NOTES OF THE WEEK.

Contrary to the prevailing notion, we have always maintained that the chief enemies we have to fear to a conclusive war are our business and financial men. Being for the most part practical men, priding themselves upon their freedom from ideas, they are incapable of realising what else is to be expected of the war than the immediate ruin of Germany's foreign trade. But however it may be for them, for the country at large, for our Allies and for the world in general, Germany's foreign trade was the least of the menaces to the progress of mankind. It was, on the contrary, the Prussian obsession that in these days of internationalism, national trade might be advanced by the aid of aggressive militarism that united civilisation against Prussia; and, by the same reasoning, it is this particular survival from barbarism that must be put an end to if the war is to result in a conclusive peace. Once and for all, and as a first condition of a new era in the world's history, it has to be shown that even under the most apparently favourable circumstances a nation can no longer hope by militarist means to impose its hegemony upon the world. Prussia has had, indeed, every advantage both for challenging this dogma and at the same time for illuminating the fact of its permanent establishment. Save for Prussia it is obvious that the world within the years preceding the war was disposing itself for a century of peace. International trade was increasing by peaceable means, vast schemes of federation were being leisurely prepared, nations were more and more concerning themselves with their domestic and economic affairs as a condition, perhaps, of erecting upon these newly found bases such cultures as history has not seen before. The refusal of Prussia, however, to join in with the common stream was always a cause of apprehension; and, in the end, our apprehensions have been justified. Now, therefore, is the moment to establish the doctrine of a pacific world finally; let us hope, and, in any case, memorably for a century or two. If Prussia, with all her relative as well as absolute advantages, can be demonstrated nevertheless to have failed in the employment of militarist means, the world may surely expect that for many years to come no other nation will attempt to repeat her method. But the demonstration must be made. Before the eyes both of Germany and of the world the proof must be given that militarism is obsolete, and not solely or even mainly because militarism is immoral, but because, no matter at what cost to themselves, the rest of the nations will not submit to it.

From the discussions now going on in the Press and elsewhere among our business men, however, it would seem that this proper conclusion of the war is being by them either underrated for the importance belonging to it, or, perhaps, despised of. On the one hand they have calculated the present economic results from the set-back to German commerce, and have begun to arrive at the conclusion that the handicap to Germany is now sufficient to enable themselves to recover their late leeway. And, on the other hand, they are saying amongst themselves that the war is lasting too long, and shows signs of costing too much. These reflections, it will be seen, imply either that our object in the war is no more than a set-back to German trade, or that any other object is beyond the willingness of business men to pay for it. It is true, no doubt, that the cost will prove to be stupendous. And if, as business men are apt to suppose, the war is for trade, both the loss is men and money may well be out of all proportion to the gain. But if, as the nation believes, the war is for a greater object than trade, what is there to be done but to persist in it even when the trade object has been attained? Moreover, is it so very certain that if Prussian militarism remains unbroken, German trade, however damaged during the war, will not recover more than its old strength in the days to come? While militarism remains a menace, German trade must needs remain a double menace. It follows, therefore, even from their own narrow point of view, that in the long run business men have as much to gain from crushing militarism as has civilisation itself. And as for the length of the war, what is there for business men to complain of in that? To begin with, it has been their own neglect of public affairs that has brought the country to the present pass, for who, if not they, have had the direction of national policy during the nineteenth century? Again, it does not become them of all men to reproach the military General
Staff with incompetence, seeing that in a score of respects their own affairs, in which they have profit as well as honour, are worse managed than the war. Finally, it must be said that for once the nation is disposed to leave them out of account. Cross out as they may that the war is lasting too long, until it is properly concluded we believe the nation will pay small heed to them.

We may be sure, however, that it is not upon humanitarian grounds that our business men are showing an inclination to stop the war. It is not by any means that the war is lasting too long that terrifies them, but the fact that it is costing too much. Whispers of the confiscation of Capital have been heard; there is talk of thousand millions, on which the interest is the trifling loathsome appeals for money now being issued by the whole country. He offers it freely, for his life may be the price of bearing them is not disputed. Does "P. W." really think that the Capitalist classes will readily forgo after the war their former profits in order to pay the war-bill? And wilder doctrines than that Germany likewise is considering her economic future. Ah, then, it may be said, so German business men are also contemplating peace! But the reply is that in such economic proposals as are now being discussed in Germany it is not only peace, but victory, that is assumed. The plans of Herr Naumann, with which in subsequent issues we shall do our best to make our readers familiar, include, among other things, the nationalising a moiety of the capital, as distinct from the gold of profiteers, dunderheaded politicians, a corrupt parliament and the whole crew of bondsmen as pillars of the State, to thimblerig the Trade of Victory. But Victory cannot be won without money and men, and Victory cannot be won without money and men.

To the foregoing reflections disposing business men to wish the war at an end may be added the news that Germany likewise is considering her economic future. Ah, then, it may be said, so German business men are also contemplating peace! But the reply is that in such economic proposals as are now being discussed in Germany it is not only peace, but victory, that is assumed. The plans of Herr Naumann, with which in subsequent issues we shall do our best to make our readers familiar, include, among other things, the nationalising a moiety of the capital, as distinct from the gold of profiteers, dunderheaded politicians, a corrupt parliament and the whole crew of bondsmen as pillars of the State, to thimblerig the Trade of Victory. But Victory cannot be won without money and men, and Victory cannot be won without money and men.
are they likely to be prepared themselves for the economic war of which, with her usual veracity, Germany is giving the world due notice? Let us see. At a meeting last week convened by the London Chamber of Commerce, and presided over by the Lord Mayor, Sir George Pragnell, one of the principal speakers, announced to his fellow-countrymen that what was needed in the new conflict of ideas was not "idealists the essayists," but practical business men. We cannot give Sir George Pragnell credit for intending by "idealists" the schoolmen of a particular metaphysic. No doubt he had in his mind's eye simply men of ideas, and it is these for whom he says he has no use. Sir George Paish, again, in a lecture to the London School of Economics, was at pains to inform intelligence that business could get on best without it. "A clever nation or a clever man," he said, "is a public danger. Our mediocrity is one of the causes of our strength." We have heard it before. In fact, this complacency of stupidity is one of the familiar qualities of English business men. But we have seen no evidence that the nation is the better for it. While, indeed, we had natural advantages and a long start over other nations, mediocrity, and not uncommon cleverness will ruin us. Compare, however, Sir Cecil Brauna's business with the criticisms of the military General Staff passed by these same business men. Of the General Staff of the Army nothing too evil can be said for its lack of intelligence, foresight, and co-operation with men of ideas. Is the General Staff of Industry now to repeat the errors of the General Staff of the Army, and with so much more openness? We imagine that it is.

The sequence from a repudiation of intelligence to a demand for Protection is natural, and, sure enough, the advisory Committee of the Board of Trade (composed wholly of practical business men) have made it. We have not taken the trouble to verify the details, but in sum the result of the Committee's labours was to recommend a tariff on the particular articles manufactured by its own members. Sir Albert Spicer, for instance, is a paper-maker, and served upon the Committee; the Committee import duty of fifteen per cent upon foreign paper. Other members insured their respective interests in the same fashion. This, we suppose, is what may be expected of practical business men, unencumbered by the views of "idealists and essayists." In his opinion, Germany will find it. As well meet the German army with grimaces as German trade with Protection; for, in truth, not only does Germany owe more to Protection than to a military war, but the control of its industry and commerce by the State is a joint partner with Capital and Labour. "The right of the State to share in exceptional profits had," he said, "been accepted; and he did not see why the application of the principle should be confined to war-profits alone. The control by the State of the investment of Capital was a startling innovation, but it was not," he thought, "an unsound principle." We, as our readers know, would go much further. Not only would we have the investment of Capital controlled by the State, but the administration of Capital should be in its hands as sovereign, with due disrespect to Sir George Pragnell, is the idea Utopian. If so phlegmatic an observer as Dr. Shadwell can doubt whether Labour will put up with the hardships inseparable from a trade-war with Germany, we may well believe that such a war without the willing co-operation of Labour will prove as ruinous as the present military war without its help would surely have proved.

Before continuing a subject on which we shall never finish, an illustration of the uselessness of Protection without national organisation may be taken from the recent discussion at the Farmers' Club of the employment of agricultural machinery. For near upon two years now, farmers have had such Protection, owing to the war, as they are never likely to get during peace. Instead of a tariff of fifteen or twenty per cent, upon corn and food-stuffs the tariff our shipping profiteers have instituted to their own custom-profits has been fifty to a hundred per cent. But has this Protection led farmers to better their condition? Has it, as per these, given them a breathing-space in which to reconstruct their obsolete machinery? The general complaint at the Farmers' Club was that in spite of the unparalleled incentives and the extraordinary opportunity, farmers everywhere were clinging to their old methods with all the tenacity of limpets. They would not buy machinery themselves, they would not co-operate with their neighbours to buy it, they would not be told by scientists what to do with their soils and crops, they would not plant their farms and allotments, as at present, might not the same phenomena be looked for from Protection when it is applied to them? Assuredly it might; for, in truth, not only does Germany owe no complaint at the Farmers' Club was that in spite of the familiar qualities of English business men. But we have seen no evidence that the nation is the better for it. While, indeed, we had natural advantages and a long start over other nations, mediocrity, and not uncommon cleverness will ruin us. Compare, however, Sir Cecil Brauna's business with the criticisms of the military General Staff passed by these same business men. Of the General Staff of the Army nothing too evil can be said for its lack of intelligence, foresight, and co-operation with men of ideas. Is the General Staff of Industry now to repeat the errors of the General Staff of the Army, and with so much more openness? We imagine that it is.

The sequence from a repudiation of intelligence to a demand for Protection is natural, and, sure enough, the advisory Committee of the Board of Trade (composed wholly of practical business men) have made it. We have not taken the trouble to verify the details, but in sum the result of the Committee's labours was to recommend a tariff on the particular articles manufactured by its own members. Sir Albert Spicer, for instance, is a paper-maker, and served upon the Committee; the Committee import duty of fifteen per cent upon foreign paper. Other members insured their respective interests in the same fashion. This, we suppose, is what may be expected of practical business men, unencumbered by the views of "idealists and essayists." In his opinion, Germany will find it. As well meet the German army with grimaces as German trade with Protection; for, in truth, not only does Germany owe more to Protection than to a military war, but the control of its industry and commerce by the State is a joint partner with Capital and Labour. "The right of the State to share in exceptional profits had," he said, "been accepted; and he did not see why the application of the principle should be confined to war-profits alone. The control by the State of the investment of Capital was a startling innovation, but it was not," he thought, "an unsound principle." We, as our readers know, would go much further. Not only would we have the investment of Capital controlled by the State, but the administration of Capital should be in its hands as sovereign, with due disrespect to Sir George Pragnell, is the idea Utopian. If so phlegmatic an observer as Dr. Shadwell can doubt whether Labour will put up with the hardships inseparable from a trade-war with Germany, we may well believe that such a war without the willing co-operation of Labour will prove as ruinous as the present military war without its help would surely have proved.

Among the more enlightened comments of recent writers, we have the rare pleasure to quote Dr. Shadwell, who, in the current "Nineteenth Century," deprecates a trade-war with Germany on the ground that "the relations existing between Capital and Labour are not in a state to stand the strain." At the meeting of the Chambers of Commerce to which we have already referred, the Lord Provost of Glasgow and Mr. Neville Chamberlain, the Lord Mayor of Birmingham, both spoke to the same effect. It was desirable, said the former, that representatives of both business men and of Ministers, Lord Milner, again, in a speech at the Leeds University, remarked, that among the effects of the war he looked to see the entry into industry of the State as a joint partner with Capital and Labour. "The right of the State to share in exceptional profits had," he said, "been accepted; and he did not see why the application of the principle should be confined to war-profits alone. The control by the State of the investment of Capital was a startling innovation, but it was not," he thought, "an unsound principle." We, as our readers know, would go much further. Not only would we have the investment of Capital controlled by the State, but the administration of Capital should be in its hands as sovereign, with due disrespect to Sir George Pragnell, is the idea Utopian. If so phlegmatic an observer as Dr. Shadwell can doubt whether Labour will put up with the hardships inseparable from a trade-war with Germany, we may well believe that such a war without the willing co-operation of Labour will prove as ruinous as the present military war without its help would surely have proved.
At different stages in the course of the war I have dealt with the relations existing between the United States and the belligerent Powers. It has never been pretended by anybody that President Wilson's task was or is an easy one; but there is no doubt on one point, namely, that throughout the war we and our partners have consistently tried to defend the principles of international law and have been successful in every case.

In no case have we taken steps, not in accordance with usage, which tended even remotely to endanger human life. Both on land and on sea we have patiently submitted to violations of accepted law, contenting ourselves with a formal protest to neutrals at the time. We have been, however, sowed mines in neutral waters, or seized hostages, ill-treated prisoners, and bombarded open towns, we did not retaliate in kind. It followed that we had every right to expect that neutral nations would show us sympathy, especially in the greatest neutrality of all; the neutral which had laid almost fantastic emphasis on strict adherence to the spirit of international law and of humanity.

Readers of The New Age do not need to be reminded that this sympathy, so far as the United States was concerned, was lacking for many months. The outrages of various kinds committed by the enemy naturally produced a deep impression on the minds of people who have begun to realise what this war means, and to what an extent the Allies are fighting for ideals which the Americans themselves profess to hold.

But, despite the American quarrel with Germany over the question of submarine warfare, it would be useless (as I have often emphasised) for us to overlook the fact that there are disputes outstanding between Mr. Wilson's advisers and ourselves. In the last ten or twelve days the President has delivered a series of addresses in which he has called upon his fellow-counymen to prepare for a dangerous diplomatic situation; a situation which is given to understand, likely to lead to serious military and naval developments. There has been a tendency to assume that the dispute between America and Germany over the submarine question cannot be settled peaceably, and that, in consequence, we may expect to see the assistance of a new Ally. There is little ground for this supposition to be openly expressed. The best we can venture to hope for is—in view of the most recent statements relating to the "Lusitania" case—that the United States may at some time be induced to set her before dealing with us; but it is very doubtful whether any move which the American Government can make now could be of an effective military or naval character. It is proposed to increase the American army to half a million men; and Mr. Wilson, in one of his latest utterances, demands that the American Navy shall become the greatest in the world. Half a million soldiers and the greatest navy in the world—a tall order! We know what it means to try to raise an army, to train it, and to equip it; and American organisation is not of such a nature that the task can be made any easier for the Washington Cabinet. The present naval and military forces at the disposal of the President are, to speak frankly, negligible; they could be used with some pretence to effectiveness only in conjunction with stronger armies. The American navy, assuming the worst, could damage our food supplies very greatly until Japan redressed the balance for as she certainly would. The threat of cutting off our munitions would have less effect now than a year ago. There are, however, other factors to consider.

The United States, acting against Germany, and endeavouring to use her forces alone, could do little. She has no men to spare; her sailors and ships—such as she could spare—are unnecessary in view of our completed naval programme. The United States can render the Allies little aid beyond arranging for banker's credits. Supplies to Germany are already, for the most part, stopped. But if the circumstances were altered, and the United States decided to help Germany, her economic war on us might be of much greater consequence than her military war. Our own Navy could no doubt prevent the United States from trading with Europe, Africa, Asia, and Australia, leaving her only South America. But the total prohibition of trade with England, which would naturally follow any rupture of diplomatic negotiations with us, would have serious consequences. I mention these matters because the one question on which we have never reached an agreement with the United States has once again become pressing and acute. Washington has never admitted the legality of our Order in Council of March 11, on the ground that it included naval operations which took of the nature of a blockade of Germany, though a blockade was not proclaimed. It was not proclaimed because it could not be made "effective," which is simply saying in other words that we could not exercise complete control over the Baltic—at the time it was thought we could do so by means of submarines. American trade was severely hit by the severity of the regulations in the Order in Council; and the only satisfaction which Washington could find was in questioning the legality of the Order.

We on our part have never admitted the illegality of this Order; and in any case there is a considerable difference between the promulgation of an Order in Council, which affects the pockets of neutral traders, and the German order with regard to submarines and their attacks, without warning, on merchant shipping. The fact remains that hundreds of thousands of American exporters blame the Order for their loss of trade, and demand that it shall be cancelled and a regular and "effective" blockade proclaimed, if necessary. With this latter demand it is hardly in our power to comply. In any case such a demand forms what we know so well as a legal quibble. It is nevertheless being made in good faith, and we must reckon with it. We should remember, too, that Mr. Lansing has suggested to the belligerents that merchant ships ought not to be armed—a proposal which might enable the Germans to settle the "Lusitania" question skilfully by saying they thought that the Americans were anxious to end the war.

We have heard a good deal of hyperbolized Americans and pro-Allied Americans: we must not forget that there are many Americans who are just Americans and wish to be let alone. It is, in the circumstances, an inhuman thing to assume that our friends are to be charged with the sympathy which they certainly would. We shall only irritate these people by professing to see in Mr. Wilson's speeches ideas of friendliness which he did not put forward.
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War Notes.

Reasons which are sufficient to make us reject "pacifist philosophy" are not sufficient to make us accept this particular war. The fact, for example, that a high value should be attached to military heroism, has nothing to do with the justification of a particular event in which such heroism may be displayed. This is an absolutely different question.

There are, moreover, at this moment, a class of pacifists who do not accept a "pacifist philosophy," and whose reasons for objecting to this war are based on the nature and causes of this war itself. I was talking recently to a pacifist of this type, who threw a good deal of light—for me, personally, at any rate—on the nature of a certain opposition to the war. He had no objection to killing; and conveyed the impression that he was quite prepared to fight himself in some more "ideal" type of struggle—one with some positive and definite aim—in a war, for example, which would bring about the final disappearance of capitalism. But he was not prepared to fight in this war, which in as far as it was not an entirely unnecessary stupid thing, would bring about no social change at all.

It is not sufficient that you shall merely perceive a possible German hegemony; it is necessary that you shall give force to it, the perception of Progress. By that I do not mean merely that you think that capitalism will ultimately disappear. It is rather, that progress is looked upon as inevitable in this sense—that the evils in the world are due to definite oppressions, and whenever any particular shackles have been removed, the evil it was responsible for has disappeared for ever; for human nature is, on the whole, good, and a harmonious society is thus possible. As long as you hold this conception of the nature of history, you are bound, I think, to find nothing in this war which makes it worth while. But this is a false conception of the character of human activities. What makes the objection possible and gives force to it, is the conception of Progress. By that I do not mean merely that you wish to show a cat its reflection in a mirror. It isn't the "good" here does not interest, its mind is incapable of seeing facts, which would necessitate a change in their opinion, or in some other way, humiliate them. Trying to indicate the consequences of German hegemony to this type of pacifist is like trying to show a cat its reflection in a mirror. It isn't interested, its mind is full of other interests—it smells, for example, Mr. Blatchford.

In approaching this subject (the consequences of German hegemony) I feel at once the presence of certain difficulties. The people one wishes to convince seem instinctively inclined to discount what one says in advance. Before going into any detail, then, it is best to deal with the reasons which prevent due weight being attached to these things.

They seemed to be under the impression that because we are moved by certain impulses of national pride and aggressiveness, and we then desire to find good reasons to justify our attitude. This sycophancy has a good deal of force because it does describe accurately the position of many people. Many people are moved not only by the impulses mentioned above, but by a certain instinct which makes men want life at a higher,
pitch and intensity (the instinct which makes a man seek the excitement to be got from gambling)—and they imagine that war will provide them with this. Under these circumstances we might deceive ourselves; we should tend to think the issues at stake were much more important than we shall think them in peace time. There is, then, something unreal about the justification we give for the war, because our action is really not dependent on the reasons we give.

But, without any undue concert about the matter, I feel convinced that I am, personally, at any rate, free from such influences. I do not say that I was not moved by such impulses at the beginning of the war; but I am writing now at a period when any such bellicose impulses in me, any exuberance in this direction, have been curbed by experience; I don’t think I have an ounce of bellicosity left. I probably have quite as intense a desire for peace as any pacifist. I am fully aware of the wretched life led by those in the trenches—practically a condition of slavery—and would like to see it ended. But I have no disguise reactionary motives. I have no disguised reactionary motives.

There is another way in which such reasons may be misleading. People who can read foreign newspapers, and who take an interest in foreign policy, tend to acquire certain special interests, which they then mistake for the real interests of their country. They propose such solutions for the world in general as might enable them to continue their intellectual pursuits in peace time. This is true that if I read in a newspaper some vainglorious boasting over our coming victory, I should at once feel a very strong revulsion of these impulses of aggressiveness and pride, and a desire to humble at all costs the people who have written these things. I do not say that I am free of such impulses. I can honestly say that my convictions about the consequences of defeat, whether right or wrong, are founded on observation, and not on impulses. The reasons I give are in no sense special pleading. I think they are true, but wish they were not.

There is another way in which such reasons may be misleading. People who can read foreign newspapers, and who take an interest in foreign policy, tend to acquire certain special interests, which they then mistake for the real interests of their country. They propose such solutions for the world in general as might enable them to continue their intellectual pursuits in peace time. This is true that if I read in a newspaper some vainglorious boasting over our coming victory, I should at once feel a very strong revulsion of these impulses of aggressiveness and pride, and a desire to humble at all costs the people who have written these things. I do not say that I am free of such impulses. I can honestly say that my convictions about the consequences of defeat, whether right or wrong, are founded on observation, and not on impulses. The reasons I give are in no sense special pleading. I think they are true, but wish they were not.

(2) There is another way in which such reasons may be misleading. People who can read foreign newspapers, and who take an interest in foreign policy, tend to acquire certain special interests, which they then mistake for the real interests of their country. They propose such solutions for the world in general as might enable them to continue their intellectual pursuits in peace time. This is true that if I read in a newspaper some vainglorious boasting over our coming victory, I should at once feel a very strong revulsion of these impulses of aggressiveness and pride, and a desire to humble at all costs the people who have written these things. I do not say that I am free of such impulses. I can honestly say that my convictions about the consequences of defeat, whether right or wrong, are founded on observation, and not on impulses. The reasons I give are in no sense special pleading. I think they are true, but wish they were not.

The answer I make is the same as in the first case. I am fully aware of the influences of these things on one’s opinion, and I think that I am able to discount their effect on my own mind. The fears I have about German hegemony have nothing whatever to do with the concern of the man interested in foreign policy. The things at issue, it strikes me, which will affect very strongly the life of the ordinary citizen.

(3) This last objection has proved more effective than either of the other two. The usual presentment of the consequences of German hegemony as it might be given, for example, by those who stood behind its natural limitations cordial relations are impossible until the latter shall have cheerfully acknowledged its inferior position. Stripped of all ornament and diplomatic wrappings, the two stand revealed in their naked inequality. It is vanishingly rare that they were cured by experience; I don’t think I have an ounce of bellicosity left. I probably have quite as intense a desire for peace as any pacifist. I am fully aware of the wretched life led by those in the trenches—practically a condition of slavery—and would like to see it ended. But I have no disguise reactionary motives.

Holland and the World War.
By W. de Veen.

(A second letter from the man in Rotterdam to his friend in London.)

VIII.

To W.
London.
Rotterdam, March 28, 1915.

Dear W.—For the last three weeks I have been anxious to go on to making myself as disagreeable as possible to you. But I have not had a spare moment. Now that things have slackened off a bit, let me get at once to business, and invite you first to contemplate this interesting case: a big Power (A) negotiating with a small one (B) about—anything you like to mention.

What strikes me most in the pourparlers is not the actual words exchanged, but the attitudes of the contracting parties: the character expressed in their behaviour towards each other. The patriotism which A. shows a forced modesty of B, speak volumes to us, the onlooker.

No wonder B. is absurdly modest. Between a Great Power in the full enjoyment of its superiority and a small country making itself as disagreeable as possible to you. But I have not had a spare moment. Now that things have slackened off a bit, let me get at once to business, and invite you first to contemplate this interesting case: a big Power (A) negotiating with a small one (B) about—anything you like to mention.

What strikes me most in the pourparlers is not the actual words exchanged, but the attitudes of the contracting parties: the character expressed in their behaviour towards each other. The patriotism which A. shows a forced modesty of B, speak volumes to us, the onlooker.

No wonder B. is absurdly modest. Between a Great Power in the full enjoyment of its superiority and a small country making itself as disagreeable as possible to you. But I have not had a spare moment. Now that things have slackened off a bit, let me get at once to business, and invite you first to contemplate this interesting case: a big Power (A) negotiating with a small one (B) about—anything you like to mention.

What strikes me most in the pourparlers is not the actual words exchanged, but the attitudes of the contracting parties: the character expressed in their behaviour towards each other. The patriotism which A. shows a forced modesty of B, speak volumes to us, the onlooker.
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force being applied. The secret fear at the back even of a Great Power's mind is that some day he too may have to bow the knee to a stronger than himself. This acts as a constant incentive to him at all costs to maintain or increase his present dignities; while the smaller brethren have a craving to expand and to rank equally with full-grown competitors. Great and small, all are driven forward by the wish to secure an uncertain foothold, tightening a feeble grip, retaining what they have won in the face of others' constant attempts to oust them and replace them. It is an endless race they run, and the devil takes the hindmost.

The outlook is very poor for smaller States that Fate, assisted by diplomacy, has brought within the sphere of vital interests of Ambition backed by Power, no matter what the countries' names. No claim from the weaker State upon the strong can ever be admitted. The case of the smaller State is still more desperate when the "irresistible" big brother is seized with the desire to round off frontiers or help home industries by increasing his square acreage. How is the defenceless one to say him nay? The chance that he will get fair treatment or even a hearing—being unable to demand it—is small indeed.

It makes no difference whether the compelling State be Germany or another. The fact that small nations living under the shadow of a stronger are only semi-living under the shadow of a stronger are only semi-living under the shadow of a stronger are only semi-living under the shadow of a stronger is not by any means confined to rulers, Governments or the diplomatic departments of the leading nations, Isolates are no more.

It is an endless race they run, and the devil takes the hindmost.

The truth is terrible, yet undeniable, that when he treats the smaller nations within his reach as helots the German stands on firmer historic ground than do those who are content to abide already entered an ante-room of the temple of perfect brotherhood when the war came and spoilt it all. Impelled by his brutal instinct, his primitive logic, his snobbish contempt for minor values, the Hun has only accentuated the isle of Britain's aims. We are convinced that what is required for defensive purposes alone.
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leading Anglo-Saxon, Power. We are sure that if we joined the Allied forces only for the time being should we be allowed to pose as equals—once the war is over we should be quickly relegated to our position of a negligible quantity again. Even on the peace negotiations we should not exercise the influence demanded by the enormous sacrifices we should have made. Our claims would not be permitted to extend one fraction beyond the restricted limits imposed by the big contracting parties.

Believe me, the recognition of the full rights of a weak State is, under prevalent conditions, exceptional and artificial; whether Europe be at peace or turned into a huge battlefield, a weak State should never be in a more instructive in this respect than the attitude of the Balkan States, who talk openly of the "Big Powers" as if these were the guardians deputed by Providence to look after them.

Conditions of mutual confidence, of better understanding, can only be created by an almost incredible self-abnegation on the part of the more powerful nations. In matters of that Justice which they all pretend to rate so highly, not Might but simply Right should invariably take the earliest place. Much of the enormous capacity of the huge arsenals for the manufacture of engines of destruction should never be allowed to enter into any question of fair play to be accorded either to a humble friend or to a rival. Should, for instance, France and the Republic of Andorra disagree, the question must be solved quite apart from the consideration which is the better able of the two to enforce its standpoint.

Is such a future possible? Theoretically, yes. Why should not the same principle be adopted in international relations as in all civilised countries has long been the rule, as well between individuals as between the citizen and the State? Why should not a weaker State enjoy the same privileges as a strong one? If all the inhabitants of a country, taught to respect each other's persons, irrespective of biceps or of their relative status in the community? Though the comparison does not quite hold good—for in a family there are the parents and in the community there is the law to smooth out inequalities of years, or wealth, or prowess. Between State and State is no such compelling factor.

However, in theory, this vision of yours appears quite feasible. I only ask, How would it work out in practice? How long a life would the principle, Equality for all, enjoy, supposing it were ever instituted? Can you imagine a strong, self-conscious nation setting an example in its own unjust and illegal regulations for securing the public safety and the defence of the realm? No, you don't: and nor do I.

What happened in England a short while ago when the headmaster at that big school Eton preached to his boys to the effect that England must lead the way in international self-sacrifice, and might perhaps begin by handing Gibraltar back to Spain? He was shouted down by his compatriots as a sedulous, dangerous fellow and a traitor to the cause. I am sure many of you are enlightened enough to see that the rest can be understood that the small, weak and helpless States, like the Dutch, may be allowed to exist in peace and work out their own special destiny, each in their own fashion, seems as remote as it has ever been.

In so far I agree with you that the next best thing would be the decisive victory of the Allies. Even then Holland will always be small and insignificant. We Dutch are, unfortunately, dependent on the goodwill of the bigger brothers whether we take sides with or other of them in this frightful war or not. This conclusion you cannot wriggle out of.—Yours, A.
was passed (March, 1915), for the purpose of securing to British subjects coming within the scope of the Regulations the customary right of trial by a civil court with a jury. The issue of Regulation 14 (b) deprived the subject of this right. Parliament specifically conferred upon him three months previously. In a word, the Court practically said that Parliament, having abrogated its own powers of control, leaving the Home Secretary to act as he pleased, had ipso facto abrogated the powers of the Court, to do with, as it pleased, of course, leaving the Executive to judge of the legality or otherwise of its own actions. In defiance of custom and precedent, a British subject may now be imprisoned without trial, solely on the authority of a regulation issued by an uncontrolled member of the Executive. In other words, the Executive is playing the part of King John, whose powers had to be controlled by the Great Charter, forced upon him by the barons.

Let us see now what the text-books and earlier decisions have to tell us. The following excerpts (in some cases abridged and modified) have been chosen from records of cases and various law books of unquestioned authority:

**Habeas Corpus**

In English law is a writ issuing out of one of the superior courts, the body of a prisoner to be brought before the court. There are various forms of this writ, according to the purposes for which it is intended.

The most famous form of the writ is the *habeas corpus ad subjiciendum*—the well-known remedy for the violation of personal liberty. It is addressed to the person to whose custody another is detained, and commands him to bring his prisoner before the court, with a statement of the day and cause of his capture and detention, "ad faciendum, subjiciendum, et remitendum, to do, submit to, and receive whatsoever the court or judges awarding the writ may consider on that behalf." It is described as a high prerogative writ, i.e., it is one of a number of ordinary remedies, such as mandamus, prohibition, and the like, which the courts may grant on proper cause being shown. The writ of habeas corpus issues only after motion before the court or application to a judge, made on a sworn statement of facts setting up at least a probable case of illegal confinement. It is a common-law writ.

"From the earliest records of English law," says Hallam, "no Freeman could be detained in prison except upon a criminal charge or conviction, or for a civil debt. In the former it was always his power to apply to the Court of King's Bench a writ of habeas corpus ad subjiciendum, directed to the person detaining him in custody, by which he was enjoined to bring up the body of the prisoner who was accused of the warrant of commitment, and to judge of its sufficiency and remand the party, admit him to bail, or discharge him, according to the nature of the charge.

The writ issued of right, and could not be refused by the court." Habeas corpus is, in fact, the appropriate instrument for enforcing the law of personal liberty, as declared in the great Charter. It is the check touching liberty imposed but by the lawful judgment of his peers or by the law of the land.

In Darnel's case (3 Car. I, 1627) the judges held that the command of the King was a sufficient answer to a writ of habeas corpus. The House of Commons thereupon passed resolutions to the contrary, and after a conference with the House of Lords, where a measure known as the Petition of Right was passed, which, inter alia, recited that, contrary to the Great Charter and other statutes, divers of the King's subjects had been imprisoned without any cause shown, and when they were brought up on habeas corpus, and no cause was shown other than the special command of the King signified by the Privy Council, were, nevertheless, remanded. They concluded "that no freeman in any such manner is, as before-mentioned, to be imprisoned or detained." In Jenke's case, 1676, the Lord Chancellor (Lord Nottingham), in the face of the King's vacation. Shortly afterwards was passed the famous Habeas Corpus Act (31 Car. I, c. 2), which is sometimes described as a confirm of all not illegal restraint of the writ in Jenke's case, but which, as Hallam shows, was really due to the irregular proceedings of Lord Clarendon. This Act has passed the Lords after many similar measures sent up by the Commons had been rejected.

The Habeas Corpus Act, it will be seen, applies only to the case of persons imprisoned by authority of a court. In times of public danger it has been found necessary to suspend the Habeas Corpus Act by a special statute. This was done in 1817 by the Act empowering the King to secure and detain such persons as his Majesty "shall suspect are conspiring against his person or government." More recently this extreme measure has been judged necessary in the case of Ireland (see 20 Vict. c. 1, continued for a short period by annual Acts; but always followed by Acts of Indemnity).

In the history of constitutional liberty, of which the Great Charter is the expression, the provisions of the Great Charter are of far less importance than its underlying principle. What we to-day consider the great safeguards of Anglo-Saxon liberty are all conspicuously absent from the first of its creative statutes, nor could any of them have been explained in the meaning we give them to the understanding of the men who framed the Charter. Consent to taxation in the modern sense is not there; neither taxation nor consent. Trial by jury is not there in that form of it which became a check on arbitrary power, nor is it referred to at all in the clause which has been said to embody it. Parliamen
t, habeas corpus, bail, the independence of the judiciary, are all of later growth, or existed only in rudimentary form. Nor can the Charter be properly called a contract between king and nation. The idea of the nation, as we now hold it, was still in the future to be called into existence by the circumstances of the next reign. The idea of contract pervades the document, but only as the expression of the always existent contract between the suzerain and his vassals which was the foundation of all feudal law, one of the provisions of our civil liberty, mainly in the interest of individual rights, are plainly present. That private property shall not be taken for public use without just compensation, that cruel and unusual punishments shall not be inflicted, nor excessive fines be imposed, that justice shall be free and fair to all—these may be found almost in modern form.

But it is in none of these directions that the great importance of the document is to be sought. All its specific provisions together, are not so much as the expression of the always existent contract between the suzerain and his vassals which was the foundation of all feudal law, one of the provisions of our civil liberty, mainly in the interest of individual rights, are plainly present. That private property shall not be taken for public use without just compensation, that cruel and unusual punishments shall not be inflicted, nor excessive fines be imposed, that justice shall be free and fair to all—these may be found almost in modern form.

But it is in none of these directions that the great importance of the document is to be sought. All its specific provisions together, are not so much...
can command in the event of war. The difference between the Act and the Royal prerogative is that the former may be exercised, provided that the Defence of the Realm (giving the Government immense powers even after the war) while the extended use of the prerogative comes to an end automatically with the end of the emergency, i.e., with the ending of the war.

Now, though the King, by virtue of his prerogative, and by virtue of it, either by delivering, bail or remanding the prisoner, under penalty of trouble damages forfeitable to the party grieved.

This statute, which is still in force, was intended further to secure the liberty of the subject by regulating the issue of the writ in the particular cases of infringement of the right of personal security. At the hands of the King or of the Privy Council, and was necessitated by the cases of arbitrary imprisonment which were very prevalent at the date of the statute (c. 1675, 52 Eliz. 2, Tit. 1).

The Habeas Corpus Act, 1679, 31 Car. II, c. 2, probably one of the best known, and certainly one of the most valuable of the enactments upon the statute roll, was passed for the better securing the liberty of the subject. This it effected by specifically mentioning the various devices by which the common-law right to the writ had hitherto been evaded, and, in particular, by making the writ readily accessible during the vacation, by obviating the necessity for the issue of an alias and pluries, by imposing penalties for the refusal of the writ and the procedure upon its return.

In the face of such arguments as these, based on the experience of centuries, there are authorities who suggest—privately—that Sir F. E. Smith did not make out an arbitrary imprisonment which were very prevalent at the date of the statute (c. 1675, 52 Eliz. 2, Tit. 1).

The Habeas Corpus Act was another attempt by Parliament to keep intact the old idea of English Government. It is impossible, therefore, to say that in English law the Habeas Corpus Act or any similar guarantees of personal liberty give effect to a principle which is radically different from the spirit of our old Common Law. Blackstone's eighteenth-century definition of law as a classification of rights is hardly adequate to the circumstances. Rights are negative. The old Common Law looked rather to the powers of the subject, which were positive. If we are informed that a subject has rights, we may think of something which may be given or withheld, according to circumstances; but when we are told that he has powers we realise that he has become a political factor. The theory is that a man, a subject, has powers to serve the King; and the Great Charter plus the Habeas Corpus Act guarded these powers from interference even by the King.

This distinction is vital to the whole war; and I hope to have an early opportunity of devoting a special article to an explanation of its far-reaching importance. It is a unique absence of the official privileges which, as I have said, prevail in other countries. The principle acknowledged by the Charter and the Act is the one essential element in our Constitution which we can oppose to the principles which could have a visible, highly organised, and tyrannical State in the world. Examine German law, Roman-Dutch law, and the Code Napoleon itself, which has served as the basis of so many other codes, and you will find nothing like this.

This recognition of the one thing that distinguishes us from the Continental countries against (and with) which we are now fighting.

The Attorney-General will appreciate the distinction.

It may be said without offence that Sir F. E. Smith is relying on a principle which is quite foreign to the spirit of the Act; for the circumstances it was devised to guard against do not, as a rule, arise in calm and untroubled times. Further, the writ of Habeas Corpus cannot possibly do any harm to the interests of the country, since it merely gives the arrested person the right to have his case heard. The Attorney-General argued that there were exceptional cases where the Executive suspects a person and cannot find enough proof to bring him to trial. But in those cases the Royal Prerogative is quite strong enough, for the Executive may suspend the writ in such cases the issue of the writ of Habeas Corpus need not have been interfered with. If one may gather anything from their attitude on such a point, one may regard it as highly probable that Lord Halsbury, Lord Parmoor, and perhaps Lord Loreburn also, would have recommended something more constitutional as well as effective course, viz., that the arrested person should be brought before the judge, and the Executive invited to convince the judge of the bona-fides of the arrest. The Executive could reply—and this, in war time, would be held to be a sufficient answer even to the Habeas Corpus writ—that the person (say) was living in a dangerous area where the military authorities could not allow anybody to reside unless they knew all about him. Any judge would hold such an answer to be adequate, on the assumption that he was convinced that the arrest was bona-fide.

The Attorney-General will appreciate the distinction.
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More Letters to My Nephew.

My Dear George,—The Don Rodriguez duly appeared at his own door, cut and turned out to be a livery cricket. I could see, however, that under the cloak of the farceur is a body trained to endurance and a heart not easily daunted. Intellectually he is a Stoic, even if his habits indicated the gourmet. (The two attitudes are by no means mutually exclusive. A Stoic may be a man of good taste; a man of good taste may be a gourmet.) He belongs to an old and clean-bred Spanish family of large estate. The President of this Sambo republic cut a big slice off their possessions. One of the best introductions to sympathies. The noble President, fearing the verdict, had him shot out of hand, and without further ceremony seized Naboth's vineyard. The Don is a young man. He has patience; he can wait. He will surely remember. Rafael had been detected in the act of taking down a picture. It was a picture of a bust of Voltaire. So, so, so. Our conversation was unrestrained. Undoubtedly, there is an insurrection on the Pacific slope, but it was agreed that it must fail. There is money; there is power; not for liberty but for plunder. And always has been the policy of the President: give me power to do as I please, and I will not use it. Now he has been called for it. But I do not think it will do them any good. He has not enough money, and he has not enough power. He must wait a better chance, he said.

"For the sake of Rodriguez, I hope it will come soon," said Rafael, "but, if successful, how will it mend matters?"

"It will feed revenge," came the simple answer.

That is how things are out here. Politics is a fierce personal struggle. The only known political principle is Liberalism, and its high priest is the President. It is curious that the word "Liberal" has a special connotation in England, where it implies some generous impulse, some social compunction. But elsewhere (perhaps also in England) it is surely the most abominable creed ever devised. If you would be a master-politician, you must thoroughly grasp the inner meaning of the vile thing and realize also that it is the most powerful force in world-politics. As Liberalism is understood out here, it is a combination of anti-clericalism with full liberty to exploit labour. It implies that the Government, backed by the exploder, must leave the exploder alone. It also implies that the exploder must play fair with the Government. The ancient Catholic hegemony of Central America had at least this virtue—would not permit its children to accumulate large profits for anybody save Mother Church. Of course, it did its own spoliation to the glory of God. As bourgeois population and habits grew stronger, it is hardly surprising that a struggle was waged between the Church—mainly guided by Jesuits—and the trading classes for a fairer division of the spoils. Out of that struggle came the independence of the republics (their constitutions models of bourgeois morality), and the final expulsion of the Jesuits and other religious orders. Then followed the reign of the exploiter, who naturally had the Government in his pocket. Every insurrection that followed has been a grab, sometimes successful, at power; not for Liberty but for plunder. And always their watchword was Liberalism.

The story of European Liberalism is in essence similar but necessarily more subtly contrived. It had to give a greater content to the concept of liberty, and it squared the shoddy trade into a profitable, and, in the hands of some statesmen, a mighty force. The very word "Liberal" was Liberalism in its purest form. What you must understand is that, from its earliest days, Liberalism has been impregnated with economic motives. Its doctrine is simply this: that happiness comes through accumulation. When Adam Smith and the Physiocrats were propagandists, any interference by the STATE with money-making was deemed to be unnatural; it was "artificial." The STATE must leave industry alone. Let it stick to its own last—the proper application of force against outside enemies and inside agitators, particularly those who form combinations "in restraint of trade." Possessing the economic power, they naturally had the political power. Need we wonder that they made a Hell of Great Britain?

They did more: they performed a miracle; for they made our people proud of it.

I think I have remarked more than once that economic power dominates political theory and action. But that does not mean that political movements and methods are impotent or futile. If I buy a newspaper and pay an editor to expound my views, it by no means follows that no power inheres in his work and personality. It merely means that I can exercise power over him. In his turn, however, he exercises influence (which is power) over as many faithful readers as are attracted by his skill and persuasion. So it is with politics. The power behind the throne is money; but the power of politics is proved by the fact that Liberalism was able to enslave the population and yet make it proud of its liberty. Liberalism—essentially an economic movement—has commanded the ablest statesmen and politicians during the past century. Just think of them: Peel, Lord John Russell, Cobden, Bright, Gladstone. They were the bell-wothers; they lured the flock to be sheared. Nor were they without their prophets and their sacred writings. Adam Smith, Quesnay, Turgot, Malthus, Ricardo, John Stuart Mill, Bastiat, with his discordant "Harmonies," J. B. Say, Evr Guoyot. Read them all: in their diversity you will find one harmonious strain. "Harmonies in church—to see him—and wondered whether he knew that he, more than any other man, had taught Capitalism how to hitch factory legislation to its own wolf. He taught it that inhuman condition of do not pay; that factory laws and regulations, properly conceived, improved the quality of labour and bound it more securely to the wage-system. All was serene well, so long as you could buy labour at a market price and sell its product at a profit. The rest was leather and parchment, the theme of all the State Socialists from Robertus to Webb. I remember as a young man advocating the eight hours day because a man could produce more in eight hours' intensive work than in nine or ten hours' prolonged work. And I remember Sidney Webb proving to our satisfaction that the Factory Acts were a blessing because they had transformed the shoddy trade into a profitable, and, therefore, a respectable industry. Competitive confusion had given way to regulation. It had become imperative, not in the interests of the workers, but of the profiteers. All the younger fry of economists take this ground. Within the bounds of waggery, State interference is good for the worker and better for the Capitalist. It is merely one aspect of the tendency of high wages. More corn in the belly, more work in the shafts.

But what an ideal! All the sanctities of life, "les longs espoirs et les vastes pensées," reduced to the measure of money and commodities. It is not a political economy. The economists take this view. Where, then, did it take the wrong turning? I believe in its definition and appreciation of "value." Take Adam Smith. Of course, you learnt in the schools his distinction between "value in use" and "value in exchange," afterwards so effectively developed by Marx. In either alternative, value resides in an inanimate thing. Ricardo argued that value is determined by the cost of production. Again, value resides in the thing produced. Marx carried Ricardo's theory a step further. "All value is the product of labour." Again, value is the thing. All the economists are agreed on that point. Granted the
Imagine the heading: 'Death of a Professor from shock on discovering a human political economy.' How did Sismondi apply it?

'By laying great stress on distribution. I daresay his argument is all wrong. He wrote in the early part of last century, you know. But I like him because as an economist and an historian he had compassion for those who suffer from trade crises. The invention of new machinery, the freedom of competition, and all the other stock-in-trade of the Liberals made him furious, because they had no compunction for those who suffered during the transition. To him, political economy, broadly conceived, is a theory of goodwill, and any theory that in the final analysis does not increase the happiness of mankind does not belong to the science at all. Doubtless, he was hopelessly wrong-headed, but I like him for it. His work is full of good things. You know the old argument about the spontaneous re-arrangement of society following increased mechanical production. Sismondi jumps on it with both feet. He flourishes his fist; he shouts in his anger. 'Show more regard for men and less for machinery' is his indignant cry. 'Let us desist from our habit of making abstraction of time and place. Let us take some account of the actual division of labour and the frictions of work and production and consumption. Ah! Then you can't escape after all from an inquiry into the quality of life!'

Being neither a dreamer nor an impossibilist, I recognise that the political economists have done their best with their material. Let me answer their arguments. If you are not a moralist, aren't you? Then why do you call yourselves political economists? Let me tell you that political economy involves morals. If it does not, then you are mere counting-house pen-pushers. But it certainly does involve morals, as I can prove in a trice. Thus, in your various definitions of value, how do you distinguish between slavery and wagery? You tell me it is a purely economic distinction. But how? Greater productivity under wagery. Why, good sirs? The immediate effect of machinery is to throw some of the workers out of employment, to increase the competition of others, and so to lower the wages of all.'

'Of course, he admits that a certain equilibrium is re-established. But, if they are not to suffer, and ex hypothesi, suffering is uneconomic. Then again, he spotted the waste involved. Competition has induced women and children to bear the burden of production instead of adults. Cheapness, in such circumstances, is gained. And moreover nothing enjoyed by the public is more than counterbalanced by the loss of health and vigour of the workers.'

'By the same token, and apart from material results, woman in industry is uneconomic.

'I daresay it is. We insinuatingly hate the idea of our women living bedraggled lives in factories.'

'Thanks for telling me about Sismondi. George Moore showed his intense love for the Irish language by making his nephew learn it. That's the kind of vicarious learning that suits me. I'll make my nephew read Sismondi. But a dreadful doubt oppresses me. These historical writers are nearly all pure impossibilists. Deduction for me! When a man says that his experience leads him to conclude that economic law is meaningless, what harm has he? I suggest we must have the abstract before we can distil the truth.'

'Poor Tony; orthodox and doesn't know it!'

'Perhaps and perhaps not. But, after all, there is more science in the classical than in the social-economic school. I prefer to build on the classical. There is less to reject and a vast deal more can be added. If I were a theologian, I would choose the Catholic and not the Baptist theology. The one may be right in this or that particular, but the other has the broad sweep and encompasses the living issues—such as they are.'

'And the deuce of a lot more inertia.'

'True; that is our problem.'

'I doubt if it is really a problem. Take the commonly accepted emotional Socialist—the ethical stuff. I remember that the Socialists were never tired of proclaiming it to be the very essence of Christianity, and the Church rejected the claim. The Socialists fought their way into a sentimental popularity, and now the Church asserts that it is the one and only Socialist body. In like manner—touch wood!—if you were to go for a holiday of breathing the greatest economic factor, the classical fellows would first laugh at you, and finally assert that you exactly express their sentiments. The fact is that all the inexact sciences are more or less humberg. The wise thing is not to be bulldozed by them.'

Your affectionate Uncle.

ANTHONY FARLEY.
Drama.

By John Francis Hope.

The artistic soul of Manchester has recently been troubled; and its Playgoers’ Club, the keeper of the artistic conscience of the metropolis of the North, tried to offer it some consolation in the form of a symposium. The question which it addressed to those whose opinions it invited was: “What is your opinion, is the best form of Drama for the present time?” and the replies showed a general consensus of opinion in favour of light comedy. This was not the answer that was hoped for, and the secretary darkly reminds us that “Nero fiddled while Rome burned, and that when the Terror was at its worst, at the time of the French Revolution, the theatres and dancing saloons of Paris were in full swing.” I may remark that Boccaccio’s “Decameron” was written during a visitation of the plague; that the so-called Restoration comedy of England developed rapidly after the plague and fire of London. It is a known fact that the gayest and most licentious people are those who live in places which are subject to earthquakes or volcanic eruptions; and generally it would seem to be true that Comedy flourishes in the shadow of Calamity. Did not Byron declare that he laughed because he would not weep; and did he not live and write during what is now regarded as one of the most calamitous periods of European history? What should we do but laugh, we who are spectators of the most stupendous, and what is rapidly becoming the most stupid, conflict in history? “Eat, drink, and be merry, for to-morrow we die” is the complete philosophy of recklessness; and although, thanks to our sumptuary laws, it is difficult to eat and drink, it is comparatively easy to be merry at this moment.

Certainly, there is plenty to laugh at. About a fortnight ago I was invited to the production of a play by a lady named Miss Monica Ewer. The play was entitled: “My Lady Poverty”; and it was a poor play, poorly produced, and poorly acted. But it has been suggested to me that a critic ought to define the significance of a play, so that a play may live after the poverty of which it is the vehicle have been forgotten. Poverty, she sees, is going to be “the thing”; and she sees in the character of the lady, poverty, only found happiness when her wealth was nothing but the clothes she wore (that was more than the clothes she had worn when she was rich). She has set her heart on marrying a rich man, and to teach us to meet it with the spirit of St. Francis. Was not St. Francis the light comedian and social reformer, who refused to believe that a woman, is not shot by her when she casts her off, but at the moment when he is murdering a man. But in spite of these apparent injustices to women, I congratulate Mr. George Porter on having written a very fine melodrama. It is more American than real American melodrama is, and its language is vividly vernacular of the stage; but it affords opportunity for some very fine acting, notably by Miss Madge Titheradge, Mr. H. A. Barlow, Mr. Ambrose Manning, Mr. Charles Glenney, and Mr. Sam Livesey.

But lest it should seem that the stage has become serious for a moment, let me hasten to add that even the Stage Society offered a very light comedy as a foil to Mr. Sturge Moore’s tragedy. “So Early in the Morning” contained some of the wittiest dialogue that has been heard of late years. The play was a farce, and it invited no moral or political teaching that this teaching should be revived at this moment? Wealth is not money, as the mercantilists thought it was; wealth is not happiness, as the psychological hedonists thought it was; wealth is nothing but wealth, and is not always even that. It is a pillar of cloud by day, it darkens our life by its cares; it is a pillar of fire by night, for then it is that wealth is burned; “Twas mine, ’tis his, and has been slave to thousands.” The girl married £10,000 a year, and a motor-car that sounded like a Ford, because she hated poverty, only found happiness when their wealth was dissipated in speculation, and she and her husband had nothing but the clothes they wore (that was more than the clothes they had worn when they were rich). She has set her heart on marrying a rich man, and to teach us to meet it with the spirit of St. Francis. Was not St. Francis the light comedian who refused to believe that a woman, is not shot by her when she casts her off, but at the moment when he is murdering a man. But in spite of these apparent injustices to women, I congratulate Mr. George Porter on having written a very fine melodrama. It is more American than real American melodrama is, and its language is vividly vernacular of the stage; but it affords opportunity for some very fine acting, notably by Miss Madge Titheradge, Mr. H. A. Barlow, Mr. Ambrose Manning, Mr. Charles Glenney, and Mr. Sam Livesey.

But lest it should seem that the stage has become serious for a moment, let me hasten to add that even the Stage Society offered a very light comedy as a foil to Mr. Sturge Moore’s tragedy. “So Early in the Morning” contained some of the wittiest dialogue that has been heard of late years. The play was a farce, and it invited no moral or political teaching that this teaching should be revived at this moment? Wealth is not money, as the mercantilists thought it was; wealth is not happiness, as the psychological hedonists thought it was; wealth is nothing but wealth, and is not always even that. It is a pillar of cloud by day, it darkens our life by its cares; it is a pillar of fire by night, for then it is that wealth is burned; “Twas mine, ’tis his, and has been slave to thousands.” The girl married £10,000 a year, and a motor-car that sounded like a Ford, because she hated poverty, only found happiness when their wealth was dissipated in speculation, and she and her husband had nothing but the clothes they wore (that was more than the clothes they had worn when they were rich). She has set her heart on marrying a rich man, and to teach us to meet it with the spirit of St. Francis. Was not St. Francis the light comedian who refused to believe that a woman, is not shot by her when she casts her off, but at the moment when he is murdering a man. But in spite of these apparent injustices to women, I congratulate Mr. George Porter on having written a very fine melodrama. It is more American than real American melodrama is, and its language is vividly vernacular of the stage; but it affords opportunity for some very fine acting, notably by Miss Madge Titheradge, Mr. H. A. Barlow, Mr. Ambrose Manning, Mr. Charles Glenney, and Mr. Sam Livesey.

But lest it should seem that the stage has become serious for a moment, let me hasten to add that even the Stage Society offered a very light comedy as a foil to Mr. Sturge Moore’s tragedy. “So Early in the Morning” contained some of the wittiest dialogue that has been heard of late years. The play was a farce, and it invited no moral or political teaching that this teaching should be revived at this moment? Wealth is not money, as the mercantilists thought it was; wealth is not happiness, as the psychological hedonists thought it was; wealth is nothing but wealth, and is not always even that. It is a pillar of cloud by day, it darkens our life by its cares; it is a pillar of fire by night, for then it is that wealth is burned; “Twas mine, ’tis his, and has been slave to thousands.” The girl married £10,000 a year, and a motor-car that sounded like a Ford, because she hated poverty, only found happiness when their wealth was dissipated in speculation, and she and her husband had nothing but the clothes they wore (that was more than the clothes they had worn when they were rich). She has set her heart on marrying a rich man, and to teach us to meet it with the spirit of St. Francis. Was not St. Francis the light comedian who refused to believe that a woman, is not shot by her when she casts her off, but at the moment when he is murdering a man. But in spite of these apparent injustices to women, I congratulate Mr. George Porter on having written a very fine melodrama. It is more American than real American melodrama is, and its language is vividly vernacular of the stage; but it affords opportunity for some very fine acting, notably by Miss Madge Titheradge, Mr. H. A. Barlow, Mr. Ambrose Manning, Mr. Charles Glenney, and Mr. Sam Livesey.

But lest it should seem that the stage has become serious for a moment, let me hasten to add that even the Stage Society offered a very light comedy as a foil to Mr. Sturge Moore’s tragedy. “So Early in the Morning” contained some of the wittiest dialogue that has been heard of late years. The play was a farce, and it invited no moral or political teaching that this teaching should be revived at this moment? Wealth is not money, as the mercantilists thought it was; wealth is not happiness, as the psychological hedonists thought it was; wealth is nothing but wealth, and is not always even that. It is a pillar of cloud by day, it darkens our life by its cares; it is a pillar of fire by night, for then it is that wealth is burned; “Twas mine, ’tis his, and has been slave to thousands.” The girl married £10,000 a year, and a motor-car that sounded like a Ford, because she hated poverty, only found happiness when their wealth was dissipated in speculation, and she and her husband had nothing but the clothes they wore (that was more than the clothes they had worn when they were rich). She has set her heart on marrying a rich man, and to teach us to meet it with the spirit of St. Francis. Was not St. Francis the light comedian who refused to believe that a woman, is not shot by her when she casts her off, but at the moment when he is murdering a man. But in spite of these apparent injustices to women, I congratulate Mr. George Porter on having written a very fine melodrama. It is more American than real American melodrama is, and its language is vividly vernacular of the stage; but it affords opportunity for some very fine acting, notably by Miss Madge Titheradge, Mr. H. A. Barlow, Mr. Ambrose Manning, Mr. Charles Glenney, and Mr. Sam Livesey.
Readers and Writers.

I have many times pointed out that the danger of Ireland, as of other small nations, is provinciality. This is shown in the easy standards of excellence applied by Irish critics to Irish writers living in Ireland. A young Irishman has only to set up as a writer in Dublin to rank immediately as a promising genius; and he has only to emigrate to London to lose immediately his Irish reputation. But I need not say that patriotism of this kind has nothing to do with judgment. An Irishman writing in London may be a good writer; and an Irishman living in Dublin may be a bad writer. One may be the other way round, for there are examples of both. But to inquire of geography as if it were an oracle is superstition disguised as patriotism. These remarks are provoked by the appearance of a new "unique monthly," "The Irishman," which has now appeared as a sixpenny monthly, is a laborious and costly waste. Mr. W. L. Hare, its co-editor (and a disputatious correspondent of The New Age), will, no doubt, reply in the words of the Ephesian silversmith. To borrow a phrase of his, "Honesty is the best policy." Yet he has been so indiscreet as recently to initiate "New Ireland"—not to mention the new monthly "Irish Review"—cover the whole potato-patch.

* * *

It may seem ungracious to continue to discourage the publication of new journals; and, no doubt, their Columbuses will reflect comically upon my motives. For instance, if I say (as I do) that the "Ploughshare" (the organ of the Quaker Socialists), which has now appeared as a sixpenny monthly, is a laborious and costly waste. Mr. W. L. Hare, its co-editor (and a disputatious correspondent of The New Age), will, no doubt, reply in the words of the Ephesian silversmith. To borrow a phrase of his, "Honesty is the best policy." Yet he has been so indiscreet as recently to initiate "New Ireland"—not to mention the new monthly "Irish Review"—cover the whole potato-patch.

* * *

The astonishing thing is that criticism of this primordial slime can exist contemporaneously and in the same language with criticism like, say, Matthew Arnold's. The good does not, that is, supersede the bad; but both may be excellent. As Professor Newman says, "We could not to-day get any winnowing for us; but, as we see daily, stuff is published during the war, and will continue to be published after the war, that contains no grain of wheat, nor even wholesome chaff.

* * *

In making up their Budget for the coming lean years, I ask my readers to examine the carve they attribute to providential Evolution in the selection of the types for survival. There exist at this moment in the literary world examples of every type of organism from the amoeba to man; and the expenditure of the reading public is relatively large. But there is no nation at work in the matter by the expenditure of labor upon their production—but of the rest, nobody, save their authors and publishers, can have any profit. Once more, I know, I expose myself to the words of the Ephesian silversmith. To borrow a phrase of his, "Honesty is the best policy." Yet he has been so indiscreet as recently to initiate "New Ireland"—not to mention the new monthly "Irish Review"—cover the whole potato-patch.

* * *

A correspondent sends me from New Zealand the "Literary Corner" of a leading New Zealand daily, "The Press." It contains an article on a recent local novel contributed by the Hon. Sir R. Stout, K.C.M.G., E.I.D., Chief Justice of New Zealand, and Chancellor of its University—in short, by the representative of culture, I suppose, in all the country. If Irish criticism is provincial, New Zealand criticism must from this example be concluded to be barbarian—for a more absurdous scale of values was never applied to literature. Not only in material things, says Sir R. Stout in his oration, have there been beneficent changes during the last forty years, "but we should realise that in the higher things of life our progress has been great." Examples? The "Spectator" of 1712 was a daily of a single sheet, twelve inches by eight, containing only about 1,500 words and seldom more than a couple of advertisements; whereas to-day—well, Mr. Strachey is in the place of Steele and the rest follows. Again, with Sir R. Stout announced himself as the editor of a Scottish Academy dinner as the real author of "Waverley" such enthusiasm was witnessed as no other dinner has seen the likes of. "We could not to-day get up any such enthusiasm about any novelist; good novels are too numerous."

* * *

Again, when Scott announced himself at the Scottish Exposition in 1851 it was shown in the easy standards of excellence applied by the New Zealand critic as if it were an oracle. Nowadays they pour in thousands from our presses every year. And not only are they more numerous, but, "as a whole, they are finer in every way than the novels of the past centuries. As for drama and poetry, Bridges is as great a monument of human genius as Homer, and Pinero as Aristophanes. At this point my readers will become incredulous; but I have quoted the very words of the New Zealand authority. My own cannot be printed.
I expect, be called upon before very long to make their choice in this matter. The cost of printing and the cost of paper are rising—which is our side of the account; and, at the same time, the cost of living is rising—which is the readers' side of the account. The moment will come when each must decide whether The New Age is to be thrown overboard to lighten the ship—or, if not, what shall be dispensed with instead of it. As for me, I hope, but I do not fear.

R. H. C.

Man and Manners.

AN OCCASIONAL DIARY.

Friday.—"I won't have him swearing at me; I'm damned if I will!" said the sprightly Duchess of Eighty in a play I saw the other week. Chestnut! (Don't mean the Duchess!) Yet how the audience hee-hawed from donkey-stalls upwards! And a critic the next day remarked that the Duchess could say her damn with the best of us. It is to this "best of us" that I object. For the "best of us" do not say "damned" unless we mean exactly "damned." To swear not by meaning but from habit implies a lack of vocabulary and invention, particularly in the matter of the small change of conversation. For the use of swear-words in expressing every-day emotions produces a false emphasis comparable to the bang of a drum in a flute obligato. For a man to swear in women's company is ill-mannered for the same reason that it would be unkindly taste to a soldier to wear his helmet in a drawing-room, or to attend a concert with his sword drawn. Helmeats and swords are for particular emergencies; and so are swear-words. To go about hacking people's feelings with inapprise expletives is only the parallel of doing bodies unwarranted injury. Here, then, comes the reason why women shouldn't swear. (Why do women copy men's vices instead of their virtues?) A swear-word is the equivalent in words of a blow in deeds. There are occasions, no doubt, when it is fitting for a man to swear, just as there are occasions, no doubt, when it is fitting for him to use his fists; but it is never for women to employ these methods of defence. For a woman to swear is to challenge man with his own weapons in her own want of them. She is even more ridiculous a-swearer than a little man without authority employing enormous terms—issuing I O U's of violence that he cannot honour. Epigran-sarcasm—a penetrating truth—manner alone—these, on the other hand, are women's proper means of pointing an argument. In general, swearing indicates a poverty of vocabulary. It is the language of the insider, of the least. But such use of it is to be thrown overboard to lighten the ship—or, at each stage the woman is a lot worse off. Let's suppose that the pleasure in the first instance is equal; when the pleasure has gone out of love, the duty and, still more, the necessity to swear while the pleasure has gone out of work, there is still plenty of satisfaction left. Things, you know, don't lose their temper; you can't hurt their feelings; they don't get jealous; and they shout back with inapprise expletives, the domestic career carries no salary, and even if you can't be dismissed, neither can you give notice. And then you mustn't even grumble about it. Harry can say, "Oh, damn the other!" as one says, "Oh, damn Harry!" But, said I, you're not blaming men for what cannot be helped, are you? Oh, dear me, no, scoffed Joan. But they ought to see the pull they have over us, and make up for it in manners and consideration. Men, you say, are so much better, but what sort of consideration? Well, said Joan, if work is everything to men and love everything to women, they ought to exchange on equal terms. Men, I suppose, get brains out of their work, or they should. Well, why shouldn't they give their brains to work as women are supposed to give them love? But not a bit of it! Men expect women to shower love about as if they were conducting a Christmas tree or running a charity. It is their nature to! But ask a man to dispense his time or his conversation, ask him to explain anything—unless there is the prospect of a flirtation at the end of it—he's simply rude. Look at Harry! I'm to be ready with kiddies and dinner at any moment. I've to be sympathetic about his work and about the work of his friends. My job is sympathy, if you please. But if I go into his study when he's working, or if I expect his friends to talk intelligently to me—wow, wow! Tuesday.—"All that I ever want to do is to be sympathetic and understanding of what he's doing. Why shouldn't he be expected to be understanding of what I'm doing? If they don't, why do they pretend they do? If they do—and men always say they do—why do their ways belittle them? Suppose women stopped talking as soon as a man joined, said, a tea-party, would he feel himself welcomed in the parlour? Yet that is the unhappy experience of the woman who joins a group of men at a café. Silence, awkwardness and neglect. All silent and all damned! For example, the scene at the Café Republique last night when I went in. One man said she didn't know insisted on vigorously shaking hands, while another remained anonymously pawing in the background, like a bear waiting to catch a bun. Of the men she had met before, two didn't judge, and another brought a glass in nearly jumping out of his hand to find a seat for her. For ten minutes no one spoke more than the weather permitted. Then three of the men returned to a formulary philosophical discussion in which they were joined for an hour by a man who had left his woman-companion to explore corners of the café, to reflect, I suppose, on philosophers! Finally, a yobh came churning up like a cattle-boat and anchored himself, without excuse or sign of compunction, between Norah and the man with the glass, she up at that very moment, struggling into speech. Now what does such behaviour indicate—destitution of ideas and indigence of vocabulary—that men cannot initiate and sustain a conversation on subjects and in terms fit for a woman to hear?—that most men's capacity for speech
has never ranged between the shop and the publichouse? It isn’t (Heaven forbid!) that I want men to con-
fuse themselves with Irish poets and the public-
house. As a matter of fact, less a woman understands of a sub-
ject the more shrewd will she be at the implication, by the
simple means of a look, a word, or an illustration, that
she is thought worthy to suffer in the cause of the
discussion on hand. What irritates women is
silence of the feeling of being talked down to by men who
haven’t yet learned to talk up to them.) But, any-
how, a café isn’t a debating hall, nor yet—I have it on
manifest authority—a place to think in, so that high-
falutin discussions must be done in more than fruit.
After all, for thinking purposes, one, if not two’s
company, but three’s certainly none. Thinking
is therefore not for society. The very raison d’être
of a café prohibits its employment for tête-à-tête tech-
analysis. A café is a public drawing-room for the use of
the world at leisure, where, instead of being entertained
by mimes and lecturers, the people themselves are supposed
to provide their own mutual entertainment. The public-
house, England’s greatest social institution, is—was, at
any rate—for men only; the café, on the other hand, is
an epicene institution, wherein the men who talk men’s
shop are not doing their social duty. They are taking
the benefits of society, without paying toll to maintain
it. Their control is no more than their price of ad-
mission. Surely, however, the feminist movement
might have provided us with a real café. Instead, it
has allowed the Café République, the once promising
beginning of the public-house of future society, to be
so mishandled by men that only women of a certain
type can be sure of enjoying themselves there. For
no intelligent woman is going to submit to being treated
like a pack of cards—shuffled and cut, hummed and
hissed over like a doll or a dolt. Neither is a
woman going to a place where the presence of one
proper mannered person puts all the company ill at
understand, his name was not exactly Marlowe—"if
Beresford. "Red nonsense! All the same," said
Marlowe, "if I really dreamed once of a fairy who changed in my arms
from a fly to a living woman.

What?"

"I should add the final clauses to my last will and
testament."

"Confound you, Beresford!"

"As much as you please. But it is uncanny. I be-
lieve in the uncanny!"

"Therefore, I had better make my last will. Per-
fected."

"Oh, it is not so simple as that. If I tell you some-
thing, you won’t think I’m pebbling? . . . I saw
a—a kind of fly, to-day, on the bridge—and it had
only four legs. And it was not hurt! It flew up on the
flag. It was covered with stuff like silk, fine silk. And it had
sparkling teeth. I thanked God. The lady noticed nothing!

"Well . . . Beresford . . . you have seen her!"

"I tell you that I believe in the uncanny. I believe
every word you have told me. These things happen!"

"I’m going below, Beresford. If I don’t come up
for dinner, say—say I’m drunk."

"Don’t be a—a, no, sir, something more likely than
that! Besides, discipline . . .?"

"All right. I’ll turn up. If you were to say that I’m
mad—so long!"

Marlowe went down to his wonderful, monstrous
large and elegant cabin. And sitting on the side of his
bed, robed in his bath-gown, was a lady, as golden
and violet as fabulous Helen.

The effect of violet eyes gazing into black ones is
a trick with the gods and the demons play upon
mortals. True mortal lovers have the same colour of
eyes; and they end their days in love, if not in peace.
The others end in aversion, or in indifference.

"You! What a surprise!" softly exclaimed
the lady—"I’m so hungry!"

Marlowe locked the door; and felt a need to throw off
his jacket and vest. He threw them off. The lady in-
sisted—"I’m so hungry!" Marlowe rang. The lady
hid behind a Crimson curtain. Marlowe knelled
and kissed her shoulder, bath-gown and all. The lady took
his head between her hands—

Rat-tat!

The lady kissed Marlowe, nevertheless. Marlowe
kissed the lady.

Rat-tat!

The lady kissed Marlowe, nevertheless. Marlowe
kissed the lady.

Rat-tat!

The lady . . . nevertheless. Marlowe . . .

"Bring me a whisky and soda and a beef sandwich."

"Y’sir!"

"Whisky and soda and a beef sandwich!" exclaimed
the lady at her ear.

Marlowe . . . The lady . . .

Rat-tat!

The lady covered herself completely with the
curtain. Marlowe unlocked the door. The whisky and soda
and beef sandwiches entered; and someone departed.
The bugle sounded for dinner.

Marlowe put on his coat and vest. "Discipline!" he
whispered.

"Trust me!" returned the lady, diving deep under
the curtain.

Marlowe . . . ! The lady said—"No, no, no, no, no,
Go, and return quickly!"

Marlowe returned ready to expire. The lady . . .

Rat-tat!

"Good-night!" cried Marlowe—"er—oh? —?"

"Good-night, your . . . ss! . . . I’ve never known
him drunk before!"

Now, who could believe that even the most well-
appointed ship’s cabin contained Summer, azure seas,
flowers, skies full of golden rays, vineyards heavy with
grapes, Stars, Moons, and Everything to Eat and
Drink? Well, it was all there in Marlowe’s cabin; or,
least, if it was not really there, nobody noticed. No-
body noticed for ever so long, until, in fact, the watch-bells rang four.

Then never was heard such a long and deep sigh as rent those two loving but ill-regulated bosoms, and touched the cabin of a desert. Neither spoke a word. Each knew what the other was thinking. Their night was almost gone and would never be renewed except by fortune! The sigh broke in two rivers of tears which were no way to be dried up by kisses, and so the two lovers did the next best thing and mopped each other's burning eyes with the sheet while searching under the pillows for handkerchiefs. They gazed, gazed, gazed.

She seemed to say—"You remember our last meeting?"

And he: "But it was all in a dream."

"What is this more than a dream?"

"I hold you."

"I must go away at sunrise. You will believe it again all a dream."

"And you will come no more?"

"Not often enough to weary you, at least."

"Not often enough to content me, even. But you have no mortal will, I know that. You wander here and there, a desire; and I who would keep you forever in my heart—I have no power to do so. One cannot capture for ever the fancy of even a mortal woman. What hope, then, of a fairy's constancy?"

The lady laughed aloud, or almost, and Marlowe smiled.

This burst of mirth was very much out of character, as everyone knows from the poets and Beresford, tragedy and death ought to await the mortal who loves a siren: and here were these two beginning to end by making a comedy of the affair! Marlowe said, nevertheless—"Let me carry you about with me—thus you will remain always with me."

"Gracious, lady! How little is dreamed of in your philosophy! Why, I weigh in my own form at least thirty infamously. Consider! Anything imaginable would seem light to you in comparison with the weight of a desire which you carry about for every moment, minute, and hour of the day. No, no, your daily discipline is a very sensible institution—you must attend to duty and you will be relieved of me. How clever men are in managing themselves!"

"No doubt I shall be glad of something to do all day," returned Marlowe: "but you, my desire, you who have no discipline to distract you?"

"Ah, I have enough to do to preserve myself! If I were seen I should be hunted. Some would hunt me to get possession of me, and the rest to destroy me. And remember that each sundown I am bound to realise on the weight of a desire which you carry about for every second, minute, and hour of the day. No, no, your daily discipline is a very sensible institution—you must attend to duty and you will be relieved of me. How clever men are in managing themselves!"

"You get finally to some very abstract plane of (h), for it is here that the difference between the abstract plane of (h), for it is here that the difference between you really has its root. And it is only on this abstract plane that a discussion on any fundamental divergence of opinion can usefully be carried on."

Any attempt to change (h), however, should be preceded by some account of the nature of such abstract attitudes, and the process by which we come to adopt them.

It is possible to trace, in every man's mind, then, trains leading in various directions, from his detailed ethical and political opinions, back to a few of these central attitudes.

A...... B........ C.................G........(h)

Instead, of the first concrete statement "A is true," we might have "A is good"; in which case (h) would be an ultimate value; the process, however, is the same. Another metaphor, by which we may describe the place of (h) in our thought, is to compare it to the axes, to which we refer the position of a moving point, or the framework, on which A and B are based.

This is, perhaps, a better description, for the framework, inside which we live, is something we take for granted; and in ordinary life we are very seldom conscious of (h). We are only led up to it by this dialectical questioning, described above. All our "principles" are based on some unconscious "framework" of this kind. As a rule, then, we are quite unconscious of (h), we are only conscious of the detailed principles A and B, derived from it. Now while we probably acquire the opinions A and B consciously, the same is not true of (h). How do we come to hold it, then? For we did not produce it ourselves, but derived it ready made from society. It came to be an essential part of our mind without our being conscious of it, because it was already implicit, in all the more detailed opinions, A and B, society forced upon us. It was thus embedded in the actual matter of our thought, and as natural to us as the air; in fact, it is the air that all these more concrete beliefs breathe. We thus have forced upon us, unconsciously, the whole apparatus.
of categories, in terms of which all our thinking must be done. The result of (h) having in this way the character of a category, is that it makes us see (A) not as an opinion, but as a fact. We never see (h) for we see all things through (h).

In this way these abstract categories, of course, limit our thinking; our thought is compelled to move inside certain limits. We find, then, in people whose mental apparatus is based on (h) while ours is not, a certain obstinacy of intellect, a radical opposition, and incapacity to see things which, to us, are simple.

Now the limitation imposed on our thinking by such categories, is the most real limitation, and it is quite legitimate. Some categories are objective. We cannot think of things outside of space and time, and it is quite right that we are subject to this limitation.

But (h) often belongs to the large class of pseudo-categories—categories which are not objective, and it is these that I wish to deal with here. They are exceedingly important, for the difference between the mentality of one great period of history and another really depends on the different pseudo-categories of this kind, which were imposed on every individual of the period, and in terms of which his thinking was consequently done. It is not difficult to find examples of this.

(1) A Brazilian Indian told a missionary that he was a red parrot. The missionary endeavoured to give some explanation of this statement. You mean, he said, that when you die you will become a red parrot, or that the red parrot is in some way related to this bird. The Indian rejected both these plausible attempts to explain away a perfectly simple fact, and repeated quite coldly that he was a red parrot. There would seem to be an impasse here then; the missionary was baffled in the same way as the humanist is, by the conception of sin. The explanation given by Lévy Bruhl, who quotes the story, is that the Indian, has imposed on him by his group a conception of the nature of an object, which differs radically from ours. For him an object can be something else without at the same time ceasing to be itself. The accuracy of this explanation need not detain us. The point is that it serves as an illustration of the way in which minds dominated by different pseudo-categories, may have a very different perception of fact.

(2) Greek. It has been recently argued that the only way to understand early Greek philosophy is to realise that it continued on the plane of speculation the categories, the ways of thinking that had earlier created Greek religion, . . . the conception of Moira, to which even the gods submitted, . . . etc. The difference between the religion attitude and myth is here quite clear. The more intimate connection with dogmas I referred to, depends on the fact that dogma is often a fairly intellectual way of expressing these fundamental categories—the dogma of Original Sin, for example. At the Renaissance, in spite of opinion to the contrary, the philosophy did not express the categories, the ways of thinking which have earlier been expressed in the Christian religion; it reversed them.

It is these categories, these abstract conceptions, which all the individuals of a period have in common, which really serve best to characterise the period. For most of the characteristics of such a period, not only in thought, but in ethics, and through ethics in economics, really depend on these central abstract attitudes. But while people will readily acknowledge that this is true of the Greeks, or of Brazilian Indians, they have considerable difficulty in realising that it is also true of the modern humanist period from the Renaissance to now. The way in which we instinctively judge things we take to be the inevitable way. The pseudo-categories of the humanist attitude are thought to be on the same footing as the objective categories of space and time. It is thought to be impossible for an emancipated man to think sincerely in the categories of the religious attitude.

The reason for this is to be found in the fact noticed earlier in the "Note" that we are, as a rule, unconscious of the very abstract conceptions which underlie our concrete opinions. What Ferrier says of real categories, "Categories may be objectively false and yet be not consciously recognised. First principles of every kind have their influence, and, indeed, operate largely and profoundly long before they come to the surface of human thought, and are articulated and expressed," is true also of these pseudo-categories. We are only conscious of A, B, . . . and very seldom of (h). We do not see that, but other things through it; and, consequently, take what we see for facts, and not for what they are—opinions based on a particular abstract valuation.

This is certainly true of the progressist ideology founded on the conception of man as fundamentally good.

It is this unconsciousness of these central abstract conceptions, leading us to suppose that the judgments of value founded on them are natural and inevitable, which makes it so difficult for anyone in the humanist tradition to look at the religious attitude as anything but a sentimental survival.

But I want to emphasise as clearly as I can, that I attach very little value indeed to the sentiments attaching to the religious attitude. I hold, quite coldly and intellectually as it were, that the way of thinking about the world and man, the conception of sin, and the categories which ultimately make up the religious attitude, are the true categories and the right way of thinking.

I might incidentally note here, that the way in which I have explained the action of the central abstract attitudes and ways of thinking, and the use of the word pseudo-categories, might suggest that I hold relativistic views about their validity. But I don't. I hold the religious conception of ultimate values to be right, the humanist wrong. From the nature of things, these categories are not inevitable, like the categories of time and space, but are equally objective. In speaking of religion, it is to this level of abstraction that I wish to refer. I have none of the feelings of nostalgia, the reverence for tradition, the desire to recapture the sentiment of ancient times that so often attaches to the defenders of religion. All that seems to me to be bosh.

What is important, is what nobody seems to realise—the dogmas like that of Original Sin, which are the closest expression of the categories of the religious attitude. That man is in no sense perfect, but a wretched creature, who can yet apprehend perfection. It is not, then, that I put up with the dogma for the sake of the sentiment, but that I may possibly swallow the sentiment for the sake of the dogma. Very few since the Renaissance have really understood the dogma, certainly very few inside the Churches of recent years. If they appear occasionally even fanatical about the very word of the dogma, that is only a secondary result of belief really grounded on sentiment. Certainly no humanist could understand the dogma. They all chatter about matters which are in comparison with this, quite secondary notions—God, Freedom, and Immortality.

The important thing about all this—which I hope to make clear in coming to deal with its effect on literature—is that this attitude is not merely a contrasting attitude, which I am interested in, as it were, for purpose of symmetry in historical exposition, but a real attitude, perfectly possible for us to-day. To see this is a kind of conversion. It radically alters our physical perception almost; so that the world takes on an entirely different aspect.
THERE can be no doubt that by the time that the Military Service (No. 2) Act becomes operative it will have received the "general consent" of the people of this country. The Labour Party Conference certainly enjoined acquiescence in the operations of the Act, and, undoubtedly, to-sitigate against it will be a criminal offence. Already the police have raided the offices of the Women's Anti-Conscription League, and no one has protested; and by the time that the Act becomes operative we shall all be discussing compulsory saving, or something like that, and resistance to the Act will have no news-value. There will undoubtedly be silence, and as "silence gives consent," Mr. Asquith's pledge will be as literally redeemed as even he could wish. What people are beginning to fear is not the Act, but the exemptions that may be granted; and if the coddling ideas of Lord Derby are adopted, that fear will be well-grounded. Lord Derby has suggested, for example, that a man with a wooden leg should be accepted for clerical work, work which a healthy man could do far better, for how can a man write with a wooden leg? The advantage of a wooden leg is that it can never suffer from chilblains, and obviously its possessor is more fit for the trenches than is a healthy man. Lord Derby's softness of heart would deprive us of the real military advantage of the conscription of cripples.

But if we turn back to history, we find the strongest support for the exemption of the physically fit. It is too often forgotten that the Battle of the Nile and the Battle of Trafalgar were won by pressed crews, crews that contained a large percentage of conscientious objectors and the physically unfit. It is certain that the most enthusiastic, capable, and vigorous sailors could not have won a greater victory than those physical wrecks and psychical nullities achieved at the Battle of Trafalgar; and the fact should make us shirk of these new-fangled theories of efficiency based on physical fitness. It may be true that our armies at the front show cleaner bills of health than have ever been known before; but can they show us a victory equally as decisive as the Battle of Trafalgar? If they cannot, and their military value is, therefore, less than was that of Nelson's pressed crews, it is even being suggested at the present time that neurasthenia should be regarded as a disqualification for service; but Dr. Boris Sidis, in a recent work on psychology, says that "one may well ponder over the significant fact that it is the neurasthenic, the 'psychasthenic,' who is doing the world's work." Victory, it is clear, cannot be obtained by the physically fit.

There is another objection to the use of healthy men in the field; it robs our generals of that fine recklessness which is decisive at the right moment. One remembers that Napoleon lost the Battle of Waterloo because he hesitated to throw good soldiers after bad; it is conceivable that he would have won if, instead of his Old Guard, he had had another swarm of inefficient and incapable soldiers to throw away. We are naturally careful in the use of valuable things, and a general cannot reasonably be expected to achieve the impossible with a perfect army. He must hesitate to throw away good material, and he who hesitates in war has lost. It may fairly be argued that physical disability is the best qualification for military service; take, for example, the question of eyesight. The military custom of blindfolding a man before shooting him indicates the belief that a blind man is obviously not so disabled. Battalions of the blind might be led to the muzzles of machineguns without suffering panic, and no general would hesitate to sacrifice such men to achieve victory. The protests that have recently appeared in the correspondence columns of the "Times" against the enlistment of the feeble-minded, the epileptic, the tuberculous, are really sentimental, "dysgenic," Dr. Saleby's word. If it is sweet and glorious to die for one's country, who are more fit to die than those who are not fit to live? No greater economy could be made in the conduct of the war than the use of men who, in normal times, are a burden to the State, and whose loss we, one would regret.

It may be protested that we cannot achieve our noble, national purposes with the off-scourings of our jails, workhouses, hospitals, and lunatic asylums. But it has already been proved by another writer: in this journal that men are not dignified by what they are, but by what they do: "dignity is based upon labour." The end dignifies the means; and if the end be worthy, shall we condemn the means as ignoble? When Belgium is freed from the invader, shall we denounce the redemption of our national honour if all our consumptives had coughed up their lungs in Flanders? Should we not rather erect a monument over these remains so manifest that not one tuberculous body ever arise from the grave? We should have made war successfully, and relieved civilisation of the contamination of the white scourge, and thus have doubly achieved a noble purpose.

I commend these suggestions particularly to the pacifists. Half their case against war is based upon the tragedy of the destruction of the good, the brave, the beautiful, the physically fit. It is the waste of humanity that they deplore, the turning of constructive purposes of powers that could be utilised in the maintenance and to the greater glory of all that we call civilisation. A war waged by the physically unfit would have all the hygienic value of a spring-cleaning; civilisation would smell the sweeter for every war and would still be glorious with military honours. I feel sure that, at the present moment, the military authorities would not need much pressing to make them adopt the suggestion; I heard only the other day of a doctor passing about a dozen men, only one of whom was physically fit—and he was short-sighted; and no other scheme would pacify the pacifists, or deprive their contention of the support it undoubtedly derives from the tragic incidence of modern war. At one sweep, the economic argument against war would be robbed of its validity, for inducements would have no terrors, for all the sick and cripples in the Army. Some of the greatest triumphs of Science are based upon the utilisation of waste products; and perhaps the greatest possible achievement of Social Science will be the making of war with the waste of civilisation.

It is life that is difficult, death that is easy. It is life that requires health, strength, and intelligence; but any man with heart-disease can drop down dead, and, if my information is correct, many of our conscripts will do so. All that is needed to ameliorate war, or to make it more efficient by the services of a medical corps, would be unnecessary; indeed, from first to last, moribund or dead, such soldiers need suffer only from one disease, malingering, which was cured at the battle off Brest, 1797, with a ratten cane. The threatened shortage of doctors would have no terrors, for all the sick would be disposed of; and if it was a test of the revolutionary zeal of the Marseillais that "they knew how to die," there is no limit to the fighting passion that we might expect from men who do not know how to do anything else. If we could only collect a few men by offering them "disease, and wounds, and deaths," what more fit recruits could we have than those who are already diseased, and crippled? There is only one step for them to take from the ridiculous to the sublime—the goose-step.
I will now proceed to show how this great scheme can be carried out. First of all, no objection will be raised by the women themselves. As a male, it pains me to state that far greater patriotism has been shown during this war by the women than by the men. On the one hand, we have women gladly sending, and if necessary forcing, their husbands and lovers to die in the mud of Flanders; and, on the other hand, only a small number of women actually objecting to even a few women assisting in the workshops and offices. The patriotism of the women who have shown the utmost courage, and who too often take the places of their husbands and brothers, but to take them at a reduced wage, has not been fully recognised, and has been left almost entirely unexploited. Again, while men have reduced their expenditure to the barest minimum, it is women who have raised many of our most important industries to a state of unexampled prosperity. What would have happened to drapers, actors, cinema proprietors, and erotic novelists, if they had relied on the support of men during the last fifteen months? We require such large organs of the Press as the "Mirror," "London Mail," "Home Chat," and "T. E.'s"? It is needless for me to answer these questions; every male is guiltily conscious of the answer.

Now my proposal is, that all this magnificent patriotism, which has been thwarted by masculine selfishness, should be given the fullest scope. All the work of the nation should be carried out by women. We shall then have an Army of at least 20,000,000 men, and even Mr. Garvin will not ask for more. I am aware that some objections will be raised to this scheme, and I intend to deal with them now.

Firstly, it will be objected that women have not been sufficiently trained to carry on many technical occupations. The answer to this is that the men in such trades, before joining the colours, will instruct the women who are to take their places. Women, owing to their superior intelligence, will be able to learn all that is necessary in a few weeks.

Secondly, it will be objected that some work, such as mining, is too heavy and laborious for women. This is a foolish objection, because women used to work in mines and can do so again; and the same applies to all other manual work.

Thirdly, it will be objected that, as all the work of organising and directing industry is carried out by men, there are no women qualified to take their place. This is the most futile objection of all. A woman who has managed a staff of thirty servants, or organised a war factory, will be able to take their place, and the support of men during the last fifteen months? Who will be able to manage a staff of thirty servants, or organise a war factory, will be able to take their place, and the support of men during the last fifteen months? Who has an Army of at least 20,000,000 men? It is needless for me to answer these questions; every male is guiltily conscious of the answer.

Now, the only way we can raise the great number of men needed is for the women to unite. As stated above, the army of women consists of 20,000,000. All the women who have shown the utmost courage, and who too often take the places of their husbands and brothers, but to take them at a reduced wage, has not been fully recognised, and has been left almost entirely unexploited. When the men of this country have resigned their business and affairs into the abler hands of the women, there will only be one thing for them to do: to go out and exterminate the Huns.
Current Cant.

"What is the matter with the English?"—ROBERT BLATCHFORD.

"If this were a woman's war ... each woman would fight like ten."—JESSE FORD.

"Make the darkness profitable."—Proof.

"New men are rising, men of the old Cromwellian stamp."—AUSTIN HARRISON.

"Mr. Wilkie is one of the soundest Labour members in the House."—Daily Mail.

"As a result of the war, Christ is drawing all men unto Him."—Rev. DUMFIES Y. YOUNG.

"It seems that one part of the British working class is not sufficiently penetrated with the gravity of the situation, and failed."—"Everyman."—

"The Voluntary system has undergone its great trial and failed."—"Everyman."

"In T.P.'s Weekly' some years ago Mr. W. L. George gave an interesting account of his beginnings as an author ... he has an intuition to doubt the value of his work if it finds favour."—"Mainly About Books."—

"Kipling shows a national love of Biblical language and it is worth while to observe how he repeatedly goes to Holy Writ for sonorous expressions."—THURSTON HOPKINS.

"There was no lack of thrills from a woman's point of view. The Hon. Mrs. Mackenzie not only wore her wonderful pearls, but also used a film of turquoise, calculated exactly to tone with her sea-green gown. It was one of the most tricksily delightful things I have seen."— "Town Mouse" in "Sunday Pictorial."

"I believe there is not one of us in the British Empire to-day who is not a nobler being—a better man, a better woman—for the chastening of this war. I know I am—and I thank God for it!"—HORATIO BOTTOMLEY.

"I feel that I am the only advertising expert. I have done some of the greatest things in advertising. ... I always feel, when mounted on my serene throne, as the only expert, and when I see lesser men peddling soap, furniture or bicycles, that there are greater things in advertising than have ever yet been attempted."—CHARLES HIGHAM.

"I have a rooted objection to anything and everything in the nature of advertising."—HORATIO BOTTOMLEY.

"The past year has been notable by the tardy recognition of the force of advertising by the British Government in its appeals for men and money. ... I am glad to find that advertising men have already distanced themselves in the new armies."—LORD NORTHCLIFFE.

"Mrs. Adair, the well-known beauty specialist of New Bond Street, relates how she originally discovered the secret of her remedies in the Himalayas from a native priest at the Temple of the Hindoo God, 'Ganesh.' So impressed was she that she adopted the word 'Ganesha' as her trade mark, and brought it back to England, where the efforts she has made to enable ladies to make themselves beautiful are attractively have been crowned with future success."—"The Bystander."

"Be loyal to your country by using Sunlight Soap."—LAVER BROS.

"The versatile Editor of 'John Bull' and foremost publicist of the day—Tribune of the Trenches and idol of the Man-in-the-Street—pays for firmness with neither mercy nor forgiveness, in Britain's terms of peace."—"The Sunday Pictorial."

"There you have it straight and flat. This baser section of the British Empire to-day who is not a nobler being—a better man, a better woman—for the chastening of this war. I know I am—and I thank God for it!"—HORATIO BOTTOMLEY.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

A DANGEROUS PEACE.

SIR,—I have for long perceived (as I have, I suspect, many of your readers) that the really dangerous agitation for an inconclusive and therefore temporary peace would not come not as fools and charlatans pretend—from the professional pacifists, Socialists, or Trade Unionists—but from the viler and more thoroughly worthless section of the Tory Party. And now a clear proof of this comes to hand. The following extract is from last week's issue of the "Bystander," an organ which may be said, without undue offence, to represent this type of Tory:

"Is there nobody that recognises the possibility that this war may have no decisive ending—that as a war between two rival alliances it may end in a draw, and that such an ending may be the best in the long run for the peace and welfare of the whole world?" And, again, "It is good that all nations should win for themselves the right to live in peace and honour, and that is the only really ideal result of this war."

Here you have it straight and flat. This baser section of the exploiting class always has had a strong sympathy with Prussianism, its political methods and its modes of thought. And now that the grim spectre of the Conscripted Wealth is looming large to the naked eye this whole affinity with tyranny and obscurantism is reinforced by sordid greed. These people care nothing for the fact that as certainly as tomorrow the World's war will be followed after a short interval by another war, in which we should have, and should deserve, no allies, and which would inevitably result as a natural consequence of this war of that time they would not doubt have arranged matters satisfactorily with the ruling classes in Germany, and would be looking forward to a continued exploitation of the country in the thoroughly congenial rôle of Kaiser's garrison. They are, it is plain, gathering their forces for an attempt to stampede the country into the peace that they desire; they are numerous, rich, and totally unscrupulous, and if we do not lock out they will put the thing through, especially if the honest pacifists, who are in mind and action as truly Prussian as much as they hate war, are fools enough to play into their hands.

C. W. S.

THE FOREIGN EXCHANGE.

Sir,—I have taken advantage of Mr. Kennedy's offer to communicate direct with him, but would like to ask Mr. Puttick to clear up one point which arises out of his letter, wherein he states definitely that the fall in the German foreign exchanges is attributable to the excessive paper issues, although at the same time he maintains that the "ultimate Government of Germany is this day not affected the matter." He shows that an increase in the amount of money—whether gold, notes, or bank credits—causes a rise in prices, and that the abnormally high prices ruling in Germany and Austria are paper prices, which is undoubtedly true; but when he continues, relating to these paper prices, "but as an inconceivable paper is of little use for foreign payments, the exchange reduces these paper prices to their gold equivalent," this makes the exchange reduce its foreign payments, whilst the American French, and other exchange rates, whilst the American exchange rate is not of use for foreign payments, the exchange reduces these paper prices to their gold equivalent, and this registers the extent of the depreciation of the currency. Then I fear I am lost. I take it that when he speaks of paper prices he means prices of goods measured in terms of notes, but, if so, I would ask whether such notes are ever of use for foreign payments either in war time or in peace; and when he says that the exchange reduces these paper prices to their gold equivalent, surely he is not confusing here in using the word "paper" to include both notes and bills of exchange? An excessive creation of the latter due to trading or financial transactions would undoubtedly lower the value of such bills, but I am not likely to be corrected if I am wrong in suggesting that the creation of bank-notes would have no such effect. The creation of bank credits would double the same effect as the issue of bank-notes, and we have probably created as great an amount of such credits and emergency notes as Germany, and of notes only, and yet our American exchange rate has not fallen to so great an extent as Germany's. If the fall be due to the issue of notes, how do we account for the simultaneous rise in our Russian, French, and other exchange rates, whilst the American have fallen?

F. B. SINCLAIR.

THE DEFORMITY.

Sir,—Has the futility of political Labourism been demonstrated with final precision during the past month? The debate at the Labour Party Conference was not caused so much by moral renegotiation as by the constitu-
As to these guarantees it must be remembered that Belgium broke her's by the fortification of Antwerp, by the maintenance of her neutrality the annexation of the Congo territory; and that not an acre of Belgian soil has been annexed. Whether they really passed on the days given or were ingeniously concocted for publication—it is a question of future happily it will not arise. Correspondence would be addressed in a foreign language—these letters suggest an uncomfortable feeling, on the part of the Peace Commissioners, that Belgium, so far as she can, has endeavoured to keep up to the responsibility she undertook: whether the attempt to stifle what passes for a conscience by the endeavour to blame for her neglect to turn to the shoulders of one—and can only—of her co-signatories is to be commended, is a matter for your readers' decision personally, I feel very strongly that it should not be tolerated.

It is amusing to find in the sentence of letter No. V., commencing "Must I remind you of the scandal of the Flashing forts?" refusal of the insignrant denial given by two other Dutch writers to the statement made in my letters of last autumn, that the Flashing forts were reconstructed in 1913 at the bidding of Germany and in breach of this same treaty.

Mr. Pickthall and Turkey.

SIR,—I can do nothing but accept Mr. Pickthall's apology when he admits that I have demonstrated the fact that he is a poor advocate of a strong case. I will add, however, that in my opinion a strong case is a plausible case, but not necessarily a good case. There is not, in fact, a "good case" for Turkey as compared with that of Russia and the Allies, and the better Mr. Pickthall's advocacy becomes the more plainly shall I be able to demonstrate that his case is really weak.

Howard Ince.

Women in Industry.

SIR,—With your permission I will indulge in a few more "tricks of debate," or "controversial gymnastics," or whatever Miss Alice Smith chooses to term them, and therein, so far as I am concerned, this problem may have a rest.

To Mr. J. F. Horrabin's letter of January 13, the reply is that there will not be a reserve army of men threatening a labour monopoly in the sense that women threaten when used in industry. As has been so often pointed out, industry is a life work to all men; nearly all women it is not, or is not intended to be. If "tall, dark" men were in the habit of bearing children and leaving the factory for home making and home tending, I should suggest that they also should be in the same category as the women. For the rest of Mr. Horrabin's letter, I will leave the Horrabin smartness to play with itself.

To turn now to Miss Smith's letter in your last issue. Having stated her case, having told us why it is, it seems to me that nothing further need be said on either side. She wants all available women in industry with men. She looks like getting them. Being a practical person who keeps theory in its proper place, she wants to drive the workers to desperation so that they will find themselves after the war will cause labour to rid itself of the masses is concerned, will be fulfilled.

To turn now to Miss Smith's letter in your last issue. Having stated her case, having told us why it is, it seems to me that nothing further need be said on either side. She wants all available women in industry with men. She looks like getting them. Being a practical person who keeps theory in its proper place, she wants to drive the workers to desperation so that they will find themselves after the war will cause labour to rid itself of the masses is concerned, will be fulfilled.

A. H. Murray.

LETTERS FROM HOLLAND.

SIR,—The letters—apparently an interminable series—which you are publishing and which purport to have passed between two Dutchmen, contain strong evidence of the increasing determination of the Continental peoples—who either Allied or Neutral—to cast upon Great Britain the blame and discredit for all the mistakes and failures which have hitherto marred the success of the Allies' Campaign. No. VII. states that: "Though Belgium ought not to have been allowed to act on her own, she was determined to maintain her neutrality." She was certainly to blame when at the critical hour the Bill endorsed by her could not be delivered. This the banker of the world is a very serious thing. By the over-quoted Treaty of 1820 England had undertaken to uphold the neutrality of Belgium. England only, if you please, not a word of France, of Russia, of Holland, which were equally committed by their signatures.

The action which is supposed to have been taken under some measure due to the loose wording of the references made by our own politicians to the Treaty of 1820. It might be generally known that Belgium did not guarantee the neutrality of Belgium; on the contrary, she guaranteed her own neutrality, and in return Great Britain, in conjunction with the other Powers, guaranteed to Holland the possession of the territory set out in Articles I, II, and IV.

A. H. Murray.
gramme, her syndicalist ideal should be realised as soon as this petty European war is over.

For my part, I regard all this as pretty certain to lead to trouble which is not in any way unimportant to the Servile State. Being a more impracticable theorist, of course I must be wrong. I will wait and see.

ROWLAND KENNEY.

REIALMS SPIRITUAL AND TEMPORAL.

Sirs,—I am glad to see that "A. E. R.," according to last week’s New Age, is aware of the fact that there are spiritual and temporal realms. That is the first step. I can quote him, I daresay, saying that "A. E. R."

Concerns to Caesar the things that are Caesar’s, and unto God the things that are God’s. I have before now myself been so greatly stimulated by looking into a new subject and by the first realisation of its meaning, that I have too hastily assumed I could pass judgment on it, and that I grasped it better than its votaries. "A. E. R." essay seemed to me extremely pretty good, but it did assume that Christians had never studied the question of the dualism of the universe, and in particular that they had never considered Christ’s teaching.

Now, in the first place, you cannot isolate a prophet’s phrases and be quite sure that the literal is the best interpretation of them. I think some Christians, at least, probably feel that the whole episode of the tribute money was tinged with irony, that the stress was laid not so much on the importance of being quite fair to Caesar, but on the unwise use of money even that even the very act was quite literal, that you had to render to Caesar his utmost due, still "A. E. R." must not joyfully seize that phrase and brandish it lightheartedly in the face of all those who deny the State’s authority over them in other matters. It was precisely Christ’s point that you had not got to defend unto Caesar the things that are God’s, i.e., as "A. E. R." knows, the spiritual things. And the Christian who will not fight but who will pay taxes to a State which is fighting is keeping these things clear. The act of paying money is not in itself an evil thing, though the tax-payer may be sorry the State is charged, that his must always be

In the Thirteenth Century to St. Francis and to the mystic who seized that phrase and brandish it lightheartedly in the face of all those who deny the State’s authority over them in other matters. For it was precisely Christ’s point that you had not got to defend unto Caesar the things that are God’s, i.e., as "A. E. R." knows, the spiritual things. And the Christian who will not fight but who will pay taxes to a State which is fighting is keeping these things clear. The act of paying money is not in itself an evil thing, though the tax-payer may be sorry the State is charged, that his must always be

The fact of Dualism, and that "A. E. R." essay seems to ignore two very important facts to the detriment of an otherwise excellent article. The first is that far more value is attached to Property than Human Life, and, secondly, that the law of love and trouble arises because they

The key to the Christian idea of true Wealth lies in the text, "Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth where moth and rust doth corrupt, and where thieves break in and steal. But lay up for yourselves treasures in Heaven where moth and rust do not corrupt nor thieves break in and steal. For where your heart is there will be also.

Cannot this be taken as a direct exhortation to the Christian to the practice of Non-Resistence? Coupled with a keen sense of wisdom and justice, what could not such men achieve in the way of much-needed Social Reforms, in the twinkling of an eye? I have tried as briefly as possible to show Mr. Dickinson the extreme significance of his omission, and I hope he will see that he cannot hope to convince modern man of the practicability of Christianity, without first divorcing him from the idea that to lose his property is to lose his all.

T. CONSTANTINIDES.
Press Cuttings.

"Among other sacrifices that our organised workers have been called upon to make is that of setting aside the Trade Union rules and regulations in many industries. Conditions which it has taken fifty years to establish have been abrogated. Unskilled workers have been admitted into the workshops to undertake skilled work. Women have taken the places of men in lower wages. And in spite of all the pledges and promises given in the enthusiasm of a national crisis, it will be one of the most difficult tasks to capsize labour in any degree had to be done in order to restore the old position of matters. In many trades, I fear, it will take twenty years' hard fighting to get back to the former level."—ROBERT SMILLE in "T.P.'s Weekly."

"When this war comes to be reviewed in proper perspective its social and economic aspects will be found at least as remarkable as the military events, and perhaps more instructive. And among them the influence of war on industry and the converse influence of industry on war will take a prominent place. We are, indeed, witnessing a phenomenon so extraordinary and unexpected that we can only see its surface as we pass, and are hardly capable of comprehending even that. Never before has the supreme issue of a great war been so fully brought out. . . . War has directly absorbed a far larger proportion of the common energy than ever before, and there seems to be no limit to the former level."—ROBERT STEAD, in the "Edinburgh Review."

"War, for Europe, is meaning devastation and death: for America, a bumper crop of new millionaires and a historic baserment of its industrial revival. The coming of war orders has created more value by five times than the war orders themselves. When the great war began America had about 4,100 millionaires. In the war continues two years more there will be a crop of at least 500 more millionaires. The making of 500 more millionaires is a mere detail compared with the psychological brace which war orders have put into a slack and snail-paced return of prosperity. A grand total of about two billion dollars in war orders is estimated to have been placed in America."—J. G. HUME, in the "American Review."

"After a century and a half of British rule, after our bitter experience with Englishavarice in trade-grabbing and land-grabbing in general, we suddenly point the Canadian graves in Flanders. Surely we are not hypnotised since we pass, and are hardly capable of comprehending even that. Never before has the supreme issue of a great war been so fully brought out. . . . War has directly absorbed a far larger proportion of the common energy than ever before, and there seems to be no limit to the former level."—ROBERT STEAD, in the "Edinburgh Review."

"Nothing can save our society from death except an internal reform so drastic as to deserve the name of a revolution. There are to-day thousands upon thousands of poor men fighting for freedom abroad, who have a right to have their say in any fight for freedom at home. The return of these men will make an entirely new world, a new epoch in English history. It will be an end of what I may call the gentry's monopoly of militarism. There has hung about all our modern industrialism an impression that only a man of the Canadian class could really ride a horse, or know the right end of a gun, or even travel in a foreign country. It will be simply impossible to adopt this one of superiority in men coming with the scars of Landreces and Neuve Chapelle. It is true that their repatriation will probably precipitate an economic crisis in the matter of payment and employment. But, lamentable as this will be, it will be all the more likely to take the shape of a vehement demand for reform. It will be a battle for all of us that there should not be starving men; but it will not be in the rich that they should be starving heroes. . . . If the Trade Unions drop their rules, the employers ought to drop theirs too; they have never seen even an attempt at any rational answer to that."—G. K. CHESTERTON, in the "Sunday Chronicle."

"These dreadful working classes are always giving trouble. They are fearfully suspicious of our patriotic statesmen, and seem to think there is some plot against their liberty. Why they should object to working day and night in order of employment, who are making large fortunes out of the war puzzles a good many people. Apparently the only cure for this kind of insubordination is dismissal. . . . When the beggars in khaki and shanty a few by example is the popular remedy. Wages have risen, but the money earned is being spent, so we are told, on drink, pianos and jewellery. In the old days, according to the financial experts, money spent by the rich on luxuries helped to maintain the poor, but now—well, why should working people indulge in music and other follies? Let them have these things to their betters and get on with their work."—"New Days."

"I have long felt that Labour is not represented properly on the boards of directors of industrial undertakings. (I expect I should be shot for saying this!) Would it not be desirable that workmen who had been four or five years in our employment should be allowed to elect one of their own number as a director on the board, and thus produce the co-ordination and co-operation that were desirable?"—DR. L. E. STEAD, F.R.S., D.Sc.

"A Bold Experiment—Unions as Contractors. . . . The Hon. J. Jensen has decided that for the future alterations to transports will be carried out by the Navy Department. The work was previously done by private firms, but this has been unsatisfactory. Mr. Jensen is now entrusting the work to various Unions, and each foreman appointed is made responsible for the construction work in his branch to the Navy Department, which buys all materials. The Unions select their own foremen. Mr. Jensen says that he realises that the step is a bold one, but he feels sure that now that each Union is responsible for the faithful carrying out of the work entrusted to it, it will endeavour to rise to the occasion. . . ."—"Christchurch News." (New Zealand.)

"Some day, sooner or later, the war will end. It would be a tragedy if we discovered on that day that for want of perspective and sanity of judgment some of the finest things we had been fighting to preserve had suffered irreparable injury. True, if the conflict passes into the stage of an elemental struggle for national preservation these things must be left to the moment, but time must not be lost. . . . The shock of this terrible conflict has stirred the dullest of us, it has created a desire for knowledge and enlightenment among many who have never known it before; and under the stimulus new aspirations and ideals are struggling to light. A nation that has been starved is not going to be content with the unsound basis of a public that has been created for education, and thousands are attending lectures and classes for the first time. This is the experience of educational bodies at work among adults, and witness to the same effect will be borne by extension centres which have been operating during the war, not a few of which will date their revival from this period. . . . Looking at the broader aspects of the question, there is need for all who value education to close their ranks. There may be a battle to fight against the forces of reaction when peace comes. Precisely at that moment the State will require in fullest measure the enlightened intelligence and public spirit of its citizens, and therefore there must be not less but more, not worse but better, means of education secured for the people. . . ."—E. S. CARTWRIGHT, in the "University Extension Bulletin."

"Money by compulsion. . . . We are told that rich folks' purchases of expensive luxuries are in some cases more prodigal than before the war. . . . In the matter of the compulsion of men, and we believe the compulsion of money, the Government totally misunderstands the attitude of the people. . . . Let there be compulsion of money as well as of men."—"Daily Mail."