter week to a view of the path they must tread if individualism is to be crushed, that vainglorious assumption of personality can teachers fulfil their trying duties; only as a Guild may they assert their power.

Motions are arranged to the Leeds and County Associations for their approval. Out of nearly two hundred, the six best are chosen. Hence, in order of merit, the motions are discussed after the chief one each session. This opening discussion is in the name of the Executive. The order is now settled; and a survey of the vital educational questions (selected by the teachers) quickens many minds. That a Guildsmen bold, and by the power of his personality, dominate Conference in a clear, enlightening spirit.

With the Executive's motions there is no necessity to deal. They cover Matters of Teachers; Age of Exception; Continuation Classes and Child Labour; and State Contribution for Education. Readers of The New Age may judge of the spirit that is in the Executive for the resolution goes on to pray for this millennium by a "statutory limitation of the hours of child labour." The only thing to do is to pass these things without discussion and get to the business that is to be found on the Agenda. Fity it is that something more fundamental could not be proposed by the Executive.

A dominant theme could not be parodoxically enough, by a policy of silence on most motions. Only thus can time be saved and the real work of Conference be accomplished on the field of the Executive. Lacking that backing, the Executive's motions there is no necessity to move at the proper place at Easter. The problem is to provide facilities for adult education in England. There are about 16,000,000 adult men and women workers who, after they leave school, receive no more "education". All that is available for them is the distortion of truth given by the sensational daily or weekly press, the picture shows, cr flights of speculating. To simplify the problem, reduce the number to one of the following. Mr. Kenney's propositions both as to (1) the institutions and means of providing the education and (2) paying for the same? I think he will agree that the solution of this problem lies in the education of the workers by the workers. Just so; thus the would-be dramatist heads a sheet of his manuscript, "Here follows moving scene." Let us have scheme in outline.

If Mr. Kenney accepts the new established usage of the word "revolutionary," we are agreed about that. The revolutionary aim would be monopoly of labour through organisations, but the object of speeding up the expropriation of the capitalist through the agency of the State, and (2) of the workers using their power in the community to eliminate all forms of exploitation of workers by the community and to secure for the workers, as and when possible, full partnership with the State in their industry.
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A dominant theme could not be parodoxically enough, by a policy of silence on most motions. Only thus can time be saved and the real work of Conference be accomplished on the field of the Executive. Lacking that backing, the Executive's motions there is no necessity to move at the proper place at Easter. The problem is to provide facilities for adult education in England. There are about 16,000,000 adult men and women workers who, after they leave school, receive no more "education". All that is available for them is the distortion of truth given by the sensational daily or weekly press, the picture shows, cr flights of speculating. To simplify the problem, reduce the number to one of the following. Mr. Kenney's propositions both as to (1) the institutions and means of providing the education and (2) paying for the same? I think he will agree that the solution of this problem lies in the education of the workers by the workers. Just so; thus the would-be dramatist heads a sheet of his manuscript, "Here follows moving scene." Let us have scheme in outline.

If Mr. Kenney accepts the new established usage of the word "revolutionary," we are agreed about that. The revolutionary aim would be monopoly of labour through organisations, but the object of speeding up the expropriation of the capitalist through the agency of the State, and (2) of the workers using their power in the community to eliminate all forms of exploitation of workers by the community and to secure for the workers, as and when possible, full partnership with the State in their industry.

** * *

THE TEACHERS' PARLIAMENT.

Sir,—The time is near when a Guildsman should arise in the ranks of the National Union of Teachers. I believe
and Friendly Societies Act, and affiliation with the National Labour Movement; or (b) Teacher's Pensions; or (c) The recognition of teaching as an independent profession.

Guildsmen know: and I am convinced that, if a judicious and sympathetic compromise be adopted, and the above resolution be reached, it will be possible to rule out (a) and (b) and concentrate upon (c) that in the National Education Act teachers have a mighty weapon. Independent control is provided irrefutable arguments for a National Teachers' Guild. We look to Messrs. Sharples and Bentliff to lead forward and upward!

C. H. Cooke.

*A REDMUND FOR ULSTER.*

Sir,—I had prepared to answer Mr. Ward's article entitled "A Redmond for Ulster," in which he took such violent exception to my signing my name to the roll of Ulster Volunteers; but perhaps the turn events have taken during the past few days may spare me—and my readers—from the trouble of repeating the reasons that have led me to offer the men of the North the evidence of the real spirit which I believe lies at the bottom of the hereditary curse of their country by the platforms.?

His article told us nothing which was not obvious from the facts more than anyone else, namely, that the whole thing looked like a contradiction in terms: and in accentuating the seeming inconsistency he quite lost sight of the wisdom which often lies in paradox.

I would ask him to re-read the article and try to understand the spirit of it, and he may have less to find fault with—nay, he will see that it points out a solution which may yet prove inevitable, but which will have lost half its value by being a compulsory concession instead of a Protestant atmosphere be looked upon as the special treatment of the North-East of Ulster. The refusal of the Army to act at this critical juncture avoided, to my mind, a catastrophe which would have been as fatal to the Phoenix Park murders were to the Home Rule of the days of Parnell.

I do not believe and I have never believed that the men of the North have anything to fear from Home Rule in itself; just as there are many who, like the Duke of Norfolk and Frank Hugh O'Donnel, think that Catholicism never had anything to fear from an undenominated or secular university; but there is no doubt that there are many who did and do think, so, and to coerce such would be a patent absurdity. It is not a paradox as is sometimes maintained by Mr. Ward, the spirit of it points to the other way. It was not, however, with the objective reasons adduced by both parties so much as with the subjective attitudes with which both parties approached the problem that I wanted to deal.

I advocated compromise and consent as opposed to coercion and compulsion; and I would lay any odds upon the victory of such a spirit in the long run; but if there is anything which I fear for Ireland, whether under Home Rule or Unionism, it is the spirit of Mr. Ward's article, that the whole length of which ran the insolent assumption that the Orangeman was neither sincere in his fears nor had any right to consider his own minority; and I repeat that if a hundred thousand men in open rebellion can claim no respect, what chance will a handful of Protestant members in a Dublin Parliament have, where the vast majority have been taught from childhood that Protestantism is the intellectual poison of Ireland by the pulpets, and England the hereditary curse of their country by the platforms? It little behooves Nationalists, however, at the moment to find fault with the Curragh officers. How often has one heard in Ireland the disgrace of taking the King's shilling, until the Service has been necessarily and fully appreciated. As to the Volunteers, they are in principle what the Fenians were—the resistance of a body of citizens to a Legislature run on the party principle, with the military at the beck of the minority in power," if Mr. Ward can understand that principle.

The general bungling of the situation by all parties, however, is a sad commentary on the Cassandra-like warnings of Mr. J. P. O'Connor; whose efforts, had they received the proper encouragement, would have brought Irishmen of all creeds far closer to a union than all the politics of the past six years.

Nay, more, the situation is a gradual disillusionment of the layman that Parliaments can deal with the social remedies needed at all, and is, not on the contrary, responsible for half the grievances by making rival remedies the sport of a profession; and it may be seriously doubted whether the "Bureaucracy" which it is intended to supplant in Ireland is half so corrupt as the "Parliamentary System" which it is intended to establish.

Were such scenes as have been witnessed of late in Westminster to take place in the operating theatre, the victim could not fail to deserve our sympathy. I feel that sympathy towards the layman that Parliament can effect the social better, for it establishes a principle, or at least

L. G. Redmond Howard.

**THE LATE MR. S. F. GORE.**

Sir,—Spencer Frederick Gore, member of the New England Academy of Thought, was one of the Independants, founder-member and member of the committee of the Allied Artists' Association, President of the Cambridge Toward purchased work of Mr. Gore's, a member of the Group and visiting teacher of drawing and painting at the L.C.C. Technical Institute, Vincent Square, Westminster, died, at the age of 36, of pneumonia, at his house at Richmond, in the night of Friday March 27. It is impossible to say what the loss means to his colleagues and friends, and to the countless painters and students who are beholden to him for the steady illumination of his work so as possible. Owners of pictures will, it is hoped, be willing to lend such as they have in their possession. Pending the formation of a committee, communications on the subject should be addressed to Mr. A. B. Clifton, of Carfax and Co., Bury Street, St. James's, who has generously offered his valuable experience in an honorary capacity. He is instructed to act for Mrs. Gore in these matters.

Walter Sickert.

**THE DELHI BOMB OUTRAGE: A SOLUTION.**

Sir,—I noticed in a recent issue of the "Times" that its leader-writer on Indian matters declares that the mystery of the bomb thrown at the Viceroy at Delhi was still unsolved. In writing this letter I have no desire to enrich with the merest personal conjecture articles appears to me the blood-thirsty philistine unexposed, but rather to offer to your readers a possible solution.

They will remember that on December 23rd, 1913, Lord Hardinge rode in long procession through Delhi to declare that city the new capital of India. Together with Lady Hardinge he was mounted in a howdah upon
an elephant; behind them stood two native jemadars—one bearing the umbrella of state. As the Viceroy rode slowly away, Choudhury Chandulal, a native of the city—the attendant with the umbrella was seen to bend over as if to ward something off; a moment after a bomb exploded between him and the Viceroy. The attendant was blown to pieces, and the Viceroy seriously injured in the shoulder and back.

A friend of mine who was at the moment in Queen's Gardens, Ahmedabad, tells me that the Choudhury Chandulal who looked over the scene, tells me that he heard the noise of a great explosion, but, thinking it to be some firework, took no special notice. He saw two or three men walking about near the houses at the time, but there was no sign of anyone making an escape. Of course, all the houses near the spot of the outrage were carefully guarded. The police hit upon the premises that had simply to be abandoned as useless. And there was no sign of anyone making an escape. Of course, all the houses near the spot of the outrage were carefully guarded. The police hit upon the premises that had simply to be abandoned as useless. And there was no sign of anyone making an escape.

Briefly, to recapitulate. A bomb was thrown from a house crowded with spectators! How impossible that it could be thrown from the roof and immediately afterwards; for it was sacked through and through and watched for months after. Again, how wonderful an aim that, from so far, could do such a thing. A bomb, or a moving mark so as to miss it only by inches. Too wonderful to be true! The theory of the throwing from the houses has had simply to be abandoned as useless. And nothing, it seems, remains.

So thought I, too, till I met a certain Brahmin adventurer in Madras, some twelve months after the crime. For the fallacy of suggestions which are his; I take neither credit nor responsibility. He claimed to have them from reliable terrorist authority, but even that I cannot prove. These were his arguments.

The first movement in the affair was that of the umbrella-bearer, who leaned forward, as if to protect the Viceroy from a bomb in the air. No one saw that bomb throw, or, as the bomb was of such little range that Lady Hardinge, seated beside the Viceroy, and the jemadar behind her, remained unharmed. Had it fallen upon or directly in front of the Viceroy, it would have suffered. Again, that wonderful aim, that came so close. Now, the dead jemadar was receiving the usual ridiculously small wages paid to Indians in India, said the Brahmin, had been bought by the terrorists to conceal the short-ranged bomb, probably in the state umbrella, and to drop it during the procession upon the Viceroy. This was the reason of his sudden motion; but he dropped the bomb too near himself and himself was killed in the place of Lord Hardinge, who escaped wounded. This explanation of the Brahmin appears to me to tolerable sound, especially as all other explanations I have been able to get are so far.
will happen if I use the words without inverted commas. I suppose that nothing less than my deportation without trial would satisfy him.

But I do not acknowledge so fast that the "unitarian" idea is the monopoly of Mr. Ould. Mr. Ould coined the phrase in defence of Mr. Barker's methods of production. Mr. Barker was a "unitarian" before Mr. Ould agreed with the principle. He has done it, and it is entitled to be the phrase to describe Mr. Barker's methods of production. I am naturally pleased; but I cannot accept his suggestion that he was not endorsing Mr. Barker's methods, for his letters expressed an unqualified approval of them. The answer to Mr. Ould's second question is quick and easy; the relation of the first to the second clause of the sentence quoted by him is the relation of contrast, and it is demonstrated by the use of the disjunctive.

RECENT MUSIC.

Sir,—In Mr. "John Playford's" interesting column on "Music and Musicians" in your issue of March 19 he asks: What are the older and more remote influences felt by the cultured Italians in my introductory note to the music of the Hungarian composers played at my husband's recent concert? How many are there, he asks, of the old or old, of the remote, and how am I aware that the folk are conscious of them? Mr. Playford will, I am sure, agree with me that concert expenses have to be limited and printing is costly. An introductory note can therefore merely suggest to amateurs a direction for study and research; for musicians it can only lightly touch on points in the past and present history of their art, with which one supposes them to be familiar.

I think I can give a brief answer to Mr. Playford's questions by referring to his last query respecting my reference to the history of music.

I do not mean that the past and present are one, only in the history of contemporary music. I have learnt that the contemporary history of music is, as I write, a constant patch of music, of its remotest origin; while it holds within itself all that the future will evolve and develop.

If one section of the history of the art is exploited to the detriment of the other, it does not suggest anything to me. To use a chunk out of it and analyse it apart from all the rest, contemporary music. I have learnt to be familiar.

I do not mean that the past and present are one, only in the history of contemporary music. I have learnt that the contemporary history of music is, as I write, a constant patch of music, of its remotest origin; while it holds within itself all that the future will evolve and develop.

If one section of the history of the art is exploited to the detriment of the other, it does not suggest anything to me. To use a chunk out of it and analyse it apart from all the rest, contemporary music. I have learnt to be familiar.

I do not mean that the past and present are one, only in the history of contemporary music. I have learnt that the contemporary history of music is, as I write, a constant patch of music, of its remotest origin; while it holds within itself all that the future will evolve and develop.

If one section of the history of the art is exploited to the detriment of the other, it does not suggest anything to me. To use a chunk out of it and analyse it apart from all the rest, contemporary music. I have learnt to be familiar.
on my mind. I began to wonder whether my admiration for Stravinsky's music was justified. Yet I could find nothing stodgy in it. My mid-day meal was a dinner manqué. In the afternoon a light dawned on me. These baroquen-Webber flute duets, which puppet love scene! All these delightful ironies had been taken seriously by "Lancelot," of the "paper that makes you think." How stupid of me! My con-
tidence was wrenched and has never been restored. Please, Mr. Playford, do not kill "Lancelot," if only for my sake. S. T.

DANCER.

Sir,—In the issue of THE NEW AGE of March 19 there is a passage to the effect that "the evils of art as we call them are sometimes able to forget the criticism which they aimed at, and were successful in getting an incentive to a particular kind of life."

Sir,—I need not say that I have been very much in-
terested in Mr. Ludovici's discussions of the "arts and Crafts of India and Ceylon." As regards his general principles, there is much about which we are agreed; this being so, I am sure Mr. Ludovici will think with me that it is best to proceed at once to a consideration of the points on which we actually or apparently differ.

The chief of these questions is raised in the last article (March 26). I lose the black lines which are described as "A Dancer," only a caricature or satire; if it is not, then it is an impenetrable puzzle of hideousness and an offensive nightmare of lines, and as great an offence to our intelligence as the methods of the wild Suffrages of our desire to be interested grows cold and, in order to

ART NOUVEAU AND ARCHITECTURE.

Sir,—I have read with interest the letter upon the treatment of the above ship, which I beg to answer.

With reference to the interesting remarks upon this ship, I beg to draw your attention to the facts of English craftsmen and decorative artists of the present day. Mr. Ludovici has two difficulties—one, that the English are sometimes able to forget the criticism which they aimed at, and were successful in getting an incentive to a particular kind of life."

The chief of these questions is raised in the last article (March 26). I lose the black lines which are described as "A Dancer," only a caricature or satire; if it is not, then it is an impenetrable puzzle of hideousness and an offensive nightmare of lines, and as great an offence to our intelligence as the methods of the wild Suffrages of our desire to be interested grows cold and, in order to

Re Art on the S.S. "Aquitania."

Sir,—I beg to draw your attention to the facts of English craftsmen and decorative artists of the present day.

With reference to the interesting remarks upon this ship, I beg to draw your attention to the facts of English craftsmen and decorative artists of the present day.

With reference to the interesting remarks upon this ship, I beg to draw your attention to the facts of English craftsmen and decorative artists of the present day. This speaks in favour of the famous Indian and Ceylonese crafts of India and Ceylon. As regards general principles, there is much about which we are agreed; this being so, I am sure Mr. Ludovici will think with me that it is best to proceed at once to a consideration of the points on which we actually or apparently differ.

The chief of these questions is raised in the last article (March 26). I lose the black lines which are described as "A Dancer," only a caricature or satire; if it is not, then it is an impenetrable puzzle of hideousness and an offensive nightmare of lines, and as great an offence to our intelligence as the methods of the wild Suffrages of our desire to be interested grows cold and, in order to

To Mr. Ludovici, I would say that I have been very much interested in his discussions of the "arts and Crafts of India and Ceylon." As regards general principles, there is much about which we are agreed; this being so, I am sure Mr. Ludovici will think with me that it is best to proceed at once to a consideration of the points on which we actually or apparently differ.

The chief of these questions is raised in the last article (March 26). I lose the black lines which are described as "A Dancer," only a caricature or satire; if it is not, then it is an impenetrable puzzle of hideousness and an offensive nightmare of lines, and as great an offence to our intelligence as the methods of the wild Suffrages of our desire to be interested grows cold and, in order to
The Simple Life in the City

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

The Home Restaurant
31, Friday Street, ... E.C.
Beautiously appointed and pleasantly served in tasteful surroundings. Sensible Meals for Brainy Men.