NOTES OF THE WEEK.

There was an appearance of candour about Mr. Asquith's speech that a careful examination of it belies. With much of what he says we agree. The people of this country have done very well during the war under trying circumstances, not the least of which has been the conduct of our politicians. And the end, however delayed, is, we still believe, certain. But, on the other hand, not only is public opinion in the dark, but the causes are now well known and hence beyond the reach of illumination from the virtual dictator of England. Nay, more, they have become rather sinister than otherwise. Take, for example, Mr. Asquith's references to the fact that Turkey's defection from the Allies was well known, and to France. How came it then that Turkey was at war with us. He was good enough to say that 'the causes are now well known and hence beyond the need of any explanation.' But is that, indeed, the case? We have followed as well as we can the literature, official and unofficial, upon the subject, and we have no shame in confessing that far from the causes of Turkey's defection from the Allies being well known to us, we do not understand them to this day. Turkey, we certainly believe, had no original quarrel with us, but was, on the contrary, friendly disposed both to us and to France. How came it then that Turkey was pushed into the arms of Germany, thence to be led to oppose us, with so much disaster to our cause? Mr. Asquith, we say, is reticent upon this important episode of the war, and in the most offensive manner that reticence can take—he assures us that we all know all we need to know. But the truth is that we do not.

Again, it is seductive to sentiment when a Prime Minister chivalrously accepts the responsibility of his office in the matter of so momentous an undertaking as that of the Dardanelles; and particularly when he assures us that every expert opinion had been taken into account before the decision was made. But in the first place, the mere acceptance of responsibility affords us no real relief unless it is correspondingly discharged with efficiency; for, at that rate, we might otherwise accept any overweening fool who 'accepts responsibilities' for the discharge of which he ought to know he is unfitted. In the second place, we happen to know experts whose advice was all against the mode of the Dardanelles expedition. And, in the third place, the whole value of Mr. Asquith's assurances is destroyed by his admission that the failure of the expedition was the keenest disappointment he has experienced during the war. Admittedly the expedition was from the outset of a speculative character; it required that risks should be run. Knowing this, the least that should have been done was to prepare for failure as well as to hope for success. Mr. Asquith, however, was not only disappointed, that is, taken by disagreeable surprise, by the issue of the enterprise, but neither he nor his advisers, aware though they were that the expedition could have but one of two results, seem to have provided for the very failure that has now fallen upon us. We are in the Dardanelles, and the prospect of getting any further is remote. On the other hand, the prospect of clearing out of Gallipoli is not less remote, though precisely the present contingency should have been foreseen. This, we take leave to say, is simply stupidity. We have tried a difficult stream with both feet. We have taken a risk without preparing for failure. And the consequence is that we can neither stay in the Dardanelles, get through, nor come away.

It is satisfactory, once more, to know that the independence of Serbia is now added to the objects of the Allies. But what is not satisfactory is that the independence of Serbia should ever have been in doubt or even in jeopardy. There is every appearance of the most callous cynicism, in fact, in assuring Serbia at the very moment that her country is being occupied by the enemy, that the Allies intend to re-establish her integrity. Why should her integrity, after her first independence of Serbia should ever have been in doubt or even in jeopardy. There is every appearance of the most callous cynicism, in fact, in assuring Serbia at the very moment that her country is being occupied by the enemy, that the Allies intend to re-establish her integrity. Why should her integrity, after her first independence of Serbia should ever have been in doubt or even in jeopardy. There is every appearance of the most callous cynicism, in fact, in assuring Serbia at the very moment that her country is being occupied by the enemy, that the Allies intend to re-establish her integrity. Why should her integrity, after her first independence of Serbia should ever have been in doubt or even in jeopardy. There is every appearance of the most callous cynicism, in fact, in assuring Serbia at the very moment that her country is being occupied by the enemy, that the Allies intend to re-establish her integrity. Why should her integrity, after her first independence of Serbia should ever have been in doubt or even in jeopardy. There is every appearance of the most callous cynicism, in fact, in assuring Serbia at the very moment that her country is being occupied by the enemy, that the Allies intend to re-establish her integrity. Why should her integrity, after her first independence of Serbia should ever have been in doubt or even in jeopardy. There is every appearance of the most callous cynicism, in fact, in assuring Serbia at the very moment that her country is being occupied by the enemy, that the Allies intend to re-establish her integrity. Why should her integrity, after her first independence of Serbia should ever have been in doubt or even in jeopardy. There is every appearance of the most callous cynicism, in fact, in assuring Serbia at the very moment that her country is being occupied by the enemy, that the Allies intend to re-establish her integrity. Why should her integrity, after her first...
would not have been prepared for the worse as well as for the more favourable contingency? The preparations of Bulgaria were presumably as well known to the Cabinet as to the English consuls employed in the Balkans. Even, we imagine, the intrigues of the Greek Court with the Kaiser were not outside official knowledge. Yet, on their own admission, the Cabinet had no business to be surprised. Nobody else was and nobody ought to have been. As it is, poor Serbia must pay like Belgium for our mistakes.

And on the other side, it is perfectly certain that, as the war continues, we know no more than the Press and from the ignorance of the Government and from the ignorance of the Government department concerned that a decision come to us about the carrying out of our future orders. As the military Censorship, but of which the motives are less to be trusted nowadays to educate public opinion and from the ignorance of the Government and from the ignorance of the public; with the effect that a secondary Censorship is established of no less arbitrary a character than the military Censorship, but of which the motives are private rather than public. It was not always so, we admit; but men and times have changed. During the Crimean War, for example, on the testimony of King Constantine kept his bird of freedom in the hand for two in the bush of promise.

Finally, it is satisfactory to know that Mr. Asquith believes and hopes that the voluntary system will see us through the war, but what is not so satisfactory is that he leaves the matter in suspense, as well as the voluntary system itself in desperate muddle. On the one side, as we have further pointed out, the voluntary system is not likely to be worked to its full extent so long as the conscriptionists are allowed to hope for its failure. And, on the other side, it is perfectly certain that, as the system is now being worked by recruiting committees, drains are made upon our men without consideration of their relative serviceability to the nation at large. Lord Derby, for instance, announced last week that medical students in their earlier years of training should be prepared to volunteer. But are not medical students, as Sir John Collie instantly asked, already in training for service of an equally indispensable character? And would it not be extravagant short-sightedness to press our future into the service of the immediate present? A similar criticism, as Sir Charles Bathurst has pointed out, may be made of the attempts of the recruiters to draw the skilled agriculturists into the army. In this case we are sacrificing the present to the present; for there can be no doubt that the food-supply of this country is as important as the supply of soldiers. To draw men from indispensable industries is equivalent to wasting men; and, long before the present pass had come, the necessary industries should have been scheduled and organised nationally as service of equal importance with that of lighting.

On all these matters, however, involving, as they do, information of a secret nature, we should be disposed to trust the Cabinet, even against appearances, if at the same time our own cognizance, we knew from experience that the Cabinet is to be trusted. But we need not repeat that this is far from being the case. In the lesser mysteries as in the greater, there are muddles, and of just such a kind as we suspect in the conduct of the Censorship. In matters of judgment, there are muddles, and of just such a kind as we suspect in the conduct of the Censorship.

The conduct of the Censorship is notoriously beyond the power of intelligence to understand or to explain. So is the management of our food-supplies. So is that of the cost of living. So is our finance. These matters, we repeat, are within the cognisance of the man in the street. No affection of diplomatic secrets can be employed here as a cloak for stupidity and muddle. We can see the causes and effects as they are and judge them for ourselves. Look at them! Concerning the Censorship, for example, Lord Morley has at last had to protest in the interests of the very public opinion. Where, in the interests of the public, he is more necessary to us than any concealment of news from Germany. The leakage of news to Germany may be a danger to us—we do not deny it—but a far greater danger is the ignorance of our own public opinion. This operates in two ways. First, the channels of news and suppressing views depress the public and saps its confidence in the conduct of the war. Secondly, such pressure in various directions as the public does ultimately bring to bear upon the Government is necessarily the pressure of ignorance. Ask why it is that the Northcliffe, the Daily Telegraph, and the Blenheim Press exercises as much influence as it undoubtedly does, upon the Executive, as well as upon the public—the answer is that the public knows no more than the Press tells them, and must needs, therefore, push with it. The remedy here is not by demagogues nor by public opinion, and it is precisely more publicity that our Censorship objects to, preferring, it appears, to create a twilight in which owls and other birds of prey fly and do their deadly work. One of the most repellent phenomena of the war is, in fact, the influence exercised over our eyes by men who, in other circumstances, have no influence at all. Unscrupulous as to the truth themselves, they can, in the absence of publicity, circulate any lie that comes into their head, and, what is more, secure credulity for it. By the time it has engendered a public movement, it has become a power to which the Cabinet must yield; and thus the Cabinet falls under the sway of the worst public opinion in its worst and most ignorant form. If public opinion, as Lord Morley said, is usually less fallible than the opinion of individual Ministers, it is only when we become properly acquainted with the facts. With a Censorship such as ours, public opinion, we should say, is more fallible than any Minister even of the present Ministry.

On Tuesday the news was published that the Board of Trade wished it to be denied: that "they were con- tinued promised by the Board of Trade is not merely in itself a consequence of the Government's desire to put ships loading grain in America before December 15, and, two days later still, this announcement in turn was cancelled. What is the meaning of it all? To begin with, until it was denied, no rumour to our knowledge was published of any such action as the Board of Trade was said to be contemplating. Next, it argues the usual incompetence in the Government department concerned to our success than any concealment of news from Germany. The leakage of news to Germany...
tage for the purpose of raising their profits. Our food, that was to have been guaranteed us by our Navy, having been left to be brought to us by fewer ships and all in private hands, costs us more for no better reason than that the Government charge the nation more for bringing it to these shores. The remedy, we should have thought, was obvious; and particularly to a Government that had already, under precisely similar circumstances, requisitioned the entire railway system of the country—it was to nationalize it for the period of the war the whole mercantile fleet. Why it was not done; or why, having now been suggested, the Board of Trade should deny that they ever contemplated it, are matters upon which Mr. Runciman, perhaps, could inform us. Certain it is, however, that nothing short of a State monopoly of shipping will enable us to reduce the price of food. Every other means will either be ineffective or, still worse, play into the hands of the shipowners.

The mitigation of the rigour of the Censorship is rendered more necessary than ever by the decision of the Government to remain in office for the duration of the war. This was announced in the House of Lords by Lord Lansdowne on Friday in terms that might almost be called threatening. 'The Government, he said, "would spare no pains to prevent a General Election taking place." But if, on the one hand, we are to regard the present Government as irremovable; and, on the other, the present Censorship is to be maintained, the presumption of Englishmen to approximate so closely to that of Russia as to be practically indistinguishable from it. We have given our reasons for thinking a General Election perhaps the least rather than the greatest of the evils with which we are threatened. The advantage of the present Government has not altered our view. But if, against all reason, no General Election is to be held, the condition of the exemption of Ministers from the risk of losing their jobs must be, in the interests of the nation, the provision to the public of the means of criticising them. The position, otherwise, is one that a little while ago everybody would have said was unthinkably: an Executive irremovable except by its own act, and in control of every legitimate means of public criticism. Even if it were the case that our Ministry were the best available (which it is not), or of such a record, during the war, as inspired the nation with blind confidence—ever, then, the combination of complete security of tenure of office with complete freedom of public criticism must be dangerous to liberty. As it is, we fear it may be fatal. Either the apprehension of a General Election must be preserved in the minds of the Ministry or they must pay for their security with the lifting of the Censorship. One or the other. The general assurance of the country to the prosecution of the war to the end will otherwise be endangered, and all our sacrifices will have been useless.

We cannot resist the temptation to record the defence made by Sir F. E. Smith for the lawyer-politicians of whom he is the most recent member. It took the form of an eulogy, on the one hand, of colonial politicians like Mr. Hughes and Mr. Smuts, and, on the other hand, of gratitude to Mr. Asquith, who had just played his part into the Cabinet. Whatever our opinion of Mr. Asquith, he said, 'the Prime Minister was at least a man who had grown grey in public service. Moreover, he had contributed three brilliant sons to the trenches, two of whom had already been wounded, and all were serving in active campaigning. The valiant selves of his subjects, Sir F. E. Smith's argument.

A correspondent writes: 'The recent proceedings at the Guildhall against the publications of the I.L.P., Mr. C. H. Norman, the Stop the War Committee, and other persons, present some very peculiar features. This prosecution was a prosecution of pamphlets—not of their authors. It was an application to destroy publications discovered upon certain premises upon the ground that they were calculated, in contravention of Regulation 27 of the Defence Regulations, to prejudice H.M.'s relations with foreign Powers, or were likely to prejudice recruiting.' The prosecution was founded upon Regulation 51a, which was issued on July 28, 1915, which gave power to a magistrate to order the seizure of documents likely to prejudice recruiting. Regulation 51a is brought before the Court charged with any offence within the Regulations made under

"The provisions of the Act declared that the King in Council may make Regulations designed, among other things, 'to prevent spread of false reports likely to prejudice H.M.'s relations with foreign Powers' or 'to prevent the successful prosecution of the war being endangered.' Provision was also made that trials for felony, which were defined as trials by jury, could be held in camera. Regulation 27 considerably extended the wording of the Act. 'No person shall by word of mouth or in writing spread false reports, or make false statements or reports likely to prejudice H.M.'s relations with foreign Powers, or spread reports or make statements likely to prejudice the recruiting of H.M.'s forces.' The introduction of the expression, 'statements likely to prejudice recruiting,' went far beyond even the drastic powers granted by the Act; but Mr. Muir stated at the Guildhall that the making of true statements was an offence within the Regulations. Also, Regulation 51a has ignored the limitation of in camera proceedings to felony, in that it permits the trial and condemnation of literature taken to take place in secret. The result is that no individual is brought before the Court charged with any offence known to the English law, but only the documents.

"According to the 'Law Journal,' Mr. C. H. Norman applied ex parte to the King's Bench Division on October 30 for a writ of certiorari, to bring up the Alderman's order for destruction, for the purpose of having it quashed, on the ground (1) that Regulations 27 and 51a were ultra vires the defence of the Realm Act, and (2) that the sitting of the Court in secret invalidated the whole proceedings. The King's Bench, however, declined to accord to this application, which may be carried to the Court of Appeal, and possibly to the House of Lords. Looked at from the Government point of view, the advantage of the procedure adopted in these cases is plain: the secret hearing creates the idea in the public mind that these publications must be of a most serious character; while the prosecution of the documents only, and not their writers, prevents the case ever being investigated by a jury. These legal devices are a revival of the Star Chamber methods before courts without the competence of that famous tribunal; and, as such, cannot 'command themselves to enlightened minds. The questions raised are the more important in that the Defence of the Realm Acts and Regulations have no section in them limiting their operation to the duration of the war.' In fact, the prosecution of political opinion (for the chief complaint was that the pamphlets alleged this was a capitalist war) has been re-established in Great Britain, notwithstanding the specific pledge given by Sir J. Simon to Parliament before the passing of the Act that the Government had no such intention.'
Foreign Affairs.

By S. Verdud.

We need not concern ourselves with the complicated details behind the intrigues which led to the fall of the Greek Cabinet. It is sufficiently evident that the alleged arrogance of the War Minister towards the Venizelist party was merely an excuse, and that M. Venizelos made use of his majority because he thought the moment favourable. We may take it for granted that he would not have gone to extreme lengths without previous consultation with the representatives of the Entente Powers; and the defeat of M. Zaimis may be regarded as a sequel to the steady and increasing pressure which the Allies have recently been bringing to bear on the Greek Government. Eliminating the wilder stories current in some of the capitals—such as that King Constantine may order his army to attack the Entente troops at Salonika unless the British and French Governments agree to remove them—we may say that there are three obvious courses open to the King. He may, in the first place, dissolve the Chamber and consent to a general election to be held. Even if M. Venizelos were returned again, as he very likely would be, with a preponderating majority, it is reckoned that this manoeuvre would enable the Court to gain at least six weeks’ time; with the possibility, of course, that effective bribery and election rigging might enable the pro-German elements to defeat the Venizelist. Secondly, he might try to induce M. Venizelos to become Prime Minister conditionally, the chief condition being, naturally, that Greece should not go to war against Germany and Austria. In view of M. Venizelos’s repeated statements that he regards Bulgaria as the hereditary enemy, and that he would insist, if returned to power, on Greece carrying out her treaty obligations towards Serbia, it is hardly likely that an arrangement on this basis can be reached. Or, thirdly, King Constantine might ask M. Zaimis to try his luck in the Chamber yet again, endeavouring in the meantime to bring about some form of compromise between the opposed parties. This, too, would appear to be unlikely.

It is almost inconceivable, in view of what has occurred in the past, that the King can be urged to adopt the only course open to a constitutional monarch, viz., to accept the resignation of the nominal Prime Minister, M. Zaimis, to re-appoint M. Venizelos to the post which he ought still to be holding, and to make ready to lead his army, if he wishes to do so, against the Bulgarians in fulfilment of Greece’s treaty obligations. I do not care to emphasise the possibility of this course being followed; but it should not be regarded as altogether surprising if it were. True, there are great German influences at the Greek Court, and the business community would like to see war averted if possible. On the other hand, there are many responsible political elements, and many people engaged in commerce as well, who clearly recognise that if Greece does not take the field against Bulgaria now she will almost certainly have to do so at a later stage, and fight her battle alone. Again, even though his consort is the sister of the Kaiser, it is scarcely likely that King Constantine, if faced with the alternative of losing his throne or aiding the Allies, would care to trust solely to the Kaiser. It is just possible that coming events in Greece may lead to such an alternative.

It must be becoming clear to the Greek Court that the German endeavour to break through by way of the Balkans is a last and desperate throw of the gambler. It is evident to readers of even the highly censored German newspapers that the condition of the Central Empires is as bad as it can possibly be. I do not refer merely to the food riots, to the protests of the Social-Democratic Party against the rising prices, to the inflated currency, to the entire dislocation of some of the most important industries of the country—shipping, for instance—but rather to disclosures which correspondents are permitted to send from the front, and to the fact that thousands of men previously rejected as unfit for service are now being recalled for further examination. It is evident that large numbers of men were drawn from the Russian front when the recent French offensive began in Champagne, aided by the British offensive at Loos. These men were thrown, without rest, into the firing-line on the western front. Neutral observers have told us that the large Belgian towns, such as Brussels and Antwerp, have had nine-tenths of their garrisons removed, only elderly men of the Landsturm being left in charge.

These facts, I repeat, and many others like them, while they are not known to Greek newspaper readers, are certainly known to the politicians and the Court. Furthermore, there is no mention of the reports published in the papers at Athens and Rome that the numbers of men engaged on the enemy’s side in the Balkans have been exaggerated. Mackensen’s army is estimated to consist of, perhaps, a hundred and fifty thousand men, allowing for the reinforcements he has recently received. The Bulgarians have not more than two hundred thousand men under arms; and they do not appear to be too well equipped. Further, they do not seem to be inclined to push their advance much beyond the territory they expect eventually to be allowed to hold. It is worthy of notice that the important German papers — the “Berliner Tageblatt,” the “Kolnische Zeitung,” “Der Tag,” “the Frankfurter,” “the Kreutz-Zeitung,” “Vossische,” and the “Hamburger Nachrichten,” not to mention Austrian papers like the “Neue Freie Presse” and the “Wiener Tageblatt”—have shown a certain amount of coolness towards their new allies in the last week or two. The Sofia official communiqués are given for what they are worth, and there are appeals for the Bulgarian Red Cross; but there are no more of the glowing leading articles about the noble, the brave, the ‘heaven-knows-what armies and people of King Ferdinand. It is not illogical to assume that this coolness is due to Bulgaria’s disinclination to oblige her Austro-German friends beyond a certain point.

There is one other factor, however, which the Greek Court must be taking into serious consideration. That is stated that sixty thousand French troops are now in contact with the extreme right wing of the Serbian main army, that they are fighting in Bulgarian territory, and that they are being aided, in turn, by nearly forty thousand British troops, while the ways of communication are being kept open towards Salonika. We may be sure that reinforcements have been hurried to Salonika—the statements made by Mr. Asquith and M. Viviani leave no room for doubt on that score, and there are other indications in the German and French papers which the initiated can interpret satisfactorily. It is the English newspaper reader, as usual, who is being kept more in the dark than anybody; and it is the British case, which, as usual, is being presented to the world by the correspondents of neutral newspapers in the worst possible light. How can it be otherwise when so relatively little of value in the shape of news can pass the Censor, while Northcliffe is allowed to criticise the Government to the top of his voice? The German newspapers, on the other hand, give the impression of being presented to the public in the most bombastic pro-Germans in Athens. But we shall be all right, and the pessimists will once more have made fools of themselves.
The first remark of a foreigner visiting England to-day arises out of our habitual taciturnity, usually intensified during critical periods, the remark is not only true, but it is considerably within the truth. Much less than the war or of a soldier back from the front is that England does not yet realise that we are at war. Even allowing for our habitual taciturnity, usually intensified during critical periods, the remark is not only true, but it is considerably within the truth. Much less than the war or of a soldier back from the front is that England does not yet realise that we are at war.

The inability of the mass of Englishmen to appreciate the issues of the war arises from a number of mental predispositions, some of them native to the English character, and others resulting from recent conditions and prevalent doctrines. Among the former is the reluctance of the national mind to dwell upon the subject of war at all. We are by nature one of the kindest people that ever lived, good-natured, sentimental and fundamentally amiable; and the contemplation of war, particularly in its realistic aspects, is naturally disagreeable to us. But this pleasing characteristic has unfortunately been flattered as having somehow become what it is, never greatly to change again. A petty political transformation, such as the republicanism of Portugal, may occur here, or a party dispute in Russia may establish a Duma there; but in the distribution of the main units of Europe no change can be expected. From this reasoning, it will be seen, no event can be regarded as of really great importance; for why should we concern ourselves deeply when the outcome of every event is predetermined by the principles of an immutable small? An Armageddon may be upon us in the opinion of isolated thinkers and rhetorical journalists; but an Armageddon, in fact, threatening any fundamental transformation of European civilization, is ex hypothesi impossible. To this it can only be replied that the hypothesis is not only wrong in fact, but it is likely to prove fatal when it is attempted to pursue it, while the rest deliberately and even, we might say, intelligently, pursue another path altogether as if

There is, to begin with, the Liberal assumption, practically never challenged, that things are fixed more or less as they are, and cannot radically change. The map of Europe, for example, is commonly supposed to be of as having somehow become what it is, never greatly to change again. A petty political transformation, such as the republicanism of Portugal, may occur here, or a party dispute in Russia may establish a Duma there; but in the distribution of the main units of Europe no change can be expected. From this reasoning, it will be seen, no event can be regarded as of really great importance; for why should we concern ourselves deeply when the outcome of every event is predetermined by the principles of an immutable small? An Armageddon may be upon us in the opinion of isolated thinkers and rhetorical journalists; but an Armageddon, in fact, threatening any fundamental transformation of European civilization, is ex hypothesi impossible. To this it can only be replied that the hypothesis is not only wrong in fact, but it is likely to prove fatal when it is attempted to pursue it, while the rest deliberately and even, we might say, intelligently, pursue another path altogether as if

To take the instance that ought to be best known to us by now—that of Germany—how impossible it still appears for English Liberal opinion (Conservatives have, of course, no opinions) to eradicate from its mind the assumption that Germany is Liberal at heart. Nothing can be more contrary to the fact. Knowing Germany as I do from residence there as well as from history, past and present, I affirm that the mind of Germany is neither Liberal nor even Liberalising, that is, disposed to become Liberal. Of the two orders of German intelligence—the first-rate and the second-rate—both, it is true, are split upon the subject of democracy; but into parties of which in the first the anti-democratic party is intellectually the more able, and in the second more numerous. Set beside the names of the first-rate minds in Germany who support the present Government and the theories upon which it is based, the names of its opponents of the same rank; it will be found that the former outweigh the latter. Similarly, if the numbers of the second-rate minds in Germany (the professional educated classes) who accept the State theory and practice are compared with the minds of the same order that challenge it, the result is equally menacing to democracy. It may be replied that the progress in numbers and influence of the German Social Democrats is opposed to my statement. But while admitting it partially, no great value attaches to it. The Social Democrats are without power, and they are, in private at least, without hope. English Liberals may entertain the belief that the German bureaucracy will collapse if it is defeated; nay, even, as I have heard said, find its leaders at the end of the war swinging upon lamp-posts. But the German Government believes nothing of the kind. The parallel between the present German and the pre-revolutionary French Government is fictitious, and no hopes built upon it have any foundation. The Government of Louis was inefficient, unpopular, and, what is more, did not believe in itself. The German Government is, on the
other hand, efficient, popular and self-confident. No hope of revolution from internal causes can therefore be anticipated. For the time being Germany is not only not Liberal, but it is actively bureaucratic and anti-Liberal, and appears likely to remain so. The only hope—and that is faint—for the victory of Social Democracy in Germany is the victory of the Allies.

Wolf, wolf, has been cried so many times in this country that, on the one hand, we have lost the sensation and almost the very notion of national peril, and, on the other hand, we have presumed upon our historic security to leave our future security to chance. In the matter of Peru, for example, it is doubtful whether more than one in a thousand of our intelligent population has had his mind once crossed during the war by the thought that perhaps England is really in danger. And even fewer, I imagine, have once asked what are likely to be the consequences to the English of England's defeat. All we mean by democracy will certainly take a second place in our daily lives if the Central Powers have their way. It cannot be otherwise. Democracy and bureaucracy are obviously incompatible; both cannot be dominant at the same time; they are the professional and the human ideals which are always in antagonism. For German bureaucracy to succeed is to ensure the failure of English democracy, and with it all the secondary variations dependent upon it. This paradoxical as it may seem, one reason lies in the freedom from the necessity to be pre-occupied by a narrow politics. Think of the psychology of the Poles, and, in another way, of the Irish. Both are, in the particular sense we are discussing, more than merely defeated nations; their nationalities and their conquerors cannot assimilate, and which, equally, cannot assimilate themselves with their conquerors. With what result? Their policy is born of resentment, bred on conspiracy, and brought up in an atmosphere of whispered gossip. Everything must be subordinated to the Catilinarian in nations such as these. Free thought, free speech, free culture, all these are resented among a conquered but unconvinced people as diversions of energy from the one occupation of recovering their independence. It is to this state that the victors of Germany, though it stopped short of an actual conquest, would bring us in England. And I leave it to be reckoned what further losses would result from it.

It will be seen, I hope, that in the discussion of the war at this stage the question of causes is comparatively unimportant. Subsequently, when history comes to be written, and when, if happily it be so, the peril is past, the causes, immediate and remote, may be examined, and judgment may be passed upon them. But it is with consequences that our first concern should be at this moment. Let it be supposed, if you please, that we got into the war by the worst of all possible means; that no crime was left uncommitted by our diplomacy and our politics to bring it about—the fact still remains that the consequences of defeat are such as nobody in England can face with his eyes open. Pacifists, Little-Englanders, Social revolutionaries, pedants—all alike are equally involved in the results of the war. Not one can afford to be indifferent to it. At the same time, not one can afford to wish anything less than the victory of the Allies. In a national melting such as the present, everybody is concerned primarily, not with the question of how we got into it, but how we are to get out of it. All other questions are secondary if not irrelevant.

That Germany has a theory is well known; but what her theory is our publicists have taken less trouble than the publicists of any other nation to discover. That it is, as I have said, not only the contrary but the challenge-
On the Balance of Power.

By Ramiro de Maestu

It is not true that this is a war of ideas. It is a war of Powers who are fighting for power. That does not mean to say that the war does not influence ideas. Every human conflict influences ideas; or at least, their realisation in social life. Amid the competition of the Stock Exchange the ruin of one financier, who happens to be a patron of letters, influences literature adversely, while the enrichment of another who loves pictures is favourable to the art of painting; but the struggles on the Stock Exchange are not on that account struggles between literature and painting, but of money against money in search of more money. The intellectuals who maintain that this is a war of ideas do so because they suppose that if it is not it cannot have any interest for them; or, at least, it ought not. There are many intellectuals who have not reflected enough on the importance of the factor of power. There are others, on the other hand, who do not believe in any other values than those of power. Against the former we shall argue that it is utopia to ignore the element of power; against the latter, that it is blindness to deny the values of the good, the true, and the beautiful. The assertion of ideas and the denial of force is pure mysticism; the assertion of power and the denial of ideas is pure Barbarism.

Even if it were possible to prove that all the belligerents, the Allies and the Germans, the Central Powers and the Entente, in the same way, that the primacy of the ideas of liberty and nationality, and that all the Powers in the other group were defending with one mind the primacy of the ideas of authority and Empire, it could not be deduced from that fact that the present conflict bears the burden of the ideas of freedom and authority, between nationality and imperialism. If a Liberal and a Conservative go to law, that does not mean that they submit to the verdict of the court the polemic between the ideas of progress and order. It is quite possible that the law suit may be concerned only with the ownership of a house. I have seen on a cinematograph a lawyer and a physician boxing. They were not fighting for the primacy of the law or of natural science, but for a woman. Wars have been undertaken for ideological motives, as, for example, the war declared by the European monarchies against the French Convention in 1793. The present war does not propose to achieve the triumph of any idea. It is a war of power. Germany wishes to secure the hegemony of Europe; the Allies wish to prevent her. It is in this way that the war is interpreted by retired soldiers in their club armchairs, and these are men, as a rule, of few ideas. That does not mean that their interpretation is false, nor does it lessen the interest with which the war inspires the world. I believe, on the contrary, that it ought to inspire the intellectuals with as much interest as other men. The thesis of this article is that European culture is based on the balance of power; and that in fighting for the balance of power England is fulfilling her great historical function of fighting for European culture.

The balance of power, in Europe, has no alternative other than the hegemony of one of its States, as it had no other also in Ancient Greece, whence we derive the two ideas of hegemony and balance. We may lament as much as we like the fact that in this world of power the ideas of the Sermon on the Mount do not prevail; our lament will be useless. A conflict of power can only be solved in two ways: balance or hegemony. In the Middle Ages it was possible because the Church was opposed to the ambitions of the German Empire; at the time of the Renaissance the balance was saved because the Reformation undermined the power of the Empire; in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries it was England who saved the balance by fighting against the ambitions of France; in the nineteenth century England remained faithful to her policy of maintaining the balance, but her Governments committed the tragic error of not perceiving, until forty years too late, that the Power which threatened the balance was not Russia but Germany.

The position is clear. As the Germans crossed the Danube to enter Serbia, the meaning of the war has come into the limelight. The Germans do not want to remain in Belgium, but to negotiate with it; perhaps, too, they do not want to keep Poland, except in so far as to make it an autonomous but tributary kingdom. What they do intend is to expand to the south-east and to form a great empire or group of empires which shall cross the centre of Europe from the North and the Baltic Seas to find its eastern and southern boundaries in the Black Sea, the Persian Gulf, the Red Sea, and the Suez Canal. At one side of this immense stretch of European and Asiatic territory Russia would remain isolated; at the other side, our side, the Western Powers: France, Italy, England. In the centre of the whole continent, as now in the centre of Europe, the German Empire would remain supreme.

This German Empire would not imply the disappearance of the Austro-Hungarian Empire or the Ottoman Empire, or of the kingdoms of Greece, Bulgaria, and Roumania, provided that they behaved themselves satisfactorily towards the former. The German Empire would also allow of the four kingdoms could remain, as there remain to-day within the German Empire itself the four kingdoms of Prussia, Bavaria, Saxony, and Württemberg; the six Grand Duchies of Baden, Hesse, Mecklenburg-Schwerin, Mecklenburg-Strelitz, Oldenburg, and Westphalia; five duchies, seven principalities, and the three free cities of Hamburg, Bremen, and Lübeck. The organisation of the German Empire is elastic. It is an organisation of hegemony by concentric circles. In Prussia the King, with his army, and his authority, are in command. Side by side with the sovereignty of Prussia the remaining German States maintain their own sovereignty; but in the affairs of the whole Empire the supremacy of Prussia is assured by the fact that she possesses the majority of votes in the Council of the Empire. Why should not this series of concentric circles be extended? Even at the present time it is a fact that the Prussian General Staff directs the military operations of the whole German Empire; it also directs those of the Austro-Hungarian and Turkish Armies, and probably the operations of the Bulgarian armies as well.

While the Austro-Hungarian Empire might still exist, it would be possible to attach it more closely to Germany by this system of concentric circles, in such a manner that the German-speaking Austrians might come to form the first vanguard of the Greater Germany; the second would be the Hungarians; the third, the Bohemians; the fourth, the other Slav peoples governed by the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy; the fifth, the Serbians, in the same state of dependence as the Bosnians and Herzegovinians are in now. Then would come Bulgaria, enlarged at Serbia’s expense; then Greece and Roumania; and, finally, Turkey, with all the honours of the Ottoman Empire, but governed in the same fashion as Egypt is, with a number of German and Austrian personnel, who would irrigate the region of Mesopotamia with the waters of the Tigris and the Euphrates in order to provide Northern Germany with raw material from the tropics—coffee, cotton, etc.—and with the foodstuffs which she now has to get from other lands. This new Empire would not need a new war of conquest, of which Holland would be
the victim one day, Persia the next, Denmark the next, and Egypt the next. The method is simple. Those who were discontented from idealism would be shot; those who were discontented from ambition would be given employment in the newly-conquered territories. In this way the new German Rome would gradually extend its boundaries until it comprised the whole of the old countries; Asia, Africa, and Prussia; and the rest of the world would be added unto it.

It is against this monstrous dream that the Allies are fighting. I should like to see all the countries now neutral fighting it, too: first, because I believe that its realisation is possible, though not probable; and, secondly, because its realisation would be fatal to culture. To which you may reply with the evocation of Imperial Rome. All Imperialistic dreams are no more than remembrances of Ancient Rome. This is because Ancient Rome satisfies one of the perennial longings of the human mind: the longing for grandeur. When I was a child, and my eyes wandered over the engravings that illustrated Mommsen's "History of Rome," I liked to imagine on an enormous scale the eleven forums, the ten basilicas, the twenty-eight libraries, the nine aqueducts, the theatres, temples, and the circuses, rising high above fountains and gardens and sculptures without number. Even now I awake sometimes as I am dreaming of colossal monuments. However civilised a man may be, he always preserves within himself a barbarian fondness for fat women, like the Arabs. That lower part of ourselves which prefers quantity to quality, luxury to art, rhetoric to poetry, power to justice, and mass to form, will always find its ideal in the Roman Empire. "If you do not know how to build the Pantheon, pile up the Pyramids," was the advice given by Flaubert to a young architect, his nephew.

I was lucky enough not to see Rome until after I had saturated myself, in Florence, with the grace, the life, and the joy of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance. Perhaps that was why the Roman arches and the ruins of the Colosseum and the thermal baths weighed so heavily on me that I could breathe easily only in the Catacombs. Mysticism and asceticism are blind alleys. Our eyes were not made to see the mysteries; and self-indulgence and self-contempt cannot make love the good things more. But in the ruins of ancient Rome the mysticism and asceticism of the first Christians is easy to understand. If the world did not offer any other values than those of accumulating power and of expending it in material productions, every refined person, even if only slightly refined, would feel inclined to deny the world. Nobody can deny the utility of the work carried out by Rome in subduing the peoples on the coasts of the Mediterranean. That work made easier the access of Greek ideas to the barbarians. Rome was the road over which Greece passed. But we owe civilisation, first, to Athens and the cities of Hellas; secondly to Florence and the Italian cities; and thirdly to the European nations. To Rome, the administrative mind excepted, we owe nothing. The pomp of Roman literature badly conceals its low imitative quality. The two central ideas of her Law, the imperium and the dominium (State despotism and private property) are the two great obstacles which still impede the constitution of human societies according to the principles of justice to be observed.

It is an historic fact that culture and civilisation arise from nations and cities in the moments in which, perhaps, they may be aspiring to hegemony, but in which they do not reach it, since the balance of power remains with rival countries and towns. Culture and civilisation arise from rivalry, but from balance of power. The example of Germany confirms the rule. The whole of her culture was produced in that period of uncertainty and fluidity in which the real hegemony Austria had ceased and that of Prussia had not yet come into being. On a previous occasion I combated the assertion of David Hume in his essay: "Of the Rise and Progress of the Arts and Sciences," viz., "that it is impossible for the arts and sciences to arise, at first, among any people, unless that people enjoy the blessings of a free government." I attacked this assertion because David Hume had not perceived that by freedom he meant Liberty has nowadays, thanks to Mill, the sense of a facilitative power, by virtue of which the individual believes himself authorised to defend his country or not to defend it, to sepa the society or not to serve it, according to his wish. In this sense liberty is anti-social, abominable; and has nothing to do with culture. But one may give to the word liberty another meaning, that which it had among the Greeks—the meaning of citizenship or participation in the government, and in that case David Hume's assertion recovers its full value. It is around the problem of the governance of countries, and precisely when the governance of countries constitutes a problem, that civilisation has been built up.

The reason of this historic fact is not historical, but philosophical. The central theme of culture is the governance of peoples. It is the central theme because it is the synthetic. For the good governance of peoples a knowledge of the real factors—economics, military power, and arts and crafts—is as necessary as a knowledge of the ideal factors, justice and truth. In the theme of government the facts group themselves in the ideas, and the ideas discipline themselves in the realities. In Plato's Republic we must see, not merely a Utopia, but also a programme to that Hellenic cities would certainly have tried to adjust themselves if their independence had not been destroyed, first by Macedonia and then by Rome. Plato's Republic is not a Utopia, but an anticipation. But when the cities of Hellas lose their autonomy, Greek thought always returns to reality. Its orators become vagrant jugglers, wandering from city to city, clothing themselves in festive attire to deliver their epideictic speeches of mere show in the market-places; and its philosophers decorate the bouquets of the stupid senators of Rome. Rome, perhaps, would have been a country creative of culture if, at the beginning of her development, she had been contained by neighbouring countries as strong as herself. Then the struggles between the patricians and the plebeians would have been prolonged indefinitely; and from these struggles a great political literature would have arisen—not to mention the literature which would have arisen among the Etruscans if they had been able to maintain their independence in the face of Rome and the Greek colonies. But it is the practical necessity, and precisely when the governance of countries constitutes a problem, that civilisation has been built up.

It is the belligerent, eternal, and indestructible side of human nature. Imperialism is natural to man. It is, as Seillière says: "The original tendency of human nature to prepare for itself a future of rest and well-being through the rational exercise and increase of its force." Only when this will to power shatters itself against other wills to power which are opposed and antagonistic to it does the human spirit turn on itself and discover the superior values of the true, the beautiful, and the good. In this sense the balance of power, both in home and foreign politics, is the condition sine qua non of culture.

To this it may be objected that the balance of power leads to rivalry in armaments, that armaments cost money, and that this money must be withdrawn from social reform, education, culture, etc. To that I reply: It is true; but when a nation devotes the whole of its strength to the ideal of achieving the hegemony, the other nations have no choice but to sacrifice themselves to stop it. But what I do affirm is that the balance of power is not only an essential condition for culture; it is also essential in order that one day international relations may be based on justice, through the application of the objective principle of law, the guild or functionalist principle. But that will require another chapter.
Servia or Constantinople?

Experts and the general public appear now to realise that England has made a huge mistake in the Eastern theatre of war. Had the force which was sent to the Dardanelles been sent to Servia, Turkey would have been cut off permanently from all help from her Allies, and must inevitably have succumbed in time to economic pressure; Bulgaria would never have declared for Germany, Greece would not have hesitated, and the neutrality of Roumania would have been secured, without the slightest need for bribery. At the same time, we should have gained a name for helping our Allies, not without value as an asset for the future. Not that the defence of Servia can be considered our immediate business. Russia egged on Servia to resist the Austrians, just as we encouraged Belgium to resist the Germans, promising to see her through the consequences. But since we undertook the attack upon the Dardanelles at the request of Russia, England has become the protagonist of the Allies in the Turkish section of the war, and since she has suffered little in comparison with France and Russia, and has much larger reserves of men available, it devolves on her to give the necessary help to Servia. A couple of months ago, our failure at the Dardanelles was evident, and half the force immobilised there might just as well have been transferred to Servia, and entrenched upon the Danube front, or so it seemed to an onlooker. The mistake is political, originating in the desire to conquer Constantinople in pursuance, one is forced to imagine, of some compact with the Russian Government. Already there are rumours that a fresh attack upon Constantinople through Bulgarian territory, rather than the theatre of war. Had the force which was sent to save the Serbs is to try to buy the help of the Roumanian army. The whole policy is that of a decadent empire; it depends on mercenaries. Every one of our Allies has to be paid her price. And every one of them, thus paid, will feel contempt for us.

The other conception of the war is that of the majority of Englishmen: we have been jockeyed into war, we don't see very clearly why; but, being in it, it is our affair, the whole of it. Servia is our ally. To save a friend from being crushed to death is more important than to strike an enemy. The Serbs have called to us, and we must help them. If Russia wants Constantinople, let her go and take it! We have no knowledge of the machinations of diplomacy; we mean to win the war; and when that object is achieved, we shall hold a full inquiry into the intrigues which led to it. Possibly, we may disclaim responsibility for some provisions of a compact which was made without the knowledge either of us, the English people, or our representatives in Parliament.

This conception is the more generous, while the former is the more correct. And the more generous conception will, I fancy, prove the better strategically: for the correct diplomatic view is hide-bound, and has no mobility, and the face of a great war is always changing. If England, after such mistakes made beneath the eyes of the Balkan peoples, should win a step through the assistance of Roumania, the glory will be for the Balkans and the self-sacrificing. If I were the British Government, I would send every available man into Servia—indeed, I should have done so months ago—and if Servia had been crushed before my troops arrived, I should use those troops to liberate her, and for no other purpose, certain that in Servia is the gate of Germany's ambitions in the East, and that on our treatment of Servia will depend the honour of our nation in the East in years to come.
II.—THE ATTACK UPON CORPORATIONS.

The growing monarchies, conscious of their power, and eager to increase it, were soon at open war with every type of independent organism. Either they must submit to the omnipotent State and acknowledge their rights and their very existence to be mere grants from its sovereign authority, or they would be exterminated.

The new State could find no place within its borders for the self-existent, self-dependent corporation. The imperium in imperio was anathema.

The civil lawyers, eagerly claiming for the Kings of England or France the powers of a Justinian, brought the authority of the Roman and the canon laws to the aid of the State. Gains had laid it down that “neque societas, neque collegium, neque huiusmodi corpus, passim omnibus habere conceditur, nam et legibus et senatuisconsulatis et principaliibus constitutionibus esse coeetur.” The medieval canonists had conceived the idea of the persona ficta, and had laid it down that only the supreme authority could effect the miracle of political transubstantiation and confer legal personality upon a body of men: and no association unpossessed of this State conferred individuality could hope that its existence would be recognised by the law, or that it would be allowed, unless by some subterfuge of trusts, to hold property. By the opening of the 16th century it was already the received doctrine, as in Blackstone’s time, that “with us in England the King’s consent is absolutely necessary to the erection of any corporation, either impliedly or expressly given.”

The most dramatic phase of the struggle between the State and the corporations was the contest with the Church. The old issues of the middle age, the contest for priority between Pope and Emperor, the quarrels over the delimitation of spiritual and temporal powers had vanished. The newer and more startling claim was that of the political sovereign to be head of the Church in his dominions, the claim of the temporal power to absolute lordship over the spiritual. That is the central fact of the Reformation. Revolutions in discipline and manners, variations in dogma and ethics were no novelty. The distinctive feature of the Reformation was its Erastianism. The universality of the Church was denied: religion became everywhere a matter of State concern. In England Henry VIII adopts the daring title of Supreme Head of the Church: Elizabeth assumed all “jurisdictions, privileges, superiorities and preeminent spiritual and ecclesiastical,” and “unites and annexes them for ever to the imperial crown of the realm”: the long religious wars of the continent resulted in the establishment of the principle of “cujus regio, ejus religio.”

Throughout Europe the sovereign States are victorious, the independence of the Church is destroyed, and religious freedom exists only on sufferance. Where toleration is refused it is on political rather than on religious grounds, because the Governments feel that national unity—and hence national power—is threatened by religious differences. Where it is permitted, there is always the limitation that it must not in any way threaten the supremacy of the State. Thus has been denied the right of the sovereign to compell conformity “nisi quid detrimenti illius republicae capiat.” James I excluded Catholicism from toleration, because it is politically subversive, and Cromwell, for the same reason, will not permit papacy or prelacy.

So, not only in Protestant countries, the Governments throw off the control of the Papacy, and assert their own jurisdiction over religious matters. And simultaneously they attack, with equal vigour, the existence of religious corporations within their dominions. In England the old learned monasteries were placed under immediate royal control. But the death of the King prevented its execution, and preserved some measure of autonomy to the threatened institutions.

Statesmen who were indifferent to the independence of hospitals and colleges were little likely to allow the existence of local autonomy of a similar nature in the government which was not avowedly and immediately subordinate to the central authority. And as the State grew in power so the medieval system crumbled away.

The autonomy of Ireland was destroyed by Henry VII, and Poyning’s Acts made of the Irish Parliament little more than an agency of the Privy Council; Henry VIII abolished the franchises of the Northern Palatines, and made Wales into twelve English counties: James I tried harder to effect the complete union of England and Scotland.

The municipal institutions of England were steadily centralised. The old County and Manorial Courts had already been superseded in all but formal functions by the Justices of the Peace—nominees of the Crown, liable to be dismissed at pleasure. And the Tudor kings still further subordinated the government of the shires to their own will by extending and strengthening in Act after Act the control of the Privy Council and its subordinate organs over the local magistrates.

The fate of the boroughs was different from that of the counties. The old free spontaneous municipalities of the Middle Age were not destroyed or replaced by a newer system. They were suffered to continue their existence on condition of forfeiting their freedom and acknowledging themselves creatures of the Crown. The new doctrine of corporations was applied: charters were granted by the Crown: and the Court of Common Pleas laid it down that every existing town which was a de facto corporate body must be presumed to have been incorporated by some lost and forgotten charter. Thus, by a shameless legal fiction, the free character of the municipalities was destroyed, their autonomy placed at the mercy of the Crown, and the way cleared for the wholesale destruction, under Charles II when Jefferys ‘made all the charters, like the walls of Jericho, fall down before him, and returned laden with surrenders, the spoils of towns.”

So, on every side, the tendency of 16th century politics was towards centralisation, the extension of the power of the Crown over every phase of national life, and the decay or extirpation of every form of independent and autonomous organisation. The monarchies were bent on the absorption or the destruction of every other type of political or social organism. And public opinion, remembering the triumphs of feudalism, all things for peace kept by a firm hand, was willing to make the sacrifice, and to barter freedom for security.

W. N. EVER.
The Organisation of Munitions Work.


For the successful organisation of munitions work two things are necessary: national mobilisation of industrial resources in the shape of workshops, plant, and the like, and the willing co-operation of the workers. Under the Munitions Acts, the former has in the main been secured; the workers, on the other hand, have been alienated. Under the Munitions Act, the worker is handed over tied and bound to the Imperial Administration, in the person of the supposedly "impartial" chairman of the Munitions Tribunal. The worker has no share in the ordering of his own work; he is at the same time without freedom and without responsibility. The result is growing unrest, and the threat of serious trouble.

Thus at one time it did seem that Mr. Lloyd George and the Government intended to set on foot an organisation of industry on the lines of representative government, allowing to employers and employed an equal share in the control of matters that concern both alike. But no sooner had the local Committees been established, and before they had become general, than the Government turned its back upon the representative principle and began to oust the local Committees from all share in the control of matters that concern both alike. The Munitions Act made the employer once more an autocrat in the conduct of his business, and removed even the Trade Union safeguards against abuse of his power; it also took away the disciplinary powers of the local Committees and handed them over to the impartial Chairman of the Munitions Tribunals. Finally, responsibility for the organisation of the supply of labour was taken into its own hands by the Ministry of Munitions, which sent three officials of its own into each district to supervise the supply of labour. The local Committees, deprived of every shred of their power, were in some cases informed that they need no longer meet.

Thus the Government went back on representative government. But the effects of the change were not the same for all parties. Under the Munitions Act the employer received almost absolute control over his own establishment; thus, for him, representative government was replaced by autocracy. The worker, on the other hand, submitted to the almost absolute control of the employer, lost the powers attaching to representative government: for him, the change was from representative government impossible. It is based on the opposite principle of autocracy, and without its repeal no local scheme not having part of a national scheme, the Local Committees should include, in addition to representatives of the employers and workers concerned, a representative of the Chambers of Commerce of the district, a representative of the Trades Councils of the district, and a representative of the Ministry of Munitions. This is, in our eyes, a serious imperfection; but it seems inevitable in a purely local scheme.

SUGGESTED AMENDMENTS.

1. (a) In all munitions areas Local Joint Committees, equally representative of employers and employed, shall be established.
(b) The employers' side of each Local Committee shall be elected by the employers in the district, and the workers' side by Trade Unions or Trade Union branches in the district.
(c) In each establishment a Joint Sub-Committee, equally representative of the employers and employed, shall be elected, one half by the management and the other by the Trade Unions in the establishment.
(d) Similar Joint Sub-Committees shall be formed, wherever necessary, to deal with particular problems or requirements.
(e) All Sub-Committees shall be under the control of the Local Committee.

2. (a) A Central Joint Committee, consisting of an equal number of representatives of employers and employed, together with members nominated by the Ministry of Munitions, shall be established.
(b) The employers' side of the Central Committee shall be elected by the Employers' Associations concerned, and the workers' side by the Trade Unions concerned.
(c) The nominated members shall not exceed in number one-half of the number elected for each side.
(d) All demands for changes in rates of wages, methods of payment, hours of labour, and conditions of employment, including all proposals to abrogate or vary any Trade Union regulation or workshop custom, or to import new classes of labour, or to utilise semi-skilled or unskilled labour, shall be submitted to a Central Committee, whose members shall be selected from those serving on the previous Central Committee and from the employers and workers so serving on it. The decisions of the Central Committee shall be governed by the conditions prevailing in existing establishments for the same or similar processes and products.

3. (a) All demands for changes in rates of wages, methods of payment, hours of labour, and conditions of employment, including all proposals to abrogate or vary any Trade Union regulation or workshop custom, or to import new classes of labour, or to utilise semi-skilled or unskilled labour, shall be submitted to a Central Committee, whose members shall be selected from those serving on the previous Central Committee and from the employers and workers so serving on it. The decisions of the Central Committee shall be governed by the conditions prevailing in existing establishments for the same or similar processes and products.

4. (a) The Local Committees shall enforce in all munitions establishments the payment of the Trade Union district rates of wages for each class of work.
The Average Man,
By Ivor Brown.

If Great Men can only carry us from muddle to more of it, and if, at the same time, we are not to abandon ourselves to a debauch of pessimism, we must look elsewhere for our safety.

If Great Men fail, why not the Little Men? But all the arguments which can be applied against aristocracy, apply equally surely against cacocracy. But between these two poles lies a great company of average men. The point about the averages man is, that the more in other countries, he is really average. The desires of mankind are simple and they are right. That is dogmatism and demands explanation. The desires of man are right just in so far as “the good life” depends not upon abstract canons of morality imposed from without, not upon some categorical imperative known to professors and not to plumbers, but upon a common-sense regulation of normal desire. The average man is a person with normal desires, the desires, for instance, to live, to eat, to drink, to work, to marry, to have children, and not to be bothered by superior people. Wrong is for him not the horrible prompting of a devil, nor the failure to reconcile the self with the absolute, but simply the surrender of his personality to one form of desire, which thus becomes abnormal and a nuisance. It may be drinking or excessive marrying, excessive working, or excessive idling, excessive thinking, or excessive doing.

In these cases he will become either a criminal or a bore. It is the lack of regulation according to common sense, the abandonment of normality that constitutes the fault.

It is a sad comment on the sanity of reformers that, when they feel the world to be all wrong and man to be wasted or wicked, they immediately set about creating further and greater abnormalities. And when they have developed man’s normal desire for acquisition into further and ghastly abnormalities instead of restoring the norm. Reformers have no sense of proportion, no taste for the average. If one man gets drunk, they start a stately rampage called a teetotal campaign, in which they attempt to remedy one stupid excess by another. If another individual contracts an illness from the too abundant consumption of beef-steak, the same force is enacted, and we are all to be hustled into the eternal consumption of beans. And while the unfortunate average man is giving himself up to the vegetarian, and cocoa by its teetotal manufacturers, some one else will arrive and announce, that because rooms are frequently stuffy, we ought to pull down all our houses and live in tents and hammocks, and other devilish contrivances. And so, if the reformers have their way, the completely reformed man of A.D. 2000 will be a triumph of abnormality, a bedless, houseless, meatless, beerless but ‘incredibly efficient cog in the great industrial machine. Speeding up, the Premium Bonus system, and Industrial Psychology will have done their worst. That is to say, they will have developed man’s normal desire for acquisition into a passion for gain that will reconcile him to the new industrialism, and they will have so crushed all his normal desires for happiness and freedom that he will find in the new efficient factory a positive heaven. Indeed, it is no exaggeration to say that the reformed man is going to be the very devil.

The moral of all this is the necessity of leaving humanity alone, and of investigating instead the machinery of our material prosperity which has sprang up around us. Unfortunately, the average man can be moved from his divine normality by blustering and pestering monomaniacs. He can be bullied into Militarism by a lot of lies about heaven, and into Puritanism by a lot of lies about hell. The Bishop of London can entice to slaughter, as Mr. Spurgeon could London can entice to slaughter, as Mr. Spurgeon could...
Impressions of Paris.

All Paris is between consternation and laughter at the bakers' wives who desperately inform us that, unless their husbands are taken from them, they will force the bakeries to shut up, and then they will be free. The average man would endure no longer the moul and toil of wholesale bread-making! It is really a matter for consternation and not for laughter, though the other women may not for sparing all that might be spared these very unhappy wives. The tone of their petition to Parliament is the tone of physical fatigue and mental despair; they can neither think nor act any longer. One kind of labour these bakers' wives will never more claim for their province, and this is baking. It is said that the men cannot come back, and that the only solution is for fifty thousand housewives to bake their own bread or go without. Our Yorkshire women will have the laugh of some of us here when we begin! I shan't suffer for long, for I remember all the stages of smell of home-baked bread; I shall regulate my mixture by the smell.

But now we others will have to organise to protest (women never organise to any purpose except to protest) against the prices of food and coal. The French protest is to buy cheap and to sell dear, whether the thing bought and sold be labour or drudgery. Consequently, the wage-system sets a premium on the desire to gain and to lose it; and, out of due proportion to the normal complex of desires. It takes man on his commercial side and warps him. It is no use blaming the individual, who is caught up in the ugly machinery and whipped away like a feather. It is only of use to inquire whether that machinery can ever be permanent. Commercialism appeals to the acquisitive impulse of man and exaggerates it. The remedy is not, as of course, the excessive reformers with their tory-turvy logic used to demand, the complete abolition of normality in others; he is an abnormally active and irresistible nuisance in himself.

The average man is right when he is left alone, but under the present conditions of society there is no possibility of normal functioning. The underlying principle of the wage-system is to buy cheap and to sell dear, whether the thing bought and sold be labour or drudgery. Consequently, the wage-system sets a premium on the desire to gain and to lose it; and, out of due proportion to the normal complex of desires. It takes man on his commercial side and warps him. It is no use blaming the individual, who is caught up in the ugly machinery and whipped away like a feather. It is only of use to inquire whether that machinery can ever be permanent. Commercialism appeals to the acquisitive impulse of man and exaggerates it. The remedy is not, as of course, the excessive reformers with their tory-turvy logic used to demand, the complete abolition of normality in others; he is an abnormally active and irresistible nuisance in himself.

The average man is right when he is left alone, but under the present conditions of society there is no possibility of normal functioning. The underlying principle of the wage-system is to buy cheap and to sell dear, whether the thing bought and sold be labour or drudgery. Consequently, the wage-system sets a premium on the desire to gain and to lose it; and, out of due proportion to the normal complex of desires. It takes man on his commercial side and warps him. It is no use blaming the individual, who is caught up in the ugly machinery and whipped away like a feather. It is only of use to inquire whether that machinery can ever be permanent. Commercialism appeals to the acquisitive impulse of man and exaggerates it. The remedy is not, as of course, the excessive reformers with their tory-turvy logic used to demand, the complete abolition of normality in others; he is an abnormally active and irresistible nuisance in himself.

And just as sensible drinking is the goal for the statesman to consider, so sensible owning of furniture and of books and of the house is the goal for the statesman to consider, so sensible owning of furniture and of books and of the house. The Collectivist remedy for the present muddle is the remedy of maternal espionage. The politicians are to be the special constables of society, and to see that we keep our lights turned low, and our morals turned high. The "New Statesman" once informed its readers that what the public really needed was "discreetly regulated freedom." Who was to regulate the popular freedom? The idea is the will of the average person and the first feature of any Utopian schemes. By that is meant not that a man should possess land and capital, but that he should very certainly own his furniture and his books and be in control of his method of living.

The Collectivist remedy for the present muddle is the remedy of maternal espionage. The politicians are to be the special constables of society, and to see that we keep our lights turned low, and our morals turned high. The "New Statesman" once informed its readers that what the public really needed was "discreetly regulated freedom." Who was to regulate the popular freedom? The idea is the will of the average person and the first feature of any Utopian schemes. By that is meant not that a man should possess land and capital, but that he should very certainly own his furniture and his books and be in control of his method of living.

On the other hand, the remedy for excessive regulation is no more anarchy than vegetarianism is the remedy for excessive beef-eating. The average man distrusts anarchy as much as he distrusts slavery. He knows to a nicety what the public wants. He knows that it wants to spend Sunday as it chooses, and not as Cadbury chooses. It is only a matter of finding the right channels to manage the small details of life as it chooses, and not as Government officials choose. The public will never be attracted by the Collectivist state, unless the Collectivists throw off their disguise of moral superiority and omniscience, and abandon their threats about spies, whether they be German or English. The French educational authorities are just about as sensible as our own. I have taken a young girl from school to help me in the house. "Can you knit?" asked her. "No, madame." "What! Didn't they teach you to knit at school?" "No." "What did you learn?" "Geography . . . Science . . ." She writes a good hand, and, might, no doubt, make a tolerable cook and bottle-washer herself, and, besides, a hopeless celibate. Brass, cold brass from head to foot, and not a drop to melt—volà! my image of a woman in industry. The least tremor in marching down to the factory, and one man into one of the only two states left to the working woman—death by suicide, or prostitution! A nice commentary on our popular education!

The French educational authorities are just about as sensible as our own. I have taken a young girl from school to help me in the house. "Can you knit?" asked her. "No, madame." "What! Didn't they teach you to knit at school?" "No." "What did you learn?" "Geography . . . Science . . ." She writes a good hand, and, might, no doubt, make a tolerable cook and bottle-washer herself, and, besides, a hopeless celibate. Brass, cold brass from head to foot, and not a drop to melt—volà! my image of a woman in industry. The least tremor in marching down to the factory, and one man into one of the only two states left to the working woman—death by suicide, or prostitution! A nice commentary on our popular education!
dressmaking, millinery, cookery, minding of children, governness-ship—no, no; in none of these can a woman hope to reach mental freedom and self-expression. These are all one with the grave and prostitution! I confess to laughter rather than to consternation. The notion of a woman preferring to call herself a cotton operative rather than a cook is simply funny! The notion of a cotton operative feeling mentally superior to any other woman in the world is funny.

But I meant to be quite otherwise than this in the presence of a woman who can assure us that "thought is not a sex function, neither do ideas come from some mysterious inner self in women." I have long believed otherwise. I have sought all ways in vain to find a single idea which women have created. It seemed to me that thought must be a function dependent on possession of the masculine sex. Miss Smith says: "We who have the faculty of thought get our ideas from material conditions."

And since only machine-minding is advanced as conducive to the faculty of thought, we others are left to suppose that material conditions means factory life. It sounds uncommon making it that is! The context of the sentence quoted above rather weakens than strengthens the claim for original thought in women. "When women enter industry and into association with other workers, they get the idea of association." These mysterious inner selves, apparently, are men; and so it would appear that the idea of association is imitated from men who let never be admitted created the idea, but got it somewhere, Lord knows how! "They were not born with it."

I remember reading a posthumous article by Ouida, wherein she examines this meanest of all feminine meannesses—the attempt of certain women to belittle the social creation. She goes back a long way further than the date of the Second Trade Union. She suggests that such women are vain boasters, and, worse, under-miners, and she blushes the blush of the sensible on being involved in the company of the silly. Miss Smith will have to seek further than she seems to fancy before she may produce her evidence for the "faculty of thought" in women. Of course, we all think in a fashion, that is, we can put together two ideas which have been already created. Even the majority of men individually never contribute more to thought than this. But the greatest effort of which rare women have been capable since ever we know about them is to have seen a vision of the wonder of thought as rare thinkers and poets see a vision of the wonder of perfection. When men shall possess an organ of perfection women may possess an organ of thought, but hardly before this.

And what is there to worry about, even if worrying were of any avail? If women, so far, and at their greatest, have only been able to put ideas together with such result as leads them into a factory, we must surely expect to have to wait a little while before the mental freedom we acquire there shall produce in us an organ of creative thought. No, really, we had much better begin to use the ideas which are "in the air," as Lord Rosher would say, not for making pretty academic cakes, as some learned women do, iced over to hide the stale ingredients, or for menacing men in the industrial world which they are fighting to humanise—but to do the feminine work of the world. But at least we should be spared suicide and prostitution.

There is considerable meaning in Miss Smith's article. But the trend of things industrial indicates that men will, sooner or later, refuse to have women in industry. It is, perhaps, fantastic to imagine the female ring-spinners holding up the cotton industry against the consent of the male-spinners and other men; but let it be imagined; vengeance would be invited, the one and final vengeance of clearing the industry of women. The fact that the workers in the initial process of spinning things can go on regardless is simply that and no more. Cotton in an initial process is not of much use to anybody. It seems likely that the men workers in the final process would have the final word with the owner who, as Miss Smith says, is not in business for the benefit of the workers, and who knows very well whom he can most easily replace. The mere fact that the women in the cotton industry do not blackleg the men does not prove that the women are capable of inventive organisation; it merely proves that they go out with the men and come in with the men.

In any case, it would be no great feather in woman's cap to organise herself into the factory! With the wide world in which to seek a living—and to walk into a factory! You lack something Miss Smith, my friend! P.S.—My gayer readers will not imagine me to be exalting domesticity for its own mere sake!

Letters About Russia.

By C. E. Bechhofer.

Now that I have come back from Russia, I have the opportunity to write the things I wrote when I was there, but which I knew had no chance of reaching their destination. The Censor has even done away with translations from Saltikof and Cheboff, how could I write about the notorious "German Party."

In the dense ignorance of England about Russia (comparable only to that of Russia about England) there have, nevertheless, been hints and suspicions of a separate peace between Russia and Germany. It can no longer be denied that a strong party of its advocates exists in Petrograd, and yet the Russian people regards the war as the great liberation, and is determined to fight it to the end. This extraordinary contradiction is to be understood only by a consideration of existent Russian society. It would be impossible to find a better proof of the difference of origin and ideals between the Russian Government and the Russian people. But in Russia there is a Russian State which can set an example to the world. But at least we should be spared suicide and prostitution.

The Grand-Duke Nicholas is known to have been the head of the reactionaries. The Empress, as all the world has reason to know, is a somewhat shrewish German princess.

The influence of such charlatans as Rasputin over her is an illustration of her character. Of the old Dowager-Empress it seems now unnecessary to speak; her public activities seem to have ended with her famous warning to her son in 1905, that it was his duty to leave the country to his son in the same condition as he had received it from his father. But of these August personages we may simply recall the contemptuous remark of Witte the Freemason, who endeavoured to establish a Russian Republic under German influence: "Whoever are they! They have read nothing." The people surrounding the Emperor and Empress are those with whom we are concerned. Of Rasputin I will write another time, have to deal with direct policy can be said to have originated with him.

The Grand-Duke Nicholas is known to have been the head of the reactionaries, the Black Hundred, in 1905.
The Russian Government of that period, that is to say, the Tsar's Court, had the largest influence in the country. That he is a patriotic Russian is not in doubt. His father's reputation was blackened by a hesitation to march on Constantinople in 1878, and it has been the life-task of the Grand Duke Nicholas the Younger to re-establish the good name of the Grand Duke Nicholas the Elder. We must call the "patriotic actionaries!" The recent sudden and astounding exile of the Grand Duke from the command of the armies to the Viceroyalty of the Caucasus filled the Russian people with horror. It is quite possible that the great new popularity of the Grand Duke (despite his not very successful generalship) frightened the Tsar and his circle into this plan of disgracing a possible rival to the Throne, but this is the explanation of a minority. The majority believed that the Grand Duke had been cleared out of the way by the "German party" as an awkward obstacle to a separate peace.

It is not difficult to understand the policy and personnel of the German party. The Russian reigning house is German, and so have been the heads of Russian Government for the last two centuries. The one aim of Germany has been to make her huge easy-going idealistic neighbour an economic colony, a dumping-ground, an India. While the autocracy assisted her purpose, she maintained the autocracy, but even intrigued against it in 1905 and ran a Republic in opposition. We hear from friends in Berlin that "the German Government on the Moscow town hall then, "that the money for the disorders is being supplied by France and England." Her only purpose was to keep the Russians ignorant and servile, she did not need the popularity of the Grand Duke (despite his not very successful generalship) frightened the Tsar and his circle into this plan of disgracing a possible rival to the Throne, but this is the explanation of a minority. The majority believed that the Grand Duke had been cleared out of the way by the "German party" as an awkward obstacle to a separate peace.

Is it really possible that the great new popularity of the Grand Duke (despite his not very successful generalship) frightened the Tsar and his circle into this plan of disgracing a possible rival to the Throne, but this is the explanation of a minority. The majority believed that the Grand Duke had been cleared out of the way by the "German party" as an awkward obstacle to a separate peace.
declared that it would take place. A pique arose between the girl and her father. The young man was forbidden the house. Doña Diana was no longer taken into the country, and very rarely to church; with studied care, despiseful fashion, for all was allowed to her, but she was denied her. The latter disguised himself and saw her clandestinely at long intervals. She grew more and more stiff-necked, and refused the most brilliant offers, even one involving a title and a high position at Ferdinand VII's court. All Sevilla talked of the misfortunes of the pair, and of their heroic loyalty. At last Doña Diana's majority drew near; she gave her father to understand that she was about to enjoy the right of disposing of herself. The family, now on the point of surrender, began negotiating for the match. When it was half settled, at an official gathering of the two families, the young man, after six years of constancy, refused to wed Doña Diana.

A quarter of an hour after this announcement, Doña Diana showed no traces of emotion. She had found consolation. Was it that she loved from pique, or that she had a lofty soul, which disdained to reveal its sorrow to the world?

Often passionate love cannot attain happiness save by causing a pique to arise. Then it apparently obtains all that it could ask for, complaints on its part would seem utterly senseless, it cannot confide its grief to anyone. Yet this grief is ever present and ever palpable; the proofs of it are intertwined, if I may so express it, in every flower, in every flutter of the heart, calculated to create delightful illusions. This grief rears its hideous head in the most rapturous moments, as if to deny the lover and make him feel at once that it is a supreme happiness to be loved by the charming and callous creature whom he is clasping to his arms, and that this happiness will never be his. After jealousy, this is perhaps the most cruel affliction.

In a certain great town they still remember a man of gentle and affecionate disposition, filled by a sudden madness of this kind to compass the death of his mistress, who only loved him out of pique against her sister. One evening he induced her to go out on the sea with him in a pretty boat which he had designed himself. When they had gone some way out, he touched a spring, the boat opened and disappeared for ever.

I have seen a man of sixty maintain the most capricious, the most frolicsome, the most fascinating, the most affectionate actresses on the London stage—to wit, Miss Cornel. "What pity—so young!" That day we had just read a play by old Massinger, which ends tragically, but in which the heroine receives with a similar apparent calm the news of her lover's death. I saw the mother shudder, in spite of her pride and her hatred; the father left the room to conceal his joy. In the midst of all this, while the onlookers, quite dumbfounded, were gazing open-eyed at the fool who had told the news, Doña Diana, the only calm person present, went on talking as if nothing had happened. Her mother, somewhat alarmed, afterwards heard her watch her maid, but there seemed to be no change from her normal manner.

Two years later, an exceedingly handsome young man paid court to her. Once more, and for the same reason—because the suitor was not of noble rank—Doña Diana's parents strenuously opposed the marriage. She

* Since, out of envy, they act as censors towards each other in all that concerns love, there is less love in the country, and more loose living. Italy is more fortunate in this respect.

† [Pablo Morillo commanded the force sent out by Spain in 1815 to South America, and won some initial successes, but in 1820 was forced by Bolivar to conclude a truce, and returned to Spain.—TRANSLATOR'S NOTE]
themselves of their wife's affections for years to come by taking a mistress two months after marriage. Thus they inoculate the habit of thinking of one man only, and finally taste the bitter experience of the habit that is called fidelity.

If at Louis XV's court a great lady (Madame de Choiseul) was seen to adore her husband, this was because she seemed to be much interested in her sister, the Duchesse de Grammont.

The most neglected mistress, as soon as she shows us that she adores another man, robs us of our rest, and arouses in our hearts what to all appearances is passion.

The courage of the Italian is a fit of anger, the courage of the German a moment of intoxication, the courage of the Spaniard a flash of pride. If there were a nation in which courage was often the result of a pique between the soldiers of each company, between the regiments of each division, a defeat would inevitably be turned into a rout, since there would no longer be any rallying-point. In the case of these vainglorious runaways, to foresee the danger and attempt to remedy it would be the height of absurdity.

"One need only open any account of travels among the savages of North America," says one of the most genial of French philosophers, "in order to learn that the ordinary lot of prisoners of war is not only to be burnt alive and eaten, but to be previously tied to a stake near a burning pile of logs, and thus to be racked for several hours with the most cruel and ingenious tortures that fury can devise. One must read the descriptions of these terrible scenes by travellers who have witnessed the cannibal joy of the onlookers, and above all the frenzy of the women and children, and their abominable delight in ouving another in cruelty. One must see what they add concerning the victim, who not only betrays no sign of pain, but defies his torturers with all that the haughtiest pride, the bitterest irony, the most insolent sarcasm can suggest. He sings of his own exploits, he enumerates the friends and kinsmen of the onlookers whom he has slain, he recounts the agony he has made them suffer, and taunts all around him with cowardice, saint-heartedness and want of skill in torturing; until, as he falls into shreds and, still living, is devoured before his own eyes by his infuriated foes, he uses his last breath of life to hurl out one final insult All this would be beyond the limits of human endurance.

"In the case of these vainglorious runaways, to foresee the danger and attempt to remedy it would be the height of absurdity."

In that case, the spectacle is the highest of passive advantages which both value highly, the other's love must secure; honour must be stimulated; the surgeon must pretend, soothingly at first, then in a galling tone of inconceivable among civilised nations, will seem a fable between him and his tortures, a wager in which he bets certain operations, show nothing but tranquillity and wounded men who, were their mind and their senses in state of soul in the prisoner, which sets up a pique some day he may himself be the hero to whom it is given to dispel some day he may himself be the hero of a similar situation, may be conscious only of the loathness of soul displayed. In that case, the spectacle is the highest of passive pleasures.

CHAPTER XXXIX.

Of Quarrelling in Love.

There are two kinds of quarrels:

(1) Where he who picks the quarrel is in love.
(2) Where he is not.

If one of the two lovers is too superior in the advantages which both value highly, the other's love must inevitably die, for sooner or later the fear of contempt will enter in and cut the crystallisation short.

Nothing is so much detested by mediocre people as mental superiority. In the world of today, this superiority is the real source of hatred, and, if it does not lead to deadly feuds, this is only because the people whom it keeps apart are not obliged to live together. What will be the fate of love, in which, since all is naturalness (especially on the side of the superior partner), the superiority is not masked by any social precaution?

In order that passion may live, the inferior member of the pair must treat the other badly, or else the latter will not be able to shut his window without his partner's taking offence.

As to the superior partner, he deludes himself; not only does the love that he feels run no risk, but almost all the weaknesses he sees in the beloved make her more dear to him.*

Immediately after passionate love, among people of the same intellectual range, we must place, so far as duration is concerned, love interspersed with quarrels, where he who picks the quarrel is not really in love. Instances will be found in the anecdotes concerning the Duchesse de Berri (Duclos' "Mémoires").

This love, sharing as it does the character of those frigid habits which are based upon the egotistic and prosaic side of life, and which are man's inseparable companions till death, is a form of love which will last longer ever than passionate love. But in that case it is no longer love, it is a habit bred by love, and it has nothing of that passion but the memories and the physical pleasure. This habit can only arise in souls of coarse fibre. Every day a little drama is enacted ("Will he hold me?"); a drama which takes complete hold of the imagination, just as in passionate love we require every day a fresh proof of affection. See the anecdotes concerning Madame d'Houdetot and Saint-Lambert (in Marmontel's or Madame d'Epinay's "Mémoires"). I forget which.

It may happen that one's pride refuses to accustom itself to this form of attachment. In that case, after some months of storm, pride kills love. This noble passion, however, offers a long resistance before it gives up the ghost. The little quarrels of a happy love create an illusion for quite a long time in a heart which still loves and sees itself badly treated. A few reconciliations, with caresses, may make the transition more bearable. Under the pretext of some skeleton in the cupboard, some stroke of misfortune, a man is readily forgiven by the woman who loves him; at last, one gets used to being scolded. Apart from passionate love, from gambling, from the possession of power, what other daily occupation is there that proves so interesting as this? If he who picks the quarrel dies, the surviving victim is inconsolable. This principle is the bond that keeps many middle-class marriages together; the scolded party all day long hears talk of that which he loves best.

There is a false variety of the love that is interspersed with quarrels. Chapter XXXIII of this treatise was based on a letter written by a highly intelligent woman."

"Always a little doubt to be dispelled," she writes, "that is what keeps alive the constant thirst of passionate love... Since this love is never entirely without apprehensions, we can never grow weary of its pleasures."  

Among people who are surly or ill-bred, or who have a very headstrong temperament, this little doubt to be set at rest, this touch of fear, are embodied in a quarrel.  

* I write "he" in this passage must be understood as meaning "he or she." There is no intention of conveying that the mental superior is always the male sex. The passage so that "the superior partner" may be either the man or the woman. In French, with its system of concord and of pronouns, this can be done without clumsiness; in English, unfortunately, it cannot. —TRANSLATOR'S NOTE.  

\[\text{Volney, Tableau des Etats-Unis d'Amerique.}\]

\[\text{† One who is accustomed to such a sight, and feels that on one day he may himself be the hero of a similar situation, may be conscious only of the loathness of soul displayed. In that case, the spectacle is the highest of passive pleasures.}\]
Views and Reviews.

Who Killed The International?

These two pamphlets* have the same purpose; they attempt to prove that the collapse of the Socialist International Union at the beginning of the war was due to the perfidy of the German Socialist Party; and they hint at an attempt to revive the International, and to provoke a revolution against the war—in Germany only. It was settled long ago that Germany is wrong in everything; and it is not surprising to discover that we are not asked to attend a trial, but to endorse "a judgment which it may be possible afterwards slightly to modify, but not to rescind." It is admitted by M. Chesnais that "there are many details concerning which we are still without information"; but that is no reason, in these days, for postponing a verdict. Everybody, except the Germans, agrees that Germany is responsible for everything that we all dislike; and if we object to the disruption of the International, we must all agree that the German Socialist Party was responsible for it. That is only fair; we need not blame the noble Belgians and the ideal French for anything when we can, without being contradicted, ascribe everything to the perfidy of the Germans. The discovery of the perfidy of the Germans is the most fortunate discovery of modern times; it enables us to blame them for everything, and to exempt ourselves from the labour of listening to their excuses.

M. Chesnais enters into an elaborate analysis of the leading articles in "Vorwärts," with the intention of showing that the writers did know, up till July 31, 1914, that Germany and Austria were the aggressors. After that date, "the journal of the party alters its tone. . . . It is no longer capable of a spirit of criticism. It no longer seems to cast doubt upon the Kaiser's goodwill towards peace, and it quotes his words." In other words, "Vorwärts" was being very strictly censored. What it ought to have done is quite clear; it ought to have denounced the German Government, called for a general strike, and stopped the mobilisation. That is what the French and Belgian "Internationalists" forgot to do; and their lapse of memory threw all the more responsibility on the German Socialists. The perfidious German Socialists renounced all the "Internationalist" ideas and methods that Hervé had told them, years before, that they did not understand. These Germans, of whom Hervé had said, in 1907, that they had "no conception of revolution," did not revolt; but tamely joined the army and voted the war credits.

But all this is mere melodrama; the fact is that the International was disrupted by the forces of Nationalism. It might announce at Congress after Congress that the proletariat had no country; but the German Socialists had parted company on this point in 1907, and the statement never corresponded with the vital facts of history. The curious thing is that it was the German Socialists, and no others, who proposed to act according to the principles of the International. They sent Müller to Paris to try to secure, so far as was possible, united action by the International Socialist Party with regard to the war credits. He was met with the assertion that "if France were attacked, despite her evident efforts in favour of peace, the Socialists could not refuse war credits in defence of their country." He agreed to that; and yet this is how M. Chesnais sums up the whole incident. "The idea of a common attitude was the product, also, in part, of that Socialist phraseology with which the German Socialists were accustomed to justify their passivity in their own eyes. . . . The idea of a common attitude corresponded to the theoretical conception of international proletarian solidarity in face of capitalist States, a conception valid only when economic phenomena alone are in question." In short, we are asked to believe that the German Socialist Party destroyed the International by acting according to the principles of the International.

The fact is that the International was a pious fraud. It pretended that the proletariat had no country, that the only enemy was the capitalist class, and that all war was an inevitable accompaniment of capitalism; but it also justified a war of defence. As every party to this war claims to have been attacked, actually or prospectively, this war is a war of defence or prevention, which is only a premature defence. The Internationalists therefore become Nationalists, patriots with a country for which to fight; and all the concerted actions which had been suggested or agreed upon are relegated to the limbo of the things that might have been. The "conception of revolution" was only valid against the capitalist, and the capitalist was apparently as real as a solar myth. "Without a dissentient voice, the Socialists of Belgium rallied to the Government of King Albert for the defence of their country, of civilisation, and of the freedom of the peoples of Europe." So also did the French, and so also did the Germans. The International was dead; its pacifism, like all pacifism that is not suicidal, was only possible in time of peace.

But as both these pamphlets hint at the revival of the International, I suggest that, instead of cursing the German Socialist Party, the writers should devote their efforts to the construction of a real programme for the International. If the international proletarian solidarity is only valid in relation to economic phenomena, I suggest that the International should really devote some attention to economic phenomena. Passing resolutions against "militarism" (whatever that may be) does not seem to me to bring the economic revolution any nearer. The prime defect of the old International was that it dealt with abstractions, and not with realities. It talked of the proletariat; there is no such thing. THE NEW AGE; November 11, 1915. A. E. R.

* "German Socialists and Belgium." By Emile Royer. ([Allen and Unwin. Ed. net.)

* "The Socialist Party in the Reichstag and the Declaration of War." By P. G. La Chesnais. (Fisher Unwin. Ed. net.)
REVIEWS

Sicilian Studies. By the Hon. Alexander Nelson Hood (Duke of Bronté). (George Allen and Unwin, 6s. net.)

Sicily has long been regarded as the land of earthquakes and volcanic eruptions; to those the Hon. A. Nelson Hood adds asphalt, Aschylus, the Mafia, murder, and a couple of brigands. We miss an essay on flea-beds, which are, we believe, the most formidable fauna of the island, veritable man-killers, but with this exception the volume seems to be comprehensive of the various industries of the island. The author conveys a good deal of information concerning local customs by casual allusion; and, on the whole, he presents an idyllic picture. The people are so simple; for example, they prefer settling their own quarrels by sticking a knife between a man's ribs to asking an impartial judge to determine their respective rights. The men only go to church when an earthquake or a volcanic eruption occurs; on the last day of Carnival the family re-unites, and buries all unkindness in a dish of <!-- Image 31x45 to 561x859 -->

The Stones of Sacrifice. By Mona Caird. (Simpkin Marshall, Hamilton, Kent and Co. 6s.)

The chief objection to the "novel of ideas" (apart from its formlessness and lack of interest in human character) was that it was not a novel and expressed no ideas; and, at the best, expressed only ideas. That is comprehensive a condemnation of the novel of ideas as any reader can reasonably expect at the beginning of a review; but Miss Mona Caird presents us with a novel that does not fall entirely within the scope of this condemnation. It is true that her characters are simply pawns in her game, and that her sympathies are always wrong, for the simplicity of the spiritual scientists makes a number of control experiments, so that Sir Robert Baden-Powell is no less conscious of the fact that he is hidden from his readers in the dust of his work. Sir Robert Baden-Powell is, of course, a Druidic altar; and Miss Caird begins with the idea of the law of sacrifice, in that her method of the "control" experiment bears most fruit; for when, according to agreement, the two women who had most clearly defined their principle of action came to compare notes, each said that if she could begin again she would do the same course. It is in the reconciliation of the conflict that the author is really disappointing; she has only a vision of love permeating the whole universe with sympathy and understanding, the colour of compassionate love finally forming the complete circle of Being. But we doubt the final supremacy of any one principle; each hypothesis, all laws are immutable, eternal in duration, and infinite in extension. Where they conflict, the irresistible force meets the immovable mass, and the serenity of the being of God is not disturbed. If Love is a law of the Absolute, so is Sacrifice, so is the Conservation of Energy and of Matter; in fact, all universal laws are equally valid. However, the chief interests of Miss Caird's novel are its relation of the universal law of sacrifice to the social phenomena of to-day, and her shrewd criticism of both the problems and the solutions proposed. In spite of crudities of technique, such as the series of snapshots with which the book opens, and the garrulousness which afflicts her when she has got into her stride, the book is remarkable of modern novels by the range of its subject-matter, the depth of its feeling, and the mystical character of its apprehension. But "canst thou by searching find out God? Canst thou find out the Almighty into perfection? It is as high as heaven; what canst thou do? deeper than hell; what canst thou know?"

Indian Memories. By Sir Robert Baden-Powell. (Jenkins. 12s. 6d. net.)

We cannot forgo the pleasure of agreeing with Sir Robert Baden-Powell's interest in the episode of the boar. These memories, interesting as they are in detail, fail to produce any striking general impression. It would be easy to produce an elaborately detailed theory explaining this failure, to argue that the training of a scout so develops the secretive and deceptive faculties that they operate even when the author attempts the task of expression. Just as we can imagine Sir Robert Baden-Powell passing unseen through a tract of country, so his personality evades recognition in this record of his memories. He tells us that some of the men he has met in the activities of the white man, he sees now nothing but desiccation, says plainly that the white man there seems out of place. "I feel ashamed," he says. "I will close my book of memories. They are to me a summer's day of much sunshine and few clouds. They have value for anybody else. The memories that he recalls might be those of anybody, so lamely are they expressed. He seems to see nothing but what is before his eyes, and to see that only in relation to his purpose. We learn much of the habits of the wild boar, for example, in relation to pig-sticking; but Sir Robert Baden-Powell's interest evaporated at its death. There is a total absence of the contemplative quality, of pure intellectual activity, from these records; the habits, customs, and history of the people among whom he lived evoke only a stray sentence from him; and no understanding. To him, the practical man, everything is functional; such a man is a shikari, another is a bearer, another is a boatman, another a beater, and so on. The religious fanaticism of the Ghazis, for example, is summed up in the fact that it is dangerous to white men. Sir Robert watched their
shadows as they passed him, lest they should turn suddenly and murder him; but their religion awoke no curiosity in him. Even the scenery evoked only an exclamation, but no description either objective or subjective. So, at last, we reach the conclusion that his memories neither illuminate India nor reveal himself; and we are restrained from a sweeping condemnation of the book even as reminiscences only by admiration of the innumerable illustrations made by the author. Sir Robert Baden-Powell's pen is dumb; but his pencil is eloquent of humour, of vigour, and of beauty.

**Trade Unionism without Tears.**

Before Mr. Lloyd set out to take command of Mr. R. H. Tawney, his fellow Socialist and Economist, in one of the Lancashire regiments of the New Armies, he left with the Labour movement a small, red war-baby in the shape of a primer on Trade Unionism. The child will not disgrace the father for, though it is small, it is essentially compact and should do well. Moreover, it is organically sound and will need no fostering in a Socialist creche: indeed it is, I fancy, too robust for the Fabian nursery, which is more likely to prefer the war-offspring of the heroic St. John Ervins, shirker-poems and conscription-clamour in the Sunday papers. And what is your age, O St. John?

Mr. (or is it Temp. Capt.? ) Lloyd has done better than his fellow Fabian. Not only has he gone to the war instead of talking about it; he has also written a book about something that matters, and he has written with care and knowledge. Naturally, there is much condensation and even omission, for to record the history, to describe the present organisation, and even to play in a book which cannot contain much more than fifty thousand words is a formidable task. But the author has faced it courageously and his courage has not been in vain. The beginner in Trade Unionism has now a legitimate excuse for refusing to read the Webbs' gigantic volumes, which are as dull as they are valuable. In the first two chapters Mr. Lloyd gives us "potted history" with considerable skill, though he has perhaps underestimated the importance of the Junta and failed to make as plain as might be the entirely new note struck by the Unionism of 1889. Much of his description of the Trade Union activities and rules as they exist to-day is attractively and thoroughly done, but it would have been instructive to have paid greater attention to Trade Unionism in national and municipal industries. Especially from Mr. Lloyd, who avows himself an unrepentant Collectivist at the close, it would be interesting to hear more, for instance, of the status and claims of Postal Servants. As a student of Trade Unionism he emerges, despite his Collectivism, as an appreciator of direct action and of Industrial Unionism. Nor does he sympathise with Mr. Snowden, for he shows by a striking graphical chart how wage-strikes have coincided with rises in wages: he omits, however, to include a third line which would demonstrate the corresponding rise in prices and the position of real wages and the gain or loss of the working classes. The book should be extremely useful to all who cannot plod through the Webbs' volumes and desire an up-to-date guide to the world of industrial association. It is cheap, short, and informative; and the mark of the Webbs is not so distinct as one might have guessed. Mr. Lloyd has read National Guilds. Who said Zog?

But though Mr. Lloyd is not a Webbite, he is by no means a Guildman. His last chapter, on the future of Trade Unionism, is in the nature of a sympathetic rebuke to rath young men. It is obvious an attempt to smash National Guilds in a few sentences is doomed to failure because National Guilds afford an almost limitless subject with many phases and facets.

Really, Mr. Lloyd should have been content to describe Trade Unionism. Its future, which may possibly be the future of the world's work and therefore of the most vital aspect of civilisation, cannot surely be settled in the closing sentences of a short book. If he wishes to attack the Guilds, let him do it with a separate essay; let him take the matter seriously. I understand that in certain Liberal and Fabian circles to allude to a man as a Guild-Socialist is to place him in the dustbin. From neglect to contempt, and then to patronise! Mr. Lloyd is not so bad as that, but some of his remarks he has helpfully misleading for a chance reader. This, for instance: "The hierarchic structure of the Guild...would, from the producers' standpoint, present many of the same difficulties that we are faced with to-day in Capitalist and Collectivist enterprises..." Guild-Socialism accuses Collectivism of proposing to set up a gigantic servile State; Collectivists may retort that the Guild system would end in a score of little servile States.

Not a word as to the essential fact that Collectivism postulates government official and externally appointed bureaucrats, while the Guilds involve self-government from below and from within. It is, of course, perfectly possible that the members of the Guild may mismanage their own democracy and that the system may play into the hands of village Collectivists: that is the workers' own concern. But Collectivism does not propose to give the workers even a chance to mismanage their own affairs. It ensures servility: the Guilds risk it. That is a vital difference, and is entirely glossed over by Mr. Lloyd, when he refuses to distinguish between internal self-government of a functional association and external control by a territorial body.

Furthermore, any discussion of the Guilds must surely include some treatment of the wage-system. Here, again, either from lack of space or from inability to see the point, Mr. Lloyd quite fails to make good the point that Guild Socialism differs from State Socialism not only in the matter of industrial control, but in the equally vital matter of industrial remuneration. The Guild system, with its purchase of labour for wages and its consequent control of labour by the purchasing community, may perfectly well continue under State Socialism. It need not be possible under the Guilds. State Socialism might abolish the wage-system, but there is no inherent reason why it should, and modern Collectivists seem little disposed to aim at such a goal. The Guild system is based on the abolition of labour-purchase just as much as it is based upon Trade Unionism in method, and one cannot help feeling that Mr. Lloyd ought to have faced the whole problem, funkied the whole problem, or else limited himself to a bare and quite uncritical outline of the proposals made by National Guildsmen.

Small handbooks on big subjects are both popular and useful when well written and well informed. Mr. Lloyd's manual of Trade Unionism can claim to satisfy both demands. But their danger lies in the habit of including snippets of brief criticism which are designed to set up the pros and cons of big systems in a line or two. These criticisms cannot in the nature of things be thorough and cannot be fair. Regarded from this standpoint, Mr. Lloyd's book may be said to fail in the last chapter. Perhaps when he has helped to defeat Germany he will come back and fail to defeat the Guilds. But at this time we demand a book and not a chapter.

**IVOR BROWN.**
Pastiche.
ECHOES OF CROCE.

LUXURY.
The question may be asked, in the name of justice, why there is asparagus for the rich and not for the poor. But we have learnt the value of these attempts to solve the problem that on the one principle of truth (the truth of philosophy) asparagus is neither for the rich nor for the poor, but for those, precisely, to whom circumstances dictate the eating of asparagus.

WAR POETRY.
As such times those who have the name of poets think that the production of patriotic compositions is laid upon them as a duty, as if there could be a duty of perfidiousness or of evoking poetry from the barrenness of the abstract will. We see how the Muse avenges herself. That poetry alone will be truly the poetry of patriotism (for that alone will be truly poetic) to which the name of patriotic cannot properly be applied; or, at least, cannot be applied in advance. For poetry does not arise by the admission of sentiment with the form of verse, nor is there in the poetic world any mingling of ingredients, but only the indivisible simplicity of the poetic fact itself.

METAPHOR.
(See Chapter IX of the Aesthetic.)
The word "metaphorical" is used to mark the supposed resemblance between the aesthetic and the artistic expression; between the so-called "literal" and the non-literal. But this language is confounded, for it speaks as if expression and intention were one and the same, art spoke of the same things, but in different languages. It is not so: science and art speak of different things, and that is why their languages are different. If, then, we wish to mark this difference by the use of the word "metaphorical," let us speak with greater propriety, and say that the poet's vision is metaphorical. The confusion latent in the word then becomes apparent. This is equivalent to saying that the poet sees what he does not see, or that he sees a thing, not as he sees it, but as something else. We should not, therefore, say that the poet speaks as if rocks and winds and seas were alive; but we should rather express ourselves thus: in the poetic world rocks and winds and seas may live.

"Stories have been known to move and trees to speak."

SENTIMENTALISM.
The sentimentalist is the man who, to employ a familiar figure, lights his pipe with bank-notes. We mean by this that he purchases insignificant trifles with the genuine wealth of life. These men, or this element in Man, would cast away, for the momentary attitude of generosity, the means of solid and imperative benefaction: would suffer death or worse for the sake of indulging a proud reticence; or even, we must be permitted to repeat, do the greatest wrong from a sentimental motive. The sentimentalist speaks in the homely phrase, to eat his cake and have it; to enact the ideal part without adapting it to the facts of life. He is like a dramatist who, without making his play, produces his act of laughter in the street and discovers himself in a world to which the ideal correspondences of his play are unknown. Of such a being, when drawn in the heroic lines of art, it will be said that he has at least preserved his ideal. We must reply to this sentiment with the sentiment itself: the poet should create the thing; that is, to create it is an abstraction.

The sentimentalist is the man who, to employ a familiar expression, is a man who, to employ a familiar expression, is an "inartistic liar." Swift's proposal for the prevention of waste. Examples of logical disparagement do not readily suggest themselves; probably because logic affords but a barren field of reference.

THE SPRING.
FROM THE FRENCH OF CHARLES D'ORLEANS.
The Summer's harbingers have come
Her habitation to prepare;
Its hangings are made soft as air
With interwoven pearl and flowers.

Torn hearts by weary waiting days,
Thanks be to God, are whole and fair.
Begone from here, seek other air,
O Winter, stay no longer here.

The season hath its garment doffed
Of wind and chilliness and rain,
And donned the broidery again
Of glittering sunshine, clear and soft.

There is no beast nor bird aloft
But gives its cry or sings this strain:
"The season hath its garment doffed
Of wind and chilliness and rain."

Each fountain, rivulet and stream,
In place of gossamer livery
Beards beads of silvered jewelry,
And apparel new both gleam and luster.

The season both its garb doffed
Of wind and chilliness and rain.

J. ISAACS.

SONNET.
FROM THE SPANISH OF LOP EX D'VEGA (1562-1633).
A sonnet Violaleta bids me write;
Whilom, her wish had echoed in my deed:
'Tis said that sonnets fourteen verses need;
And there go three in joking on my plight.

I methought my rhyme-work had not been so light.
And here within the second set I play.
In the first triplet now I set my feet,
And though it seems I entered on my right
To pass judgment upon a Nero, or discriminate finely
Between shades of delinquency and read his iniquity in the painful smiles of intelligent men.

The clue to the satirical method is to be found in that hierarchy of the Spirit, which is a hierarchy of human activities penetrates and dominates the Economic, as the Logical penetrates and dominates the Esthetic. By this it is meant that on the one hand the world anterior to morality or a world anterior to logic, can there be a purely economic, or a purely aesthetic, fact. The practical realm in general is in a similar relation to the theoretical, by a philosophical abstraction alone can there exist the pure theoretical; nor can any part of a man's activities withdraw themselves from the practical judgment. It is of this fact that the satirist avails himself. To pass judgment upon a moral agent in terms of economic, logic, or aesthetic, is to reduce him implicitly to the inferior grade, and to make as if he had never quitted it. But since this is an impossi-
Current Cant.

"Militarise the country through Socialisation."—Austin Harrison.

"God and the War."—Horatio Bottomley.

"My noble friend, Lord Northcliffe..."—Horatio Bottomley.

"Why God permitted the war."—Rev. R. J. Campbell.

"Has Christianity collapsed?"—Daily Sketch.

"Permanency coal."—Daily Mail.

"Something for nothing."—Financial News.

"Should war widows wear weeds?"—London Opinion.

"The Germans, as we all know, are a very stupid people."—Daily Mail.

"Is God dead?"—Newman Flower.

"I desire to be quite frank with my readers."—Holbrook Blatchford.


"When to kiss."—London Mail.

"She was as white as chalk... and her hands had blood on them... This is a passage from a thrilling war story in the 'London Magazine.'—Daily Express.

"It is due to the fatal blindness of men who do not understand the 'Clarion' that this war has come upon us."—Harrison Bottomley.

"Let Parliament be either dismissed or suspended, or accept on his responsibility, but we beg to express profound regret that it was not the English Consulate (there is one in Kief) that had the best library of this kind. Had Mr. Bechhofer consulted this library he would have written a valuable book on the subject, or to what degree he improved them with the confidence necessary for such disclosures. Possibly the Ukrainian peasants are not such fools as they may appear, they may even have wished to throw dust in the traveller's eye; in any case, it is a notable fact that in many countries the peasants are less keen on politics than the intellectual classes which lead them. Mr. Bechhofer in his book has not even made a mention of those intellectual leaders. His 'one hundred educated people in Kief' seem to be purely imaginary personages. It is some consolation that he coexists with us Ukrainians as a separate nation. I have not yet heard that thoughtful people have from time to time advocated the autonomy of Ireland; but with regard to the question of our right to demand the free use of our language, but for the few words of honour that the 'Clarion' at that time has come upon us."—Horatio Bottomley.

"The city of distrust of those in authority in England is neither national nor religious."—Bishop Frosham.

"We need more capital and more science."—Selfridge and Co.

"The humanity of modern warfare."—David Hannay.

"Grandma will read a Kipling story in Nash's with great interest."—The Nett Sale Magazine.

"The average reviewer of journalism is as keen as anyone in finding new genius."—Herbert Jenkins.

"I don't believe in publishing works always with the sole idea of making profit."—Herbert Jenkins.

"We know that the Archbishop of York has a profound respect for the spirituality of the Kaiser."—Globe.

"Queen Alexander, with her intuition for doing the perfect thing..."—Daily Mirror.

"A strong national life demands cheery and pleasant sniffs... Good art means bad life."—R. H. Buckley.

"Let Parliament be either dismissed or suspended, or accept on his responsibility, but we beg to express profound regret that it was not the English Consulate (there is one in Kief) that had the best library of this kind. Had Mr. Bechhofer consulted this library he would have written a valuable book on the subject, or to what degree he improved them with the confidence necessary for such disclosures. Possibly the Ukrainian peasants are not such fools as they may appear, they may even have wished to throw dust in the traveller's eye; in any case, it is a notable fact that in many countries the peasants are less keen on politics than the intellectual classes which lead them. Mr. Bechhofer in his book has not even made a mention of those intellectual leaders. His 'one hundred educated people in Kief' seem to be purely imaginary personages. It is some consolation that he coexists with us Ukrainians as a separate nation. I have not yet heard that thoughtful people have from time to time advocated the autonomy of Ireland; but with regard to the question of our right to demand the free use of our language, but for the few words of honour that the 'Clarion' at that time has come upon us."—Horatio Bottomley.

"There is a difference in principle between a trade union and a limited company."—Mr. Lough on Second reading of Finance (No. 3) Bill, October 15.

"As far as I know, every one of the great trading concerns has its own union. A large percentage of their men..."—Mr. Lough, ditto.

"Profits are the wages of one class and wages are the dividends of another class."—Mr. Lough, ditto.

"I have my thumb on the pulse of the country."—Lord Northcliffe.

"Will our money hold out?"—Lord Willoughby de Broke.
WOMEN IN INDUSTRY.

Sir,—I was much interested by Miss Alice Smith’s article in your leader last week which seems to me to put admirably the case for the present position of women. Whatever Guildsmen may think desirable as the ultimate position of women, it is clearly the case that if the present position of women is set up on a firm basis, the position of the single man and the married man will be solved.

Firstly, there are a certain number of women, possibly the majority, who prefer to work in the home, but are driven into industry for the sake of freedom or economic dependence. There must be a guild of housewifery, for which these will be trained, and when qualified, the housekeeper will be paid by the Guild and not by the person for whom she works. This will get over the question of economic dependence, and also another difficulty, for which I see no other solution, namely, the difference in the position of the single man and the married man with a family. Guild organisation and training in method and labour saving devices will make house-keeping a worthy profession for any woman, instead of its being, as it is now, done in a way that is harmful to the race as most forms of industrial work.

There remain those that have no taste for work about a house, and that is the proposition that I am mainly discussing. These will presumably have to find some way of making a living, and may take up work under the auspices of various guilds. Many will be in the housecraft guild, in laundry work, cooking, and other branches. Many will be employed in the clothing industry, many in shops, many in branches of work of the public health guild, and many in teaching the use of machinery and teaching science so as to take up agriculture. All these occupations will be found to be fairly popular with women, and are in a way developments of her former domestic pursuits. In most of them the competition with men will not be very serious.

The present position of women is very largely that of unskilled workers in general, and will be solved by the accessibility of training under the guilds. There may be some who have definite tastes for some other branch of work in which they will really compete with men, but I know of none of this is likely to be large, and they will have to be enrolled in the appropriate guilds with the same conditions as men, and probably will have to be trained in the appropriate guilds with the same conditions as men, and probably will have to be trained in the appropriate guilds, and when qualified, the house-keeper will be paid by the Guild and not by the person for whom these will be trained, and when qualified, the house-keeper will be paid by the Guild and not by the person for whom these will be trained, and when qualified, the house-keeper will be paid by the Guild and not by the person for whom these will be trained.

The present problem of women consists of fine ability and achievements in other departments are not mine.
Press Cuttings.

"The modern man of business must be primarily a good fighter; our competitive industrial system involves businessmen in constant commercial warfare with each other, and the struggle between them is daily tending to become more and more relentless. As competition becomes keen, the man who can render a good account of himself in this struggle cannot have the least hesitation in expelling or killing if he can, in the commercial sense, the man or men who are endeavouring to do the same to him. Thus is produced a type which at home is a man who in his business dealings is invincible, courageous, and absolutely without mercy. Among all business men 'woe to the vanquished!' is an accepted motto. No one engaged in commercial warfare expects the least mercy when he goes under; indeed, no one but a fool would show the slightest mercy to a beaten commercial rival, so long, that is, as the latter remains fighting. . . . In the very nature of things the successful man of business is not, and cannot be, merciful in his business dealings. Take, for example, the case of the employer who has a consumptive clerk—inefficient, the bread-winner for a wife, and perhaps three or four children. This is a very common happening. To an employer or a good business manager there goes the desire of dealing with an inefficient clerk, whatever may be the cause of his inefficiency, and that is to get rid of his services. . . . Kindness in business is the exception to the rule; men in the commercial world are the severest in their business dealings. . . . Effort is the dominating note of the life of the modern man of business. Business can nowadays say, 'I am safe from competition. I have a secure and well-established business, and I can, therefore, take my ease.' So long as he remains in business in this age of fierce competition, he knows quelling all that he is never safe from attack, and that however securely established his business may be, it requires ceaseless effort to guard it from the vigilant and merciless rivals. . . . It is necessary for ceaseless effort and ceaseless vigilance which produces the finest business qualities which make men resolute, resourceful, masterful, and, in their business dealings, relentlessly merciless."—"Everybody's Weekly."

"In the Australian Victorian cow country many children are overworked at home, and when they attend school are totally unfit to profit by the instruction. In one particular district, of the thirty-one pupils only two milk cows before going to school—a boy of eight years and a mere baby, milks six cows, and a girl of six, a mere baby, milks five cows before leaving for school. Ten of the pupils rise at daybreak between on an extremely good breakfast and heavy in New South Wales. A State medical officer said he was struck by the feeble mentality and weariness of the pupils. They were evidently starved. They rose at the morning at sunrise, drove in the cows, and assisted in milking. The school is more than two miles from their homes. They are working all morning with milking and finished about dark."—"The Brisbane Worker."

"We need at this moment a spiritual awakening, bidding us all cease our strife for money, for fame, or for power. We need this call to the men in the workshop, but we need it most of all for the men in place and power. Neither Government nor Parliament has so far done much to prove its willingness to sacrifice. They scrumble for titles and for salaries, for place as keenly as ever. Not merely is German militarism on trial. Competitive commercialism has been weighed in the balance and found wanting in the hour of trial and difficulty in every country. . . . The war, as it were, has stripped Germany, and we can soberer than ever before what a mean, sordid kind of life we have been leading."—GEORGE LANSDUBE.

"All who are weary and heavy laden; all who suffer from injustice, all who suffer from the outrages of the existing bourgeois society; all who have in them the soul of the brotherhood, the heart of humanity, look to us, turn hopefully to us, as the only party that can bring rescue and deliverance. And if we, the opponents of this unjust world of violence, succeed in reaching the hand of brotherhood to it, conclude alliances with its representatives, invite our comrades to go hand-in-hand with the enemy whose misdeeds have driven the masses into our camp, what result will it have in our minds? How can the masses longer believe in us? If the men of the clerical party, of the progressive party, and the other boodle party feel that we have joined them in the struggle against Capitalist Society, whose representatives and champions all of these are? What reason have we, then, for existence? It must be that for the hundreds and thousands of the millions that have sought salvation under our banner, it was all a colossal mistake for them to come to us. If we are not different from the others, then we are nothing but a false Messiah, no better than the other false ones!"—WILHELM LIEbknecht.

"At present in the United States and in England the Trade Union movement is weakened by its internal dissensions, its lack of solidarity and of a clear and lofty common ideal. It is by these defects, too, that it is weakened for the purpose of the realisation of the Guild ideal. The first step on the road to Guild Socialism is for the men who organise in trade unions to understand that every union would become 'blackleg-proof' in the widest sense—that is, that it should embrace all workers of every class working in its particular industry. It is clear that a union which has by educational and propaganda work created a corporate spirit that would be as powerful as intelligence and development would necessarily embody a sensitive and efficient internal organisation, and would represent a high state of social conscience. Such a union, the Guildsmen contend, would be fitted to assume the entire control of its industry, and the whole industrial system of England might well be comprised within 150 or 200 such unions. Each of these would have a charter by Parliament, conferring on it the exclusive right to carry on its particular industry—a concession that would be justified, because every worker is included in his or her own guild organisation. The internal structure of the several guilds would, no doubt, receive far more recognition. One thing may, however, be postulated: that an extremely democratic form of government would exist throughout the whole industry. Every guild officer, from a shop foreman to the general manager, would be elected by those over whom he was to exercise authority. The whole of the affairs of a guild would be controlled pretty closely by the members of the guild, whose position is made the conditions of their work would thus be ensured. The value of the corporate spirit that would undoubtedly grow up in such a body can scarcely be too much emphasized. The difference between a worker club and a trade union which has by the present war (a) voluntary, (b) under compulsion, has been shown to be that between 24 and 7. It may be said: of what good is a guild unless there is a guild? For some exist between the work of a free labourer in a guild in which he was a fully enfranchised member and of one driven by compulsion, to labour under the vile conditions of modern capitalism."—LAURENCE WELSH in the "International Socialist Review."