NOTES OF THE WEEK.

The present House of Commons is never more unanimous than when it is declaring itself indispensable. However the various groups may disagree upon every other matter of importance, they all combine to agree upon the question of keeping themselves where they are. The excuse upon the occasion of the debate last week was the calamity of a General Election in the midst of the war. But we have examined that objection and we know it to be as slight as it is plausible. Many worse things, we maintain, could befal us during war than a General Election; and some of them may well be offered us as an alternative to a General Election during the progress of the war. Are we then from fear of the lesser to choose the contrary, a parliament so elected should, if theory goes for anything, exhibit all the qualities of the nation at its ripest. Upon other occasions, in fact, we believe it will be noted that on the plea that the civilian electorate is unrepresentative, the advocates of an immediate Register were driven to profess belief in the practicability of a poll of the whole Army and Navy. Nothing, however, could be more nonsensical.

To poll the men at present encamped in England is perhaps a feasible notion, though the value of the result would in our opinion be trifling; but to imagine that polling-booths could be set up in the seven quarters of the globe where our men are scattered is an idiot's fancy. Sir Edward Carson, however, who advocated it, had another purpose in his mind than his claptrap excuse of Votes for Heroes. It was not of heroes he was thinking, but of jingoes. An Ulster Irishman, a man of law, and a civilian who has never seen more than a political fight, Sir Edward Carson is under an impression that is false both from a national and a military point of view. His impression is that the Army and Navy would be more disposed than the civilian electorate to return a bellicose and bloodthirsty parliament. But it is, we should have thought, notorious that an English army when once it has done its work is the most friendly and peaceable collection of men upon earth. Its instinct is to shake hands with its enemy as soon as the latter has admitted himself to be fairly beaten. Resentment and the continuance of the war past the military decision—these belong to the disposition of a section of the civilian population—of the section, in fact, to which Sir Edward Carson belongs, whose instincts for fighting are never materially satisfied. As we said last week, we shall be well content to leave the decision of our future relations with a defeated Germany to the men of the Army and Navy who will have defeated her. And what is certain in our opinion is that that decision will disappoint Sir Edward Carson as much as it will surprise him.

Another false assumption upon which Sir Edward Carson and his group of fallacies proceeded was the assumption that war-service must be regarded as a conclusive qualification for the exercise of the franchise. This is playing to the gallery, and there is no wonder that Mr. Will Thorne, who is fast becoming the comic corner-man of the Labour troops, introduced at this point his patter about a rifle a vote. The proposition, as anybody can see, is at once too large and too small for the case it is designed to meet. For, on the one hand, if we are to count what is indubitably war-service, we must extend the franchise (as Mr. Asquith pointed out) to women and girls in the munition factories and
hospitals, as well as to all the men and boys in the Army and Navy; and, on the other hand, we ought to exclude from the franchise upon this assumption of men and women who have merely been attending to their own business during the war. The case is further discredited by the fact that in all hopeful probability the qualification of war-service will cease for our generation with the present war. Are we to found a permanent franchise in a particular occasion and rest the whole body of electoral principles upon a chance event? We must agree that the present principles of the franchise are none too clearly defined, though, in the main, a household or householders are the thing that is; but how change them for the accident of war-service is to swap confusion for chaos. Nevertheless, it is in just this direction that we can see Sir Edward Carson and his gallery moving.

Against this demand of women for the vote, now that the argument of war-service has been presented to them, it is difficult to maintain a case. It is not to be denied that the services of women during the war, services direct as well as indirect, have been enormous; and that upon their record in this respect, if services are to count for enfranchisement, women have earned the vote several times over. What, however, we must continue to deny is that war-service (or, indeed, any kind of calculable social service whatever) are in themselves qualifications for the particular responsibility rather than privilege of the franchise. Public honours, greater social consideration, pensions—anything you like—are the due of all women, who have made sacrifices during the war—but a vote is not a reward for good conduct or a privilege to be won by service: it is the symbol of the possession of a particular kind of responsibility, namely, that of the independent head of a household. It is one thing to admit, as Mr. Asquith has been compelled to admit, that upon the supposition already defined, the imposition (call it concession, if you like) of the vote upon women is logically consequent, and the case for it therefore "irresistible"; but it is quite another thing to admit that our actions should necessarily be determined by strict logic. The Prussians, we know to our cost, are logical enough beyond all conscience. We should not be indisposed, indeed, to agree with those who say that our war is a war against women, if our war followed as we believe it to be, that there is something better than logic, namely, common sense, the sense of man-kind; and we contend that it is precisely the common sense of the nation that would meet the irresistible logic of the women with the imperfect and insufficient conviction that votes for women are a social mistake. We freely admit the dilemma into which public opinion is being forced in this matter. Between the irresistible demand of women for the vote in return for their war-services and the rooted conviction of the nation that somehow or other, the enfranchisement of women will prove to be a profound mistake it will be hard for many men to choose. It will appear to be the choice between logic and sentiment: or, again, between fair-play and prejudice. And already we see that many ancient opponents of women's suffrage are succumbing to the temptation to make a false choice. The only remedy that we can see is to insist more strongly than ever upon the inadequacy of social service as a qualification for the franchise; and, in the meanwhile, to appeal to women to forgo their logical triumph. What, indeed, would become of them or more elevate their status in society than that, having by fair means even if upon men's false vote, they showed how turn round and decline it? Such an act of abnegation would put them as far above the vote as now they think themselves below it.

To our economic objection to the political enfranchisement of women we have seen as yet no reply. Briefly it is that the vote will confirm women in the wage-system. Many of our readers, we know, are under the impression that The New Age is opposed to the admission or to the retention of women in industry, no matter of what kind. May we once more say, however, that our only, and in fact our sole, objection to industry is the objection to their entry into wage-industry? Wages being the price of Labour as fixed by the Supply and Demand of labourers, it follows that, while the wage-system remains, the entry of large numbers of women into industry can only have the effect of depressing wages. It is all the same whether the immigrants into industry are women or coolies; the greater the supply the less the price. Once abolish the wage-system, however, and we see no reason to exclude women from industry. Once for all welcoming into industry such women as are naturally fitted for it. But as well as doubting whether, given a humane industrial system, many women would actually feel themselves called into industry, we have every ground for concluding that their present invasion of wage-industry is more by necessity than by choice. And what we fear from the political enfranchisement of women is the confirmation of a choice they have never really made. Consider how fatally easy is the slope down which, from our point of view, women are slipping into irredeemable wagery. Mr. Asquith himself was impressed by the argument that since so many women are already in industry and parliament has the determination of industrial questions (or thinks it has), women should have the influence in parliament and indirectly the conditions of their labour. Plausible, you will see, beyond plausible reply. Nevertheless the sufficient reply is that women themselves have not yet had free choice of whether they should be in industry or not; and been offered the chance of the choice of what they should do in industry is premature as well as illusory. Abolish the wage-system first, we say, and create thereby a system under which women can, if they please, remain out of industry; and then see what revolt against the home remains. Unpopular as for various reasons, the chief being economic, home-life is to-day, we venture to say that the abolition of the wage-system would see the restoration of home-life and its march towards a perfection from which wage-industry has calamitously diverted it.

With Mr. Montagu's statistical hits-hits concerning our present output of munitions, only the public that has been brought up upon Harrington's Encyclopaedia can nourish its soul. We rejoice that it is to the rest of us that the daily output of the hundred or so national factories would fill a train of 1000 trucks? All we want to know is that the output is sufficient for our purpose; and of this not trains but the men at the front are the best judges. Elsewhere in his review of the work of his department, however, Mr. Montagu touched upon several topics of interest and in a manner that was less interesting. Was it, for example, by inadvertence or by design that he included a share of control in industry among the legitimate objects of Trade Unionism? But even that was not the most significant of his remarks. Reviewing the comparative sacrifices of Labour and of Capital he explicitly affirmed that "it was on the side of Labour that the State had interfered most with the rights of the individual"; and in a later part of his speech he raised the question whether the same organisation that has been applied to industry during war might not be applied to peaceful uses. What, we should like to know, was the purpose of this? On the one hand, it is undeniable that the "moral and material energy" of both Labour and Capital have been wonderfully united and concentrated during the period of the war and have brought us results which peace might envy. But, on the other hand, it is clear that not only has the greater sacrifice of privilege been demanded of Labour, but the greater sacrifice of immediate reward as well. In no respect, to the best of our knowledge, has Labour profited in liberty by all the organisation and sacrifice to
which it has submitted; but, on the contrary, and upon Mr. Montagu’s own admission, its liberties have been more curtailed than those of Capital. So true is this that at this very moment it is a question of restoring to Labour those which have been lost, while at the same time it is a question of resuming and withdrawing the liberties that Capital has taken. Now if, as Mr. Montagu suggests, the same kind of organisation is to be continued after the war, the question must be asked whether this division of liberty is likewise to be continued—all for the employers and none for the men? Are we to prolong into peace the unequal division which the war has brought about? Is Labour to be content with a permanent reduction of its privileges and therewith to see all hope of their increase lost for ever? In our view it is a fool’s paradise in which Mr. Montagu and others are living if they imagine that the corporate spirit of industry which has prevailed during the war can be maintained, when peace returns, upon the present war-footing. With the passing away of the common danger, the struggle of the two parties in industry will and must be resumed until one or other is permanently subjected.

Little notice need be taken of pious wishes to the contrary. Undoubtedly we all wish for an end of the war between Capital and Labour; and equally certainly we have all been impressed by the marvellous things that Capital and Labour have done in the war, when hitherto nothing could be expected to happen. But the matter is one of means, rather than of ends, of practical machinery rather than of common aspiration; and he will best serve the social end who takes for granted the desirability of the union of Capital and Labour and sets about devising the means of bringing it about. Concerning the means, however, the field is occupied for the moment almost exclusively by capitalist inventions the effect of which, in our opinion, would be to put an end to the war of Capital and Labour indeed, but by denying to Labour in perpetuity all rights at all. And in that direction we are drifting. But the alternative is for Labour to devise a means by which precisely the opposite conclusion may be reached, namely, the permanent subjection of Capital to Labour; and it is to the discovery (or, let us say, to the realisation) of this means that Labour’s attention ought to be devoted. What can we do that we have not done before the notice of Labour? Several correspondents seem disposed to lay the blame upon ourselves for the failure of organised Labour to consider the suggestions made in these pages. But to that we must reply that privately as well as publicly we have pointed out that the State could have done even more limited than any reader can guess, to secure a hearing for our views. But against what odds must would-be emancipators of Labour fight! For they have three sets of enemies—each more powerful than the whole of the revolutionary minority together: the capitalist party as a matter of course; the official Labour element that hopes to bask in the sun of capitalist revolutionaries whose jealousy of real revolutionaries is unbounded. To the last cause alone we can attribute a large share of our difficulties; and it is, moreover, the hardest to overcome. Capitalists we have treated with the strength of hatred; ambitious Labour leaders we can treat with the strength of ridicule; but against our own household we have no defence. We must needs put up with such a fact as this, for instance: that there now exist some score or more of recently formed journals, societies, leagues, associations, fellowships, newspapers, not, most of which owe their creation to a split hair. The Railwayman’s application for an advance of 10s. a week in London made to the Sheffield system is rebuffed by it itself; but both the circumstances of the original agreement and the circumstances of the present situation as to prices are becoming plainer. It now appears that the men’s pledge of last October to accept as final the agreement then made was extorted from them under considerable pressure. We pointed out to the Companies at the time, says Mr. Thomas, that such a pledge would tie our hands in an unforeseen emergency, such as has, in fact, arisen, and that on this account we were disinclined to make it; but the Companies insisted upon the pledge as the price of the bonus, though they allowed in conversation that, as reasonable people, they would not be averse from reconsidering the matter if events should appear to justify the decision. The shameful admission that the railwaymen allowed themselves to be dictated to in a negotiation to which, for once, they were an equal party with the railway companies, the assurance of the latter that a revision of the pledge would be possible is enough to reopen the discussion. For there is not the least doubt that the circumstances of to-day are not only far worse than they were last October (we are referring, of course, to the cost of living), but that no ordinary man could have allowed himself to foresee how bad they have become. Who would have supposed that food-prices would have been permitted to climb higher and higher while wages were statutorily fixed and in the absence of any such effective check as a blockade to the importation of supplies? Yet so it is. Thanks to the incredible neglect (if sight not to be called criminality) of the Government our population of workers, being left to the mercy of profiteers, is on the verge of conditions that are scarcely worse in blockaded Germany and in Austria. What to them under these conditions is the triumph of our Navy or even the approaching victory of our arms? The country, it is true, has been defended from its enemies without, but only to be surrounded to its enemies within. The facts are undeniable that there is no shortage of supply, that there is no reason for the existing high prices, that high wages are not responsible for them, and that means exist to bring down prices to a level scarcely above that which prevailed before the war. Only private profiteering and the connivance of the Government with it prevent this happy consummation being arrived at. We sincerely hope that the Railwaymen will persist in their demand until, at any rate, the national food-supply has been requisitioned by the State and distributed equitably over the nation. The only lever of popular legislation is at this moment the fear of a strike.

Professor Harnack, we see, has been disgusted with the war by the profiteering of the capitalists of Germany. May his disgust infect the Social Democrats there and induce them to put an end to both. In this country, however, it is the profiteering only that disgusts reasonable men; and it has gone so far that even the “Times” has been moved to hold up an example of it. In its issue of last Saturday the “Times” quoted as a contrast two instances of State-contracting, one taken from Canada and the other taken from England. In the former case, a manufacturing company (the Canadian Cartridge Company) undertook to return the difference between its contract price and the cost of production, and did, in fact, present the State with a sum of a hundred and fifty thousand pounds. In the latter case, our contractor first undertook to return the difference, but afterwards repented. And having the Government in his power he insisted on only being allowed an additional sum for standing charges, but upon an additional commission of five per cent. on all the material passed through his hands. The sum of this on a contract amounting to nearly four million pounds may easily be calculated. But what we should like to ask is why this scoundrel has not been imprisoned or shot. A thousand alien enemies in our midst, a hundred thousand pacifists, could not work the havoc in the nation wrought by this single profiteer. Yet we shall see that far from being punished as an example, and as a result of a battle which was not even his name will be published. The anonymity of the worst of profiteers is the price the State must pay to carry on the war.
Foreign Affairs.

By S. Verdad.

It is not without interest to note that the monthly reviews have seriously begun to talk about the terms of peace; that London, Paris, and Berlin have largely ceased to rail against the Cabinet's conduct of the war, and that there is now a general atmosphere of optimism with regard to the conclusion of the campaign. Two months ago the prevalent feeling was as despondent as it is now exalted; and a sense of relief has taken possession of the public. The change is not confined to this country. Up to June of this very year eminent French politicians were pessimistic when they spoke of the progress of the war; and our own authorities seemed to have no very clear notions of what was happening—^all they could say was that Germany, if she were not defeated on land, would certainly be defeated on the sea and would be starved, more or less, into surrender; and it must be acknowledged that this was not a particularly noble attitude to have to assume.

There have been military successes with which we are all acquainted, but the diplomatic successes following upon them have been less evident. Yet they exist. It has now become clear to every neutral that the Allies will win the war; and that, perhaps, is the greatest change in the diplomatic atmosphere of Europe which has come about since the Russian offensive began on June 4, followed by the British offensive on July 1, and the offensive movements made by the Italians and by the forces at Salonika at still later dates. The consequence of this changing current of opinion is evident in innumerable ways. It is a remarkable tribute to Germany's strength that certain neutrals did not lose, after the Russian offensive, their confidence in the victorious powers, and that the primary cause of this state of things, like the cause of the improved feeling to which I have made reference, is the defeat of General von Bothmer on the Lutschek line. Balkan neutrals are suspicious; and the striking thrusts of the Russians seemed much too good to be true. Bothmer's line was the real test; for it was known that he was strongly entrenched and that not even the turning of the line to the north and south of him would induce him to move, so strong did he feel in his positions. Bothmer, however, has had to retire; and the most recent conditions of the fighting on the eastern front have not made his retirement easier. His flanks were all but turned by Sakkaroff and Tschetatkoff while Lechitsky hurled masses of men at his front. As a result, Sakkaroff has been able to force a passage at the north of the fifty-mile line which Bothmer's retirement covers, and there is a bare hope that squadrons of Cossacks might yet be able to interpose themselves between Bothmer's rear and the fortified position of Lemberg.

The difficulties which Bothmer has to contend with in his retreat are certainly not of a minor order. So far as can be ascertain, his army consists of nearly three hundred thousand men of strong conscription, munitions, guns, etc.; and the total extent of his front is fifty miles. To reach Lemberg, fighting rearguard actions all the way (if it be assumed that Sakkaroff falls to cut off the northern half of his army) Bothmer must make use of every engineer and railway officer still available, and the roads are wretched. Whether the two available railways and the three useful roads at his command will be sufficient to enable him to reach Lemberg is not altogether a problem in mathematics. In order to retreat without losses, Bothmer ought to be supported on his flanks, and at other points of the line, by strong German counter-attacks. Counter-attacks, however, mean large reinforcements, and this is precisely what Germany cannot now spare.

Since I wrote the foregoing paragraphs a little more information has come to hand regarding events in the Balkans, and the latest Bulgarian papers show that considerable nervousness is being felt at Sofia in view of the series of Russian advances which began in the direction of Durian and the Struma Valley. Why the Bulgarians should, in these new circumstances, be making desperate efforts to drive to a few more Greek villages is not clear, unless, as has been suggested, they are desirous of seizing territory which may put them in a better position to bargain with the Allies if the time ever comes for them to make a separate peace. If this is indeed their object, I need hardly say that it is very short-sighted. The Allies are not likely to be influenced in one direction or another by a few villages whatever they are in Greek or Serbo-Bulgarian territory. A definite recognition by Bulgaria of her error in backing the wrong horse would in all probability lead to excellent terms being offered to the Government, though what the effect of such a confession would be on the throne is another matter. The throne stands to lose in any case; for the foolishness of Bulgaria's policy is due to King Ferdinand much more than to his bribed ministers, and this is a fact which cannot be concealed for ever from the masses of the farmers and the peasantry.

As for the Russian advance, it is continuing satisfactorily. The feeble counter-attacks of the Austrians on the Carpathians have been ineffective to check the steady progress of Brussiloff's forces, and with every mile gained by the Russians the more pressing becomes, the need for Austria and Hungary to consider their respective position. It is clear that in the future Austria-Hungary is not Germany, and that it is still open to the Germans to retire on their own frontiers.
War and its Makers.

VI.-OTHER SPRINGS OF STRIFE.

To two great religious systems belongs the credit of having obliterated among their followers the prejudice of race: they are Mohammedanism and Catholicism. In both community of faith has always overshadowed differences of language or lineage. In the Middle Ages, before the Nationalist spirit arose in Europe, all countries that acknowledged the authority of the Pope regarded one another as members of the same family. Yet in neither case has this absence of racial antipathy led to political concord. Mohammedan and Catholic States have fought among themselves more often as they have fought against outsiders; and none seems to have ever lacked a sufficient excuse for the most lavish effusion of fraternal blood.

The histories of ancient Greece and medieval Italy offer another and perhaps even more conclusive, proof of the fact that the most ruthless feuds can divide States without any of the pleas which are held to justify wars: Athens, Sparta, and Thebes; Florence, Genoa, and Pisa were inhabited by fighting races, but the repository of many and speech. Yet this close affinity intensified rather than diminished friction; and one seeks in vain for any evidence of the slightest sympathy upon any political subject whatsoever. Peace was as precarious among them as it is among us. Alliances, aggressive and defensive, were the usual preliminaries to hostilities. Treaties were made only to be broken. And any State in need of a pretext for war could procure one with no more difficulty than is experienced by a modern State. Minor disputes might be settled by diplomatic negotiation; but when it came to vital matters, Greek and Italian Governments preferred to enforce their own views of justice at the point of the sword.

With these facts before him, one must be very sanguine to anticipate from the simple remembrance of prejudice a radical change in human affairs. Experiences derived from other sources do not tend to increase one's optimism. It is worthy of note that not a single European kingdom at the present day is ruled by a truly national dynasty. Owing to habitual latitude of marriage kingship has become international. All the crowned heads of Europe form a sort of royal caste, totally regardless of race or creed, but mindful only of rank. Yet this consanguinity does not prevent one crowned head from fighting another, and, in fact, the diplomatists of various countries are an extraordinarily cosmopolitan set.

The official List of every Chancellery in Europe bristles with foreign names. They are cosmopolitan, not only by virtue of descent, but also by education and habit. An ambassador who, after having spent all his life wandering like a stately vagabond from capital to capital, retires on a pension, confesses that he feels an alien in his own country and at home everywhere else. These conditions, as one might have expected, have a truly international attitude of mind. A man who numbers among his relatives half the nations of Europe, and who can speak fluently half a dozen languages, cannot be national in his ideas. His mentality, like his vocabulary, is a patchwork; the diplomatics of various countries are an extraordinarily cosmopolitan set.

The ordinary German who performs the same tour is expected, beget a truly international attitude of mind. But here, also, it is consoling to reflect that vanity by itself is not strong enough to impel the majority of mankind to conquest. A few individuals may be disposed to sacrificing another; and the rabid Imperialist, whether born in the United States or bred in the Transvaal, is instrumental in bringing about international ruptures. Financiers, too, are mostly citizens of the world (the Rothschild and bankers' cousins in every European capital). But it is notorious that they have almost as much to do with wars as diplomatists and kings.

As none of these people suffer from the prejudices which sway the multitude, it is evident that divisions among States cannot be ended by the removal of prejudice alone. To know and to understand one another does not necessarily mean to love one another. Antagonism can flourish without antipathy.

I shall venture to affirm, as a general proposition which admits of no exception, that more fatal to international concord than popular ignorance and academic pedantry are the vanity and the cupidity of statesmen and financiers, acting upon the vanity and the cupidity of nations. These are the love of profit and the love of power — weaknesses rooted deep in human nature, and neither class nor sect has the monopoly of them.

The ordinary Englishman who sails from Tilbury to Calcutta feels a thrill of exaltation at the sight of the Union Jack flying over every port at which the steamerouches: Gibraltar, Port Said, Suez, Aden, Colombo. If he prolongs his voyage round the world, he will find more food for his national pride. He becomes conscious that he is the citizen of an Empire over which the sun never sets.

The ordinary German who performs the same tour is equally moved, though in the opposite direction. In him the sight of the Union Jack awakens a feeling of envy and resentment. Why should not his own flag be flying over all the ports of the earth? And what is the reward that we get thus the two sides of a medal, with "satisfaction" inscribed on the obverse, "discontent" on the reverse; but it is the same medal, and its name is Vainy.

How is an anxious people round the world, it is necessary to rouse in the patriot's breast these sentiments. From the moment he begins to learn History and Geography school, his national vanity is assiduously fostered. When he leaves school, his education in that virtue continues through every book and newspaper he reads. National festivals with their concomitant speeches and flag-wagging accentuate his inflation. Throughout life he remains subject to the hypnotic influence of Imperialist suggestion.

A similar vanity, similarly fomented by teaching, will be found at the root of all nationalist movements: a sentimental element mixed with practical considerations. That element, which has played such a great part in national emancipation during the nineteenth century, now plays a conspicuous part in Imperialist expansion. Indeed, the one feeling is but a development of the other. After hoisting their flag over their own country, people wish to plant it in others; it is a sort of self-advertisement, very gratifying to certain nations, even though it may be quite empty of tangible benefit.

But here, also, it is consoling to reflect that vanity by itself is not strong enough to impel the majority of mankind to conquest. A few individuals may be disposed to sacrificing another; and the rabid Imperialist, whether born in the United States or bred in the Transvaal, is instrumental in bringing about international ruptures. Financiers, too, are mostly citizens of the world (the Rothschild and bankers' cousins in every European capital). But it is notorious that they have almost as much to do with wars as diplomatists and kings.

As none of these people suffer from the prejudices which sway the multitude, it is evident that divisions among States cannot be ended by the removal of prejudice alone. To know and to understand one another does not necessarily mean to love one another. Antagonism can flourish without antipathy.

I shall venture to affirm, as a general proposition which admits of no exception, that more fatal to international concord than popular ignorance and academic pedantry are the vanity and the cupidity of statesmen and financiers, acting upon the vanity and the cupidity of nations. These are the love of profit and the love of power — weaknesses rooted deep in human nature, and neither class nor sect has the monopoly of them.

The ordinary Englishman who sails from Tilbury to Calcutta feels a thrill of exaltation at the sight of the Union Jack flying over every port at which the steamerouches: Gibraltar, Port Said, Suez, Aden, Colombo. If he prolongs his voyage round the world, he will find more food for his national pride. He becomes conscious that he is the citizen of an Empire over which the sun never sets.
played a part analogous to the grapes of Canaan and the figs of Carthage.

History repeats itself; but with a difference. In the days of the Middle Ages, as well as in the later age of William of Normandy, the appeal to greed assumed the crude form of a promise of plunder. The lands of the vanquished became the property of the victors. The old owners were either exterminated or reduced to the position of serfs. Every participator in a successful expedition received a share of the conquered territory according to his degree. Thus, it could easily be proved that conquest paid. Nowadays, however, when subtler methods have taken the place of these rude tactics, no one pretends that conquest brings wealth to nations, unless it is convinced that there will accrue to it any practical advantage, be it what it may. A fair amount of looting may be indulged in while the campaign is in progress; but once the conquest accomplished, there is an end to it. Even if the old landowners are expropriated, to make room for new owners, they receive compensation. There is no division of spoils among the conquerors. The members of a victorious army who survive the campaign bring home with them very little besides their scars and their memories. Not one of them is economically the better off, and some are worse off, for their exertion. A French clock is not worth a clock for a lost limb, and no remnant German soldier has carried off from France even a clock. Personal gain, therefore, being out of the question, the argument rests on broader, national grounds. People are told that, though individually they lose their lands, still they may gain in the light of an investment; that territorial aggrandisement eventually leads to economic enrichment.

The appeal is particularly popular with regard to acquisitions outside Europe. It is no longer pretended that the subjugation of one European nation by another, and, under modern conditions, to be financially profitable. And, as a matter of fact, no European Power undertakes the burden of ruling over an alien European population, unless it is convinced that there will accrue out of such a burden political advantages great enough to counterbalance its evident inconveniences. The main motive for war among European States nowadays is not the absorption of each other's Continental territories, but of each other's colonial possessions. It is in Asia, in America, in Australasia, and in Africa that the booty is to be found. And it is with reference to such expansion that the economic argument is used. If we struggle for colonies and dependencies, it is urged, we do so because of colour, creed, or race, could by itself incite whole nations to crusades. The members of a nation's smiling at the prospect of lifting the curtain from the ideal, and showing it to the rest of the world that such warfare is an economic operation; that the subjugation of one European nation by another is to be regarded as a business transaction, that the cost of a war must be regarded as a matter of calculation; and the World is divided into two classes: the nations which have colonies fight to keep them, those which do not fight to get them. The time is past—if such time ever was—when a shallow appeal to the prejudices of colour, creed, or race, could by itself incite whole nations to crusades. Nor do I believe that those other shallow doctrines of "national destiny" and "missions of civilisation," which are so often used as incentives to Imperialist ardour, really exercise any decisive influence upon the minds of men. None of these doctrines have ever inspired the policy of Governments: ideals have always been employed by statesmen only as cloaks for very unideal aims.

Of course, in every human community there is and always has been a section of people genuinely averse from sacrificing principle to interest; and a much larger section of people upon whom the candid avowal of a policy of plunder jars as a harsh note upon a sensi-

tive ear. It is partly in order to conciliate these elements that noble motives are invented by statesmen. The trick is one of the most hackneyed in History. Yet, such an appeal to people's capacity to use their experience of the past as a commentary on the present, that it has never been known to fail. For instance, our statesmen at this hour do not tire of declaring that this War is a war for a Great Idea; that the cause of Peace and Right against the brute powers of Domination and Force; that it is war against war; that it is to be the last war; and that the end in view is "a lasting relief from the waste and turmoil of armaments under which we have suffered so long," it is a trick longer remembered by philosophers cited in all good faith by people otherwise in full possession of their faculties; and wondered greatly at their infinite gullibility. Surely, they have but to glance round them to find abundant evidence of the truth. Although Cabinet Ministers aver that England took up arms, not to seize territories and capture markets and wring out indemnities, but to keep her pledged word and to defend the liberty of the world, the very newspapers which print these disinterested protestations in one column proclaim in another "War on German israde"; and many private individuals in their speculations upon the results of the campaign blend calculations of material profit with professions of morality, pretty much as the American judge at his mother-in-law's funeral managed to mingle grave thoughts with refined pleasure. When the soldier returns from the French colonies a smile of jubilation lit up the faces of all our canting politicians and publicists; and none of the persons who at first so virtuously disclaimed any territorial designs ventured to whisper a word about giving those colonies back. It is a Providential dispensation, for which honest folk cannot but be thankful, that insincerity is so often coupled with clumsiness that men can be hypocritical without deceiving, except those who wish to be deceived.

We owe, then, to the inconsistent utterances and actions of living statesmen, as much as to the documents bequeathed to us by dead ones, a great debt: that of lifting the curtain from the ideal, and showing us what common animals are sitting disguised in the seeming council of angels. These animals are not always of the same species: there is evolution in political as in natural history. The fact must be taken into account for what it is worth. In bygone ages (and the thing is still the case in despotically governed countries) personal ambition or a dynastic feud was sometimes enough to plunge millions into war.

The present day in constitutional States, though personal ambition has not been wholly eliminated, it is national aggrandisement which supplies the real motive force of foreign policy; and underlying it the assumption that nationalism is a synonym with national enrichment. Until this assumption isdispelled, it would be idle to hope for a lasting improvement of international relations. Deeper than prejudice, deeper than vanity, lies the lust for profit. Convince the majority of people that possession of foreign territory is not conducive to their prosperity—that peaceful competition is more profitable than armed conflict—and you deprive the champions of war of their most effective weapon.

Without such a conviction, I fear, the hopes for permanent peace are very slender indeed. My scepticism is based not upon a priori reasoning, but upon the lessons of experience. Time and again during the last two thousand years "peace on earth and goodwill towards men" has been preached; but it has failed to convert more than a few local districts; and mankind has failed because the appeal was purely altruistic, and the average man is an egoist. Few human beings can bring themselves to respect, much less love, their neighbours as themselves. Exhortations to self-denial have never had much power over human nature; and there is nothing to suggest that human nature has
become more amenable to such exhortations. My own hope lies not in an enlargement of the human heart, but in an enlightenment of the human mind. The path to salvation, it seems to me, is not through an appeal to self-sacrifice, but to self-interest. Before men can be persuaded to abandon war, and the policy of conquest which leads to war, they must be persuaded that war and conquest do not pay. That is the only sound foundation upon which a Temple of Peace can be built.

(Kosmopolites.

(To be continued.)

Trade Unions and Friendly Societies in the Roman Empire.

Lectures delivered to the members of the Workers' Educational Association at University College, Bangor, August, 1914.

By Professor Edward V. Arnold.

III. THE COLLEGES AS STATE INSTITUTIONS.

It is said that the history of all reforms is that they are first ridiculed, then detested, and finally accepted. So perhaps it is true of all private institutions that they are first prohibited by the State, then permitted, and that finally they become a part of its system. Such at any rate was the history of the Roman colleges. We have seen that the Julian law made it a condition of the recognition of colleges that they should be of public service. The colleges, on their part, were eager to comply with this condition, and to obtain the advantages of recognition. The Roman republic governed, but it did not administer. It maintained order with a high hand, but even the collection of the taxes was left to private individuals, who contracted with the State for this purpose. Under the Empire the State assumed all power, and became responsible for all duties: it had not only to maintain peace and order, but also the safety and prosperity of its subjects. Therefore it created State offices and services, which were spread over the whole extent of the empire from Africa to Britain. The type upon which all were founded was the service of the corn market, established to provision the immense population of the city of Rome. In the first centuries after Christ, the Senate and the elected magistrates had a real share in this administration; later everything became concentrated in the hands of the emperor, and no initiative but his was even imaginable. From the time of Diocletian, the public service had become a hierarchy, in which each grade was strictly subordinated to the grade above it. But to carry out the duties of government, an army of workmen was also needed. In every grade, the Roman State demanded service if it could not procure it freely: it did not, like the modern State, demand only money of its subjects and trust to it to obtain labour. The taxes of the Roman State were to a large extent levied in kind and distributed in kind.

The simplest payment that the State can make is the distribution of honours. In the days of republican Rome, all the magistracies were entitled to honours (honores); and frequently as by a kind of lottery, there was never lack of competition for them. But when these magistracies were deprived of all independent powers by the new hierarchic system, the number of qualified competitors diminished. Then the State pressed the magistracy upon suitable persons as a public duty (munus), and it gradually became a burden. In Italy and the provinces the same pressure was even more systematically employed, not only for the magistracies, but also for membership of the provincial senates.

So for the conduct of the State services the State relied upon the trade societies; and in the first instance, on the societies of rich merchants for the transport of the corn supplies. This employment, too, was in the first centuries an honour, but later on became a severe burden. Then, when the college would gladly have excused itself, the strong hand of compulsion was upon it. This change was a symptom of the decay of the Roman Empire. Had the State flourished, there would always have been a supply of fit men for its service, both in peace and war: and there would always have been competition amongst the trade societies for State contracts. When the State decayed, men were not to be found. The use of compulsion merely postponed the day of reckoning, but could not alter the result. By the first efforts of compulsion, every man was tied to the trade to which he was born, and to the college of which he had once become a member. If he quitted it, he lost his share in the common property; but men did so gladly. Next the deserter forfeited his private means; then men became poor rather than undertake any public duty. Finally, they were threatened with imprisonment or punishment: they fled to the woods and the mountains to escape them.

The causes of this movement we cannot determine unless we can settle the vexed question of the causes of the decay of the Roman Empire. For the facts lie plain before us. Not, however, till the fourth century A.D. are they obviously alarming. The development can be most easily followed in the capital itself.

The principle on which the college system was first adopted in Rome under the Republic, when Galus Gracchus passed a law that every citizen resident at Rome should receive so many bushels of corn per month at a low price. This was in 132 B.C. Clodius, in 50 B.C., made the corn distribution universal. The reason was plenty. Julius Caesar found 150,000 recipients; he reduced the number to 150,000; Augustus fixed it definitely at 200,000. These distributions were never interrupted, but Alexander Severus and Aurelian substituted bread for corn, and from this time the distributions were made daily. The annual cost was about £1,000,000. In A.D. 330 Constantine introduced the same system into his new capital of Constantinople.

To the distribution of corn Septimius Severus added a daily distribution of oil: Aurelian added that of bacon. To these were added all kinds of distributions on special occasions and festivities.

In addition to this free distribution the State held itself responsible for the price of corn, and from this time the distributions were made daily. The annual cost was about £1,000,000. In A.D. 330 Constantine introduced the same system into his new capital of Constantinople.

To the distribution of corn Septimius Severus added a daily distribution of oil: Aurelian added that of bacon. To these were added all kinds of distributions on special occasions and festivities.

In addition to this free distribution the State held itself responsible for the price of corn, and from this time the distributions were made daily. The annual cost was about £1,000,000. In A.D. 330 Constantine introduced the same system into his new capital of Constantinople.

The invention of this new system of corn distribution was due to the fact that corn was not grown in Italy later than 200 B.C., the whole of the vast supply needed had to be imported. To supervise this, Augustus appointed a "Minister of Corn Supplies," who became in time one of the most important officials of the Empire. The administration was divided into (i) collection or purchase; (ii) transport; (iii) storage at or near Rome; (iv) preparation; (v) sale or free distribution.

Of these the most important was transport, and it was conducted through the colleges of ship-owners (domini navium, navicularii), whether for service on the Mediterranean Sea or on the lakes and rivers of the Empire. These societies existed in great numbers, and we have many records of them in the inscriptions.

The first care of the emperors was to increase the number of ship-owners; they therefore promised them honours and privileges, beginning with exemption from all personal duties in their native towns. Next they assured them of a regular rate of freight for all public supplies. Under the Republic corn was imported from Sardinia and Sicily; under the Empire, from Egypt and Africa; and thus the maintenance of the fleet of Alexander became very important; and we have numerous inscriptions connected with the college of "African ship-
owners." In later days further supplies were demanded from Spain, Germany, and Gaul, and in all these countries we hear of government superintendents and local colleges.

In the course of the second and third centuries the Government began to record carefully the names of members of the colleges in each province, as well as of those who resided at Rome, and privileges and honours were continually awarded to them. In the fourth century all these colleges appear to have been welded into one.

The first privileges, as we have said, were exemption from local duties and a regular rate of freight: the ship-owners still carried on private trade by the side of their public duties. Already in the second century we find that members endeavour to obtain the privileges and divers' right to recover submerged goods. The divers had accordingly we find a society of corn-measurers. It was not until the third century that the boatmen had also their clubs. It seems that boats were linked in a series of boats, in parallel. To undertake to make all goods up to the standards of their birth. Thus the colleges became hereditary and compulsory: a system of caste-duties was established.

Much earlier the State laid down rules as to the number of ships, their tonnage, the dates of sailing, and the time allowed for discharging the cargo: in particular, it undertook to make up all goods which had been lost due to storm and shipwreck. Breach of the regulations, and especially undue delay on the way, was punished by heavy fines.

The discharge of the ships at ports near Rome required the services of other colleges: as the "sack-bearers" or dockers (saccarii), who carry the sacks of wheat and the weight of the loaves, and its inspectors, who were connected with religious observances in the course of the worship of Cybele and Attis: probably they were also timber merchants, and when in A.D. 415 they were dissolved as a religious society they continued to exist as a trade society for supplying wood to public works.

Great societies were connected also with the maintenance of the public baths. These, as well as the fire brigades, were marshalled in colleges.

Public festivals required still further clubs. There was a "poets'" club, one for actors, one for actresses, for musicians, charioteers, gladiators, and huntsmen. In the first centuries it was easy to recruit artists for public spectacles; in the fourth they were hard to find, though the passion for sight-seeing was eager as ever. After the taking of Rome in A.D. 410 Honorius called upon the actresses to resume their duties, and compulsion was applied. Owing to the contempt felt for the profession, it was laid down that those born to it must not desert it, though the Christian bishops successfully asserted some exemptions for their own members.

Thus we find the whole society of Rome ranged in colleges of varying degrees of dignity, from the ship-owners at the top of the ladder to the actresses at its lowest rung. The great number of societies shows that the division of labour was very advanced. We do not hear of a college of wine-merchants till the fourth century: then they received subventions from the State.

Without going into further detail, we may assert generally that by the third century all trades at Rome were organised in colleges.

Similar societies existed for building purposes: as the "lime-burners" (coctio calcis), the wagoners (vectores), the builders (fabri). The last is a particularly important society, with 1,900 members: it raises a statue in A.D. 301. Here the signs of compulsion: the "builders" were compelled, in return for their privileges, to give so many days' work each year to the State buildings.

One of the most flourishing societies in the second century was that of the "lime-burners" (coctio calcis), who were connected with religious observances in the course of the worship of Cybele and Attis: probably they were timber merchants, and when in A.D. 415 they were dissolved as a religious society they continued to exist as a trade society for supplying wood to public works.

Great societies were connected also with the maintenance of the public baths. These, as well as the fire brigades, were marshalled in colleges.
third or plebeian class, the two higher classes consisting of curiales and Augustales; but from time to time they stand out as the most influential part of the plebeian body. The municipal administration was often attuned to the needs of a town, to construct a road, repair an amphitheatre, or build a temple. In return the townspeople might contribute to public banquets and processions they appeared in privileged places, with banners flying; and these banners and the attendant crowds added splendour to a great triumph or a noble funeral. Often they contribute to the needs of a town, construct a road, repair an amphitheatre, or build a temple. In return the townspeople contribute to their finances, give them a site for an assembly-room or reserved places in the circus.

The three most conspicuous colleges were those of the "builders," the "quilt-makers," and the "branch-bearers." Most towns possessed at least two of these three colleges. All of them were united in the public service of the extinction of fires. In the decay of the societies the first step is to bind each to its city, "to bind them to the services necessary to the splendour of their native town." In the fifth century Honorius (and later Majorian) complain that the cities are deserted by both of the "builders" and by the "society-men." For recovering a runaway "counsellor" five pounds was paid as a reward, for a "society-man" one pound.

The competition began with the "counsellors." Those of this class were charged with conducting the city magistracies, and these offices were so costly that no one any longer came forward voluntarily as a candidate. Hence the council class are now compelled to fulfill all the magistracies in succession. Here is a complaint under Theodosius of the decurions of Antioch: "Two hundred we are reduced to twelve: these twelve compose the whole senate; between us we have to bear all the heavy burdens. We administer the affairs of both town and country, heavy and light alike." In fact, they needed to collect the taxes to maintain the police, to provide corn and oil for the town, to keep up the baths, the aqueducts, the roads, and the public buildings, and to celebrate the public festivities.

To carry out these duties they needed workmen. In these days slaves had become few in number; the councilors therefore relied on the colleges, and on none more inventively than the bakers. Thus gradually the voluntary colleges changed into official colleges; the old names are retained, but the position is new. Of Alexander Severus we first hear that "the townspeople, the clients of his college, are now compelled to fulfill all the magistracies in succession. Here is a complaint under Theodosius of the decurions of Antioch: "Two hundred we are reduced to twelve: these twelve compose the whole senate; between us we have to bear all the heavy burdens. We administer the affairs of both town and country, heavy and light alike." In fact, they needed to collect the taxes to maintain the police, to provide corn and oil for the town, to keep up the baths, the aqueducts, the roads, and the public buildings, and to celebrate the public festivities.

To carry out these duties they needed workmen. In these days slaves had become few in number; the councilors therefore relied on the colleges, and on none more inventively than the bakers. Thus gradually the voluntary colleges changed into official colleges; the old names are retained, but the position is new. Of Alexander Severus we first hear that "the townspeople, the clients of his college, are now compelled to fulfill all the magistracies in succession. Here is a complaint under Theodosius of the decurions of Antioch: "Two hundred we are reduced to twelve: these twelve compose the whole senate; between us we have to bear all the heavy burdens. We administer the affairs of both town and country, heavy and light alike." In fact, they needed to collect the taxes to maintain the police, to provide corn and oil for the town, to keep up the baths, the aqueducts, the roads, and the public buildings, and to celebrate the public festivities.

To carry out these duties they needed workmen. In these days slaves had become few in number; the councilors therefore relied on the colleges, and on none more inventively than the bakers. Thus gradually the voluntary colleges changed into official colleges; the old names are retained, but the position is new. Of Alexander Severus we first hear that "the townspeople, the clients of his college, are now compelled to fulfill all the magistracies in succession. Here is a complaint under Theodosius of the decurions of Antioch: "Two hundred we are reduced to twelve: these twelve compose the whole senate; between us we have to bear all the heavy burdens. We administer the affairs of both town and country, heavy and light alike." In fact, they needed to collect the taxes to maintain the police, to provide corn and oil for the town, to keep up the baths, the aqueducts, the roads, and the public buildings, and to celebrate the public festivities.

To carry out these duties they needed workmen. In these days slaves had become few in number; the councilors therefore relied on the colleges, and on none more inventively than the bakers. Thus gradually the voluntary colleges changed into official colleges; the old names are retained, but the position is new. Of Alexander Severus we first hear that "the townspeople, the clients of his college, are now compelled to fulfill all the magistracies in succession. Here is a complaint under Theodosius of the decurions of Antioch: "Two hundred we are reduced to twelve: these twelve compose the whole senate; between us we have to bear all the heavy burdens. We administer the affairs of both town and country, heavy and light alike." In fact, they needed to collect the taxes to maintain the police, to provide corn and oil for the town, to keep up the baths, the aqueducts, the roads, and the public buildings, and to celebrate the public festivities.

To carry out these duties they needed workmen. In these days slaves had become few in number; the councilors therefore relied on the colleges, and on none more inventively than the bakers. Thus gradually the voluntary colleges changed into official colleges; the old names are retained, but the position is new. Of Alexander Severus we first hear that "the townspeople, the clients of his college, are now compelled to fulfill all the magistracies in succession. Here is a complaint under Theodosius of the decurions of Antioch: "Two hundred we are reduced to twelve: these twelve compose the whole senate; between us we have to bear all the heavy burdens. We administer the affairs of both town and country, heavy and light alike." In fact, they needed to collect the taxes to maintain the police, to provide corn and oil for the town, to keep up the baths, the aqueducts, the roads, and the public buildings, and to celebrate the public festivities.

To carry out these duties they needed workmen. In these days slaves had become few in number; the councilors therefore relied on the colleges, and on none more inventively than the bakers. Thus gradually the voluntary colleges changed into official colleges; the old names are retained, but the position is new. Of Alexander Severus we first hear that "the townspeople, the clients of his college, are now compelled to fulfill all the magistracies in succession. Here is a complaint under Theodosius of the decurions of Antioch: "Two hundred we are reduced to twelve: these twelve compose the whole senate; between us we have to bear all the heavy burdens. We administer the affairs of both town and country, heavy and light alike." In fact, they needed to collect the taxes to maintain the police, to provide corn and oil for the town, to keep up the baths, the aqueducts, the roads, and the public buildings, and to celebrate the public festivities.

To carry out these duties they needed workmen. In these days slaves had become few in number; the councilors therefore relied on the colleges, and on none more inventively than the bakers. Thus gradually the voluntary colleges changed into official colleges; the old names are retained, but the position is new. Of Alexander Severus we first hear that "the townspeople, the clients of his college, are now compelled to fulfill all the magistracies in succession. Here is a complaint under Theodosius of the decurions of Antioch: "Two hundred we are reduced to twelve: these twelve compose the whole senate; between us we have to bear all the heavy burdens. We administer the affairs of both town and country, heavy and light alike." In fact, they needed to collect the taxes to maintain the police, to provide corn and oil for the town, to keep up the baths, the aqueducts, the roads, and the public buildings, and to celebrate the public festivities.

To carry out these duties they needed workmen. In these days slaves had become few in number; the councilors therefore relied on the colleges, and on none more inventively than the bakers. Thus gradually the voluntary colleges changed into official colleges; the old names are retained, but the position is new. Of Alexander Severus we first hear that "the townspeople, the clients of his college, are now compelled to fulfill all the magistracies in succession. Here is a complaint under Theodosius of the decurions of Antioch: "Two hundred we are reduced to twelve: these twelve compose the whole senate; between us we have to bear all the heavy burdens. We administer the affairs of both town and country, heavy and light alike." In fact, they needed to collect the taxes to maintain the police, to provide corn and oil for the town, to keep up the baths, the aqueducts, the roads, and the public buildings, and to celebrate the public festivities.

To carry out these duties they needed workmen. In these days slaves had become few in number; the councilors therefore relied on the colleges, and on none more inventively than the bakers. Thus gradually the voluntary colleges changed into official colleges; the old names are retained, but the position is new. Of Alexander Severus we first hear that "the townspeople, the clients of his college, are now compelled to fulfill all the magistracies in succession. Here is a complaint under Theodosius of the decurions of Antioch: "Two hundred we are reduced to twelve: these twelve compose the whole senate; between us we have to bear all the heavy burdens. We administer the affairs of both town and country, heavy and light alike." In fact, they needed to collect the taxes to maintain the police, to provide corn and oil for the town, to keep up the baths, the aqueducts, the roads, and the public buildings, and to celebrate the public festivities.
the armour-makers, actors, actresses, and drivers. Every man is for ever entangled in the net of his moral occupation.

The attachment passed to children, who became members of their college upon birth. Only the daughters of actresses could escape, if they were of honest life or Christians, and so could plead conscientious objections. Usually children followed the occupation of their father: but if the father was bound to no trade, then the mother. In the case of a marriage between persons of unequal rank, the child took the lower rank.

There were still some ways of escape. The man who had been advanced through all grades in his college, and who had become a patron, was thereafter free: but he must act as patron for at least five years. Another way out was by joining the clergy: but in 345 Valentinian entirely forbids any baker to take orders. Honorius in 408 allows the collegiates to become clerics, but they must first abandon all their goods to the college: but in 445 this is again prohibited. Actors and actresses might escape if, in danger of death, they had received the last sacraments, but afterwards recovered: but all the circumstances must be investigated by the governor and his inspectors.

All officers or positions in the Civil Service were forbidden to the collegiates, lest they should be used as a way of escape. Even service in the Army was forbidden them, though the need of soldiers was every day more crying.

And now the only way out was the personal permission of the Emperor. So frequently was this sought, that it was forbidden to ask for it: and even permissions, after being granted, were annulled, on the ground that they had been obtained by surprise or by intrigue: and in 432 it is laid down as a principle that "all permissions, contrary to the public interest, must be assumed to have been obtained by surprise."

Yet so frequent were desertions that inquiry after inquiry was made into them, till in 334 Constantine decree that the penalty of evasion is death. Yet, in spite of all, the number of members decreased. Even the great societies of "quilt-makers" and "branch-bearers" became almost extinct, and shipowners, bakers, and bath-heaters were greatly reduced in numbers.

And now comes a new measure: enforced enrolment, that is, the press-gang. But still the collegiais called out for new members: sometimes the Emperor himself named the new members: more often the governor of a town or province: sometimes the colleges received authority to take whom they would. For the college of "shipowners" rich men were taken in the highest classes. For the bakers there existed in Africa a special registration office. A born baker who lost his parents in childhood could not be made to serve till he was 20: a substitute had to be found. But when the youth reached 20, both he and the substitute had to serve for life. Sometimes, in despair, one college grabbed the members of another. Young provincials who came to Rome for their studies were specially reserved: more often the governor of a town or province had to condemn criminals, in particular for the college of bakers. The collegiais was a sort of trade guild, and the members were branded on the arm, so that they might be recognised anywhere. Useless, when men had come to prefer death to a miserable life. The incredible number of new laws shows the helplessness of the State. No wonder it fell to pieces at the first onset by the barbarians: and in this collision the colleges finally perished.

Before this lecture was delivered, that blow had been struck by the outburst of war. Since then the course of the war has hastened the State organisation of all trades, and a large and new experience has been won. It is proposed later on to discourse this new experience. But it is first desirable to face the problems directly raised by the war. This was attempted in a second series of lectures delivered in July, 1915, which will now be published in The New Age under the title of "Germany in Word and Deed."

TO X.

whose immodies are superior to his serious verse

(With apologies to Mr. Austin Dobson)

I.

You intended a joke,
And it turned out a sonnet;
You're an unlucky bloke;
You intended a Pome;
You let phantasy roam,
And it turned out a skit of it.

II.

You intended a Pome,
And it turned out a skit of it;
You let phantasy roam,
You intended a Pome;
But the steering-gear broke,
As you said when you'd done it.

You intended a joke,
And it turned out a sonnet.

C. E. B.
Central Europe.

VI.—THE "TRADE WAR."

In the course of the last few weeks, since these articles were begun, I have had opportunities of examining several pamphlets published in this country with the aim of drawing attention to the need of industrial and business organisation; and nothing in them has struck me more forcibly than the apparent ignorance of our commercial bodies such as Chambers of Commerce and kindred institutions. These bodies are still only feeling their way in the matter of organisation; but, even if it be admitted (as it has been insisted) that English organisation ought to proceed on totally different lines from German, it must be acknowledged, surely, that the most elementary facts concerning the organisation of German industries, plus the relations between German businesses and the State, have not yet been appreciated in this country. A vague notion seems to persist that all we need do is to arrange for Government subsidies for banks, which can in their turn subsidise export or other industries, induce the Trade Unions to withdraw their restrictions and mobilise, and there you are! The problem demands so much more than this that I should like to emphasise the nature of our coming commercial opposition by a quotation or two from the German papers.

One point, however, before we begin. To the eternal shame of the Country (I sometimes think! It was in London that the more sordid nature of the war first became prominent, and this unfortunate result was achieved when the Northcliffe papers, at a very early stage, started the panic about "German trade." Just when the original Expeditionary Force was fighting its way back from Mons, and when the French were making desperate efforts to defend their existence, a newspaper syndicate in England, and a very large one, the people would find nothing better to do than to examine statistics relating to Germany's export trade and decide how it could best be "captured" for the benefit of a few profit-making concerns among us. The French have not yet forgiven this sordidness, and the Germans have poked bitter fun at it for nearly two years. The Economic Conference in Paris seemed to all our enemies merely confirmation of the fact that England has succeeded in persuading her allies to pursue the course of what I have sometimes called the "German way of war." It has not been easy to maintain this line of thought; but long before the Economic Conference took place the German newspapers had made up their (inspired) minds that England entered the war solely for the sake of commercial profit. It is useless to point out that, in the meantime, odd men who formed the largest volunteer army ever known—the damage to our prestige had been done. A recent number of the "Hamburger Nachrichten" (May 26 last) emphasises the work accomplished by "Germans abroad," which I mentioned in last week's issue of The New Age; but the paper does not consider what has been done as adequate:

We have always maintained that the coming trade war cannot be waged advantageously for this country from Berlin—a great part of the work must be done abroad. The German in foreign parts is quite capable of waging a trade war against his competitors if he is supported by well-organised industries and political-economic principles at home. But not even that has sufficed in the past, and will certainly not suffice in the future, when, to all appearances, England is not merely against competition in its customary forms, but against a competitive war, organised and intensified to the highest point by the best and most critic of the democracies of England. It stands to reason that diplomats who write over this head are also aware of this.

Militarism, Dr. May insists, was an enormously important factor in the organisation of the German Empire; "as a century of universal service has clearly demonstrated." But compulsion, he goes on to say, has not proved efficacious merely in the moral sense of the word. Compulsion has been beneficial throughout our entire national life. One has only to think of education, the passport system, taxation, and sanitary organisation. The result is often that the individual must suffer, "his life and limb and the털s of his property and his character." The individual who advances rapidly beyond his fellows finds himself forced into the Procrustean bed of State progress. And the process is a slow one, for the millions require time for new conquests—but to the masses this State organisation does represent progress; the dawn of a new growth of culture. For them the State is no longer the bailiff or the policeman, but a teacher and a helper.

These are abstract questions which we must set down these quotations because they indicate how the problems of industrial and political reconstruction are being regarded abroad; and with these and similar articles we move beyond the sphere of Naumann's book. There is no periodical of any kind in England which is dealing with the problem of international competition plus industrial and social reconstruction with anything like German science or thoroughness. It is none the less essential that we should know what our enemies are thinking, and it is even more important that we should know what they have done and are about to do. Our Press, for reasons of its own, has been laying stress on the difficulties of Germany and Austria-Hungary—lack of food and raw material, etc. But the reform and reconstruction is of more importance than the difficulties, and we must become acquainted with it.

Henry J. Northbrook.
The Mobilisation of the Empire.

By W. Mears.

An outline of a scheme that will enable us to lose more men during the war than any other nation, and yet possess the largest quantity of cheap labour of all. All our missions assure us that in modern warfare victory is entirely a question of numbers. Fortunately the public have taken this lesson to heart and the old idea that a nation was victorious in war through the skill of its leaders now finds few supporters. Our women and elderly men have braced themselves to endure a wastage that may involve the destruction of all our males of military age. Yet even this magnificent exhibition of bulldog tenacity, worthy of the highest traditions of profiteering, may not prove sufficient to win the war. If Prussianism is to be destroyed it is essential that steps be taken at once to provide material for unlimited wastage when the man power of our masses is exhausted. If the following scheme is carried out there will be no grounds for the slightest pessimism as to the future of our country. Our affairs will be directed by the same able hands, for modern warfare luckily, does not inflict casualties upon the true leaders of our nation: the profiteers.

The scheme, in short, is this: we must organise the whole of the human material in the Empire and apply it to the destruction of Prussianism. It is obvious to all that however long a strategically defeated Germany may continue to struggle, she is bound to succumb at some date in the future when our 380,000,000 coloured citizens are mobilised against her. In fact, the opinion has been advanced that it would not be necessary to incur the trouble and expense of training and equipping such a multitude. It has been maintained, that since by the fundamental rule of modern warfare only numbers give victory, we could advance through Germany merely by providing such a vast mass of cannon fodder that the Germans would not have sufficient ammunition to destroy it all. In other words, the great push to Berlin would be like the irresistible advance of a swarm of locusts.

This article, however, is not concerned with the military side of the question; though one would think that if the above scheme is practicable, a start could be made with the old age pensioners and other "bouches inutiles" in this country. It is as an industrial reserve that the subject-races of the Empire will be most useful, and it is on this point that the public requires most guidance.

The more far-sighted among us are already anxious regarding our capacity to maintain our labour supply. We have now fallen back upon our last white industrial reserve, the women and children, and they are rapidly being used up. It is, therefore, imperative that we should drop all foolish prejudices about race, colour, and cheap labour, and make use of all the resources that Providence has placed in our hands. Fortunately the war has had a civilising influence here. Every Englishman will agree that the Senegalaise and the Pathans, for instance, since they are on the side of the enemy, are superior to the Germans. Consequently the public will need very little instruction before it recognises that it is only just to allow a man to work with you if you permit him to fight for you. Moreover, Hindis, Malays, Arabs, Negroes, etc., are all citizens of the Empire, and it is but natural that they should come to the Motherland and help her in her hour of need. Besides, everybody is agreed that whatever is considered necessary by our rulers to win the war must be done. So it is hardly possible that any patriot would dare to object to working with a Zulu or to marrying a Hindoo. On the other hand, if the destruction of Prussianism demands his consent to either innovation.

The introduction of coloured labour into English industry will not only enable us enormously to increase our output of munitions, but will provide us with most valuable assistance in the future trade war with Germany. Indeed, if the Central Powers were to collapse to-morrow, this scheme should still be adopted. Everyone knows that neither the education of our workers nor the intelligence of our profiteers is sufficient to enable us to compete successfully with Germany on the markets of the world. We are bound to rely upon the cheapness of our labour, and the introduction of Asians and Negroes is the only method by which we can make certain of an ample supply. In fact, the only serious prejudice against coloured labour is based on the ground of its cheapness. Fortunately, the entrance of women into industry has modified ideas on this point, and, what is still more important, weakened the power of the trade unions. When all able-bodied men are removed from the workshops to the firing line and their places taken by Chinese, Negroes, etc., our workers will no longer be hampered by selfish class interests in their efforts to win the war. It may be found cheaper to displace our women as well, but there is some difference of opinion about this. In any case they deserve the gratitude of our profiteers for the completeness with which they have paved the way for our new workers.

We must also remember that we are fighting this war to preserve posterity from the menace of Prussianism. The children of our nation will not think, if we have saved them from Germany, only to leave them and England without cheap and abundant labour. Yet if the fighting males of the lower orders are killed off, who is to breed the wage slaves of the future? Again here the black and brown millions of our Empire will save us from disaster. Of course, few dreamers will raise a clamour about the evils of miscegenation, but what has profiteering to do with purity of race? Even if it be true that Mulattoes and Eurasians are brutish and servile, such qualities are quite appropriate to a slave class. Also it must be borne in mind that these proposals affect the lower orders only; the governing class will maintain its unsullied lineage.

It is essential that only the males of the various races that will form our new workers should be introduced. Otherwise the difficult problem of finding husbands for our enormous surplus of women could not be solved. It is to be hoped that our spinsters will raise no objection to the spouses provided for them; otherwise they will spoil the noble record of uncompelled patriotism that their sex has maintained during the war. They will surely recognise how illogical it would be.

It is delightful to think how admirably adapted are our popular institutions for the instruction, guidance, and amusement of the new England. Our Press has already been brought to the level of the most backward races. Our picture papers and cinemas have been designed to appeal to the meanest intelligence. Furthermore, what is most important of all, neither from our schools, our churches, nor from our Press can anyone ideas be obtained that can prove dangerous to the stability of our governing class.

The scheme that has been outlined here is not only essential to the destruction of Prussianism, but is quite in accordance with our economic development. Our workers, having made no serious effort to control industry, can but expect to be eliminated when the interests of their employers demand this step. The free Englishman of the 19th century has become the conscript workman of the 20th, soon to disappear in defence of a codrty where he is no longer essential. Nothing could be more natural than his supersession by the still cheaper races of the Empire.

The advantages that will accrue to those who live on rent, interest, and profits, when this great scheme has been carried out are innumerable. The future holds out such a glorious prospect for them that it is an inadequate medium in which to convey its brilliancy. Only those with the lyrical gift can do justice to such a Utopia for profiteers; a gift that the writer, unfortunately, does not possess.
Drama.
By John Francis Hope.

American drama has, at least, variety. I have hardly recovered from "Daddy Longlegs," or forgotten "Kick-In;" and now Mr. Percy Mackaye's play* come to remind me that there is still in America a survival of the poetic tradition. Mr. Mackaye has been called the American laureate, and he is certainly gifted—in his choice of subject. Chaucer, Jeanne d'Arc, Sappho, and the Devil, these are subjects that justify the critic's remark that there is no other poet in America "whose aim is more consistently high or whose scope is larger." Three of these five plays are actually written in blank verse, and Mr. Mackaye's stage-craft is quite equal to the demands made by his love of pageantry. But he does not live up to his subjects; his Sappho is garrulous, his Chaucer as stupid as the usual jester, while Jeanne d'Arc walks through this play with no more glory than is naturally hers.

It hardly seems worth while to resurrect Chaucer and the Canterbury Pilgrims to work out a wager concerning the virtue of the Prioress; yet that is the plot of Mr. Mackaye's play. Chaucer stakes his freedom on her honour; if the man whom she meets proves to be not her brother, Chaucer is pledged to marry the Wife of Bath. The Prioress seems to be the only one who does not know that her brother, the Knight, is in the company; and to win the wager the Wife of Bath has the Knight gagged and bound, and personates him until she gets from the Prioress the brooch of gold which is the proof required. Chaucer wanders in and out, writing poems for the Squire, and suffering his satire of Bath, having been married five times, cannot legally be married again except by dispensation of the King. When he confronts the King, the dispensation to marry again is granted to the Wife of Bath on the condition that she marries a miller. The stratagem does not work; she is heard and echoed by all those ladies who, like her in this play, do not know why they were born.

"The Ladies' Tree"; and although Jeanne declares that "there are no fairies more in Domremy," Mr. Mackaye cannot forbear his reminiscence of "Macbeth," and the "Ladies of Lorraine" approach her, each peering forth from a "bush, birch, or flowering shrub." But Jeanne does not see them; she is listening to her "voices," and rehearsing Mr. Mackaye's monologue, which presently she utters. I quote it as an example of his poetry.

O little town, hush still thy breath and hark! Thou yelIow thatches and thy poplars pale; Anger Jeannette must pass away from thee. And thou too, art up-gathered in home fields; Good night! Thou winkest with thy lids of vines, The' rooks are whirling to the nested eaves.

Vive la France! Victoire! La France Sauvee! 
For He who once disdained not to stay
His wandering star o'er tiny Bethlehem
To find the shepherds, His shinning messengers to fetch thy maid.
O little town, hush still thy breath and hark!
Amid thy narrow streets are plays better at cross-purposes than he does at poetry, and his morals are as pure as Michael's are supposed to be. My only regret is that he has no wit.
ABILITY.—We are accustomed to hear of men of great ability—who, nevertheless, remain poor. There are men who can "make anything but money." The distinction between human ability and economic ability is, however, not necessarily to the disgrace of economics. Ability, in the economic sense, has a special meaning; and while it by no means excludes ability of other kinds, the only ability with which it is concerned is the ability to "bring things to market." What is marketable and what is actually marketed are the sole concerns of economics as the science of production; and hence for the discipline of ability that enters into its purview is economic ability. It is true that even from this point of view certain forms of ability have a legitimate ground of complaint against the world. They may truly say that they are too good for the market. It is possible that the commodities they can produce are unmarketable on account of the absence of an intelligent demand. It is true, again, that we must all deplore the marketability of certain forms of ability, and wish that they did not exist. But the range of the market is defined by the range of society; and it is useless to complain that abilities are wasted on the one hand, or encouraged when they should not be, on the other—so long as supply and demand determine what shall be extracted in the way of livelihood for desirable abilities that now cannot find a market, or to starve out undesirable abilities that to-day find a ready market—we should need to revolutionise the conception of a market altogether. We should need, in fact, to abolish the market.

UTILITY.—Much the same as has just been said of ability can be said of utility, when it is employed in economics. Utility would appear in ordinary conversation to mean something useful—or, rather, anything useful: just as ability would appear to mean any capacity for anything. But the range of utility is not the same. Its object is to abolish the market. Economically the output of a nation over a given period is the sum of the goods and services actually marketed or put on the market in that period; and they are "valued" or their value is estimated at the market price. Actually, however, the market price is no less than the maximum profit a profiteer can obtain when all his tricks have been played.

OUTPUT.—There are two kinds of output as there are two kinds of ability and utility. One is the output of goods and services given by people to each other out of love and human fellowship. It is by far the most precious. But the other is alone the economic output, for it consists only of those goods and services that are brought to market. Economically the output of a nation over a given period is the sum of the goods and services actually marketed or put on the market in that period; and they are "valued" or their value is estimated at the market price. Actually, however, the market price is no less than the maximum profit a profiteer can obtain when all his tricks have been played.

LAW OF SUPPLY AND DEMAND.—Or, as it may be abbreviated, L.S.D. We have seen that the essential feature of commercial economics is a market, and that a market exists wherever a buyer and a seller come together. The Law of Supply and Demand is therefore concerned with the habits of the sellers and the buyers. Demand is the abstraction of all the Buyers: Supply is the abstraction of all the Sellers. Now the object of the Seller is to sell his goods as dearly as possible; and the object of the Buyer is to buy the Seller's goods as cheaply as possible. (This is the assumption implied in market-economics.) How will they come to terms? Each will measure his own needs and resources against those of the other and make adjustment of the difference until finally the difference has disappeared; and at that moment a Sale is effected. The Law of Supply and Demand registers that Sale is said to have been fixed by the Law of Supply and Demand; and in other words it is the point at which contending desires as to the same object compromise. For so long as this kind of chaffering continues, so long will the law of Supply and demand regulate price. But it is scarcely necessary to say that the Law is not a real law or one that cannot as easily be broken as obeyed. Outside the market, indeed, the Law does not carry the smallest weight; it can be and is ignored with impunity to human advantage. In all transactions between friends, between members of the same family, between Governments and their servants, in public services, and in all institutions run socially by gentlemen, L.S.D. is kicked out of doors and the Rule of Supply and Need takes its place.
A Modern Document.
Edited by Herbert Lawrence.
IX.—From Acton Reed.

DEAR MR. LAWRENCE,—We sail on Thursday. And "we," it seems, are a good many. Do you know I am quite alarmed at the prospect of living in public again after all these weeks passed in my own company and in writing about myself may I add day out? I have never had such a time! There is not a shadow of doubt that you have only Providence to thank for your relief; for long I should have continued to bombard you I will not further discredit myself or my arithmetic with surmising. There are, I know for certain, two or three more subjects on which I intended to clear up my mind at your expense. And perhaps more would have appeared for there seems no end to me. However, I have probably already hung myself with the rope you have allowed me, and more would be waste. It is all for the best that I have only time now to thank you for your patience up to date—whatever the bill may amount to. But only if you will believe that my thanks to you are as sincere as they are inadequate shall I be persuaded that you realise one part of the obligation under which I feel to you. Had my time not been so lenitively occupied it would most certainly have been passed in the fears and forebodings of failure which I described in my last. But my first object was to clear up my mind at your expense. And perhaps you have allowed me, and more would be waste. I await my new venture with dread. May the contrary of what appears to await me befall you, both in your life and in your work.

Yours sincerely,

ACTON REED.

X.—From Acton Reed.

DEAR MR. LAWRENCE,—Your letter was forwarded to Liverpool, and was handed to me a few minutes before we left the hotel for the docks. I tell you this that you may understand why I was unable to answer it before coming on board, for otherwise the suggestion it contained deserved and would have enraged an immediate reply. Since the resolution is of your own moving, I shall not hesitate to second and carry it, for I confess that (weather permitting) there is nothing I would like better than to fill up the leisure of the voyage in mobilising my ideas on the two or three subjects I have in mind. Not that I have any cause to complain of my company. Everyone is most friendly and cheery. But to know that you will continue to be interested in anything to you may write to me will keep my thoughts from picking and stealing the odious comparisons I might otherwise make of myself with the other women here. They are a most efficient lot, I can assure you.

We have had no experiences or adventures that would be worth your hearing, though there have been several most amusing moments. Smile if you will at them. Our bulldog provided the first at Euston on Wednesday night, as you can imagine, being feeling that it was not quite a laughing matter saying kit-bag labelled for the Pyramids and to find yourself bound for the Dogs' Home at Battersea. Our bull-dog provided the first at Euston on Wednesday night, as you can imagine, being feeling that it was not quite a laughing matter saying kit-bag labelled for the Pyramids and to find yourself bound for the Dogs' Home at Battersea. Our bull-dog provided the first at Euston on Wednesday night, as you can imagine, being feeling that it was not quite a laughing matter saying kit-bag labelled for the Pyramids and to find yourself bound for the Dogs' Home at Battersea.

Preliminary Observations.—The text of which this is a new and critically summarised edition consists of an anonymous metrical epigram. The version given is that found in the Codex Cursitorius (Section B, XIX, 1250). The commentary will take due notice of textual variants wherever these appear to affect the sense materially. It will also discuss the aesthetic and philological questions which previous editors have raised in connection, with these interesting lines. An attempt has been made for the first time to sift the literature of the subject, the bulk of which is considerable, and to settle doubtful points in a brief and discriminating manner.

LANGUAGE.—The lack of noun inflections and the paucity of verbal ending, justify the assumption that the language is English of the early twelfth century. A closer examination has led to the generally accepted conclusion that we here have a specimen of the Southern dialect. As Pobble is inclined to trace a few Midland elements.

STYLE.—This can best be characterised in the impressive words of Dr. Wolfgang Boltz (see below): "The sudden jerking forth of these fang-like vocables, the savage crunch of their steely, tenacious grip, may appropriately be compared to the ruthless and over..."

METRE.—Iambic pentameter with occasion reversed stress in the first foot (as possibly in l. 3) with consecutively masculine rhythmic. It is thus identified with the so-called heroic verse of the older prosodists, the scheme of which is as follows:

1 2 3 4 5

AUTHORSHIP.—The epigram bears the signature P.S., but this affords so scanty an indication of the authorship that it may justifiably be designated as anonymous. Numerous attempts have been made to identify the bearer of these initials. The most important and feasible of these will be dealt with in the commentary.

BIBLIOGRAPHY (selected).—Prof. Marcellus U. Fagg. The authorship of the Cursiorius Fragment. 3 vols. Baltimore. (A monument of brilliant research and penetrative reasoning. Prof. Fagg inclines to the theory of joint authorship, but leaves the actual question finally unsolved.)

Dr. Wolfgang Boltz. Das Entstehungsproblem des sog. Cursiorius-Fragmente. Ein Beitrag zur Literatur- und Literaturgeschichte. 2 Bände. Haile u. S. (Dr. Boltz, who has also written a most discerning treatise on traces of cuniform in Labrador, brings the same comparative-genealogical and encyclopaedic condition to bear on the present subject. He suggests 73 possible authors, and in each case aduces striking arguments reinforced by a wealth of illustrative evidence.)

C. Fripp. An exploded canard, being an exposure of Fleet Street audacity, American dullness and German hebetude. (This pamphlet of 3 pp., worthless both from a scholarly and critical point of view, is mentioned here, only to be unconditionally repudiated. The author, whose allusions to the labours of Professor Fagg and Dr. Boltz are in the worst of taste, assigns the epigram to a P. Selver. Such an assumption is totally unwarranted, as the collected evidence of the most competent investigators demonstrates beyond dispute.)

J. Kuipers and B. Bols. Beknopte leerboek der Engelsche taal 5 deelen. Zwolle. (Invaluable for its comprehensive glimpse and encyclopaedic erudition to bear on the subject.)

Prof. Yrjo Leitio. Viipurin Iäänin palauttaminen Suomen yhteyteen. Helsingfors. (An exhaustive and penetrative reasoning. Prof. Fagg inclines to the theory of joint authorship, but leaves the actual question finally unsolved.)

The works of the following have also been consulted:

Pobble (good, but occasionally erratic and hasty). Zentnerschwer (rather weak on the exegetic side). Muck (useful, but on the whole, too conservative). Racker (hardly capable of coping with textual difficulties in an effective manner).

TEXT.—The text, in the version here adopted, is as follows:

ON SELVER.

His satire tingles with a stinging fire;
But if another Selver roused his ire,
Then would the barbed and acid flame of it
Surpass all satire mortal ever writ.

P. S.

COMMENTARY.

TITLE.—On: Observe the figurative use of the preposition. For examples of analogous uses, see Kuipers and Bols (op. cit.), Vol. IV, pp. 768-769. Selver: Various writings bearing the signature P. Selver are found elsewhere in the Codex Cursiorius, and it is to these that the epigram probably alludes. They are, however, of little importance or merit, and would deserve no mention here were it not for the fact that Pobble, who is apt to be superficial, has attempted to identify their author with the P.S. of the epigram. It is hardly necessary to point out, as both Prof. Fagg and Dr. Boltz have most ably done in refutation of this argument, that:

(1) It is unprecedented to find an author composing an epigram on himself, especially when this epigram is the reverse of complimentary.

(2) The writings bearing the signature P. Selver differ considerably from the epigram in style, and, as regards literary value, are greatly inferior to it. But see also the note to l. 2.

Racker has adopted the curious assumption that the epigram is not uncomplimentary, but is, in fact, couched in highly eulogistic terms. This erroneous interpretation forms the subject-matter of an essay in "Gamma," Vol. XXX, pp. 89-217 (q.v.). Zentnerschwer has discovered a record of the name P. Selver in Kelly's Directory of Kentish Town, St. Pancras and North Paddington (1916, p. 348).

1. I. satira: As Mück points out, the Selver writings appear for the most part to be of a satiric nature. Hence the allusion.

The origin of the word itself has been much debated. See Beanstalk's "Pantheon of Antiquity" (pp. 774-1125).

tingles: Dr. Boltz conjectures the variant "tinkles." This suggestion has a double value: (1) It adds to the onomatopoeic nature of the wording. (2) It removes the ugly repetition of the -ing sound in the same line. Racker has objeced that this variant is untenable, since it introduces a mixture of images. But in 1. 2, there is a similar construction, and Pobble has very aptly cited a passage from Baudelaire's "Fleurs du Mal":

"Les parfums, les couleurs et les sons se répondent..."

(Connotations, l. 8.)

The word is derived from the Early Middle English "tinglen," another form of "tinklen," the frequentative of "tinkle." This etymology lends colour to the alternative reading, and which is as follows:

stinging: Mück proposes "stinking." This, however, is unnecessarily harsh, and as an epithet is not appropriate to the following noun.

1. 2, but if, etc.: The following punctuation has been ingeniously suggested by Prof. Fagg: "But if another Selver roused his ire." The epigram would thus appear to have been written not on but to Selver. In this case the heading is probably a spurious interpolation of later date. It may be added that this reading would help to remove many of the difficulties presented by the text as it stands.

3. 1, would: Used here not as an auxiliary of volition, but to form the apodosis of a conditional sentence. The word is derived from the Early Middle English past participle, "written," of the strong verb, "to write." The phrasing is perhaps awkward, and as an epithet is not appropriate to the following noun.

3. 2, but if, etc.: The following punctuation has been ingeniously suggested by Prof. Fagg: "But if another Selver roused his ire." The epigram would thus appear to have been written not on but to Selver. In this case the heading is probably a spurious interpolation of later date. It may be added that this reading would help to remove many of the difficulties presented by the text as it stands.

4. mortal: May be here either (1) a noun, or (2) an adjective. If (1) be taken, the line could be expanded thus: "Surpass all satire which (or that) mortal ever writ." The second interpretation, to which Dr. Boltz inclines, is due to Mück, and which is as follows:

"Surpass all mortal satire which (or that) has ever been written." This latter certainly appears the more likely of the two, and is now generally adopted.

write: Abbreviated form of the normal past tense and past participle, "written," of the strong verb, "to write." Its use is confined to poetical and archaic language. See Kuipers and Bols (op. cit.), Vol. III, pp. 978-1163.

For a more comprehensive discussion of the various points at issue, the student is referred to the works cited in the bibliography. In them he will also find more copious references to the literature of the subject, which will afford him invaluable guidance for further research.
He then handed her with diffidence a charmingly jewelled bracelet, which, he said, one of his nephews, a slave to the love of Mrs. Simmonds, had begged him to carry to her as a poor worshipper's gift to the queen of all beauty. The upshot of this was that Mrs. Simmonds, who was no novice in these matters, assured Mr. Simmonds, who had not been on Indian administration for thirty years in vain, that the Chief Brahmin's nephew seemed to be a fit and proper person to occupy a certain vacant post upon the Rajah's Board of Works. Mr. Simmonds made the suggestion and it was, of course, adopted by the Rajah. This shows the importance of Mrs. Simmonds.

And now they were leaving Nagapore! Mr. Simmonds had been transferred to a still higher post, with permission first to proceed home on six months' leave. They gave a farewell dinner. The guests were few, for not even a lucrative and strictly private sale of native jewellery back to the makers allowed them to venture on feeding, say, thirty thousand poor Brahmins, which is the Hindu equivalent to roasting an ox in the market-square. However, everything was on a proper scale. There was not so very much to eat (bazaar expenses were high in Nagapore), the cooking was not perfect (there are expensive cooks in Anglo-India and cheap cooks, and you get what you pay for, in point of dignity—it was dignified! There were at least twelve attendants and seven guests. The Rajah, whose caste scrapes—he had so little of either)—did not prevent his presence, was the only Indian guest, though, if certain signs are any guide, the late Mr. MacBuchanan, the daughters of his Agricultural Adviser, were also a little tinged with the blood of the land. Their whole conversation was little shrieks of laughter and 'Oh, for goodness' sake, Mr. Simmonds!' The other guest were the widower Krishnaswami, the Rajah's Chief Secretary, and a new irrigation dam. He greeted her with every sign of respect, and, in course of salutation, compared her eyes to the rays of the moon in the lighted fortnight, and the tapering horns of a holy bull, and the swaying of her hips (Mrs. Simmonds had spoken to him in his own language).

All this, I hope, serves to show how important Mr. Simmonds was, and goes a good way towards explaining the importance of Mrs. Simmonds. Not only in her own eyes was she of consequence, but she received evidence of it every day. For example, the Rajah's same Chief Brahmin arrived upon her verandah one morning when Mr. Simmonds had ridden out to inspect a new irrigation dam. He greeted her with every sign of respect, and, in course of salutation, compared her eyes to the rays of the moon in the lighted fortnight, her hands to the tapering horns of a holy bull, and the swaying of her hips (Mrs. Simmonds thought this so oriental) to the undulations of Maitreya, the celestial dancing-girl (Mrs. Simmonds was a little uneasy). He then handed her with diffidence a charmingly jewelled bracelet, which, he said, one of his nephews, a slave to the love of Mrs. Simmonds, had begged him to carry to her as a poor worshipper's gift to the queen of all beauty. The upshot of this was that Mrs. Simmonds, who was no novice in these matters, assured Mr. Simmonds, who had not been on Indian administration for thirty years in vain, that the Chief Brahmin's nephew seemed to be a fit and proper person to occupy a certain vacant post upon the Rajah's Board of Works. Mr. Simmonds made the suggestion and it was, of course, adopted by the Rajah. This shows the importance of Mrs. Simmonds.

And now they were leaving Nagapore! Mr. Simmonds had been transferred to a still higher post, with permission first to proceed home on six months' leave. They gave a farewell dinner. The guests were few, for not even a lucrative and strictly private sale of native jewellery back to the makers allowed them to venture on feeding, say, thirty thousand poor Brahmins, which is the Hindu equivalent to roasting an ox in the market-square. However, everything was on a proper scale. There was not so very much to eat (bazaar expenses were high in Nagapore), the cooking was not perfect (there are expensive cooks in Anglo-India and cheap cooks, and you get what you pay for, in point of dignity—it was dignified! There were at least twelve attendants and seven guests. The Rajah, whose caste scrapes—he had so little of either)—did not prevent his presence, was the only Indian guest, though, if certain signs are any guide, the late Mr. MacBuchanan, the daughters of his Agricultural Adviser, were also a little tinged with the blood of the land. Their whole conversation was little shrieks of laughter and 'Oh, for goodness' sake, Mrs. Simmonds!' The other guest were the widower Krishnaswami, the Rajah's Chief Secretary, and a new irrigation dam. He greeted her with every sign of respect, and, in course of salutation, compared her eyes to the rays of the moon in the lighted fortnight, and the tapering horns of a holy bull, and the swaying of her hips (Mrs. Simmonds had spoken to him in his own language).

All this, I hope, serves to show how important Mr. Simmonds was, and goes a good way towards explaining the importance of Mrs. Simmonds. Not only in her own eyes was she of consequence, but she received evidence of it every day. For example, the Rajah's same Chief Brahmin arrived upon her verandah one morning when Mr. Simmonds had ridden out to inspect a new irrigation dam. He greeted her with every sign of respect, and, in course of salutation, compared her eyes to the rays of the moon in the lighted fortnight, her hands to the tapering horns of a holy bull, and the swaying of her hips (Mrs. Simmonds had spoken to him in his own language).

All this, I hope, serves to show how important Mr. Simmonds was, and goes a good way towards explaining the importance of Mrs. Simmonds. Not only in her own eyes was she of consequence, but she received evidence of it every day. For example, the Rajah's same Chief Brahmin arrived upon her verandah one morning when Mr. Simmonds had ridden out to inspect a new irrigation dam. He greeted her with every sign of respect, and, in course of salutation, compared her eyes to the rays of the moon in the lighted fortnight, her hands to the tapering horns of a holy bull, and the swaying of her hips (Mrs. Simmonds had spoken to him in his own language).

All this, I hope, serves to show how important Mr. Simmonds was, and goes a good way towards explaining the importance of Mrs. Simmonds. Not only in her own eyes was she of consequence, but she received evidence of it every day. For example, the Rajah's same Chief Brahmin arrived upon her verandah one morning when Mr. Simmonds had ridden out to inspect a new irrigation dam. He greeted her with every sign of respect, and, in course of salutation, compared her eyes to the rays of the moon in the lighted fortnight, her hands to the tapering horns of a holy bull, and the swaying of her hips (Mrs. Simmonds had spoken to him in his own language).
Letters from France.

III.—THE LITTLE KINGDOM.

I think it more than probable that Nature is going to feed us for our aptitude of peace. In homely words the air, French and other, is laden with exhalations of "back to Nature." It is, however, not exactly the "back to the former years," but something far different. It is more like "forward to," and I feel that its meaning resides in the word externalism. Though this word does not satisfy me, it serves to denote my antagonism towards the tottering and worn-out—or should it be, misapplying?—things that I have precisely in mind is this: There is a movement taking place in my midst in France towards not only the recovery and restoration of lost and devastated departments, particularly of the Marne and Meuse and depopulated which, in that, but the welding of each region so recovered and restored into organic form expressing its real individuality. That is to say, a form external to all other forms, but having a distinct and inseparable spiritual affinity to them. There are two sides to this movement, the objective and subjective. There is the active and contemplative movement in its material and unglorified state directed by architects, engineers, contractors and speculators solely towards the conversion of the war-wrecked districts of France and Belgium into little portable villages, and there is the active and contemplative movement in its spiritualized state aiming to honour reclaimed regions by recognising and developing their soul instead of leaving it out as in past years and ages, ever since, in fact, the Middle Ages. Aiming, moreover, to make it visible to man and a safe guide for him along the path of permanent peace. It may be that men are about to be invited to re-enter the little kingdom or small State—of which I fancy Switzerland and Germany are lesser degree, are handy working models—there to regain that wisdom and proud and independent step which Nietzsche tells us is part and parcel of it. I mention Switzerland because it has attained a form of republicanism which, in France and America, is an unrealised dream as yet.

To this general movement the term regionalism has been applied, which I will retain for the present. But it does not conduct one to the root of the whole matter. Besides, it has been alive for the last twenty-five years, and has put on all sorts of loose associations. "What about inter-regionalism or internationalism?" someone will inquire. Well, the present day movement is not inter but extra-national, not intra but exter-national. It is something outside of and beyond the country, first a going into the self of a region, and localising this, and thereafter a going out on the self and universalising it in such a way that it is communicated by art, drama, and literature to all the great instincts of human nature which accordingly rise in order to absolute inspiration. This is what Greece did, and what Ireland might do if set free to the purpose. Ireland rid of oppression might indeed realise the whole of its nature both inside and out; all that it has of emotion, thought, and activity, and especially of the creation and inspiration of the arts. In other words, it could express its real individuality. That is to say, a self-contained little kingdom inspanding fruitfully unto itself instead of endlessly and wastefully expanding outwards to other kingdoms. Greece, as I have said, was actually

have lavished on Mrs. Simmonds and myself are only the last links in the long chain of generosity and support I have been privileged to enjoy at your hands. If during the last few years I have spent here in Nagapore and have been enabled to accomplish any good work in the endeavour to further the progress and enlightenment of this State and its inhabitants, it is owing solely to the truly noble co-operation of the Rajah and his talented companions here, and to the magnificent backing I have received from my friends, Mr. MacBuchanan and Serg.-er, Mr. Harcourt. Gentlemen, I thank YOU unimportant individuals among millions of their peers.

"Thank God!" muttered Mr. Simmonds savagely, receiving, after some delay, permission from the omnibus they heard their names called. The Rajah and his Brahmin placed at their service. Just as the Rajah, feeling their somewhat unpretentious address.

One fine day about four months later, Mr. and Mrs. Simmonds were walking along Regent Street. Somehow, they were disappointed with England. All that magnificent celebrity wherein they had basked at Nagapore was gone. Here they found more than ten unimportant individuals among millions of their peers. "Thank God!" muttered Mr. Simmonds savagely, only another month! They reached Piccadilly and hurried to catch an omnibus which was standing there.

"Oh, the ignominy of it! At Nagapare they had six horses in their own stables, not to speak of those of the Rajah and his Brahmin placed at their service. Just as Mr. Simmonds was handing Mrs. Simmonds into the omnibus they heard their names called. "Simmonds Sahib! Simmonds Mem Sahib!" And in another more even voice, "Mister and Madame Simmonds!" It was the Rajah of Nagapare (fifteen guns) and Krishnaswami, in a motor car driven by the Rajah. He rapidly explained that the Rajah, feeling their absence so keenly and remembering their kind invitation, had suddenly formed a decision to visit England. Receiving, after some delay, permission from the Vicerey to take a holiday outside his own dominions.

Their Excellencies Mr. and Mrs. Simmonds and, with Misses MacBuchanan and Mrs. Simmonds reached Bombay, homeward bound. One fine day about four months later, Mr. and Mrs. Simmonds were walking along Regent Street. Somehow, they were disappointed with England. All that magnificent celebrity wherein they had basked at Nagapore was gone. Here they found more than ten unimportant individuals among millions of their peers. "Thank God!" muttered Mr. Simmonds savagely, only another month! They reached Piccadilly and hurried to catch an omnibus which was standing there. Oh, the ignominy of it! At Nagapare they had six horses in their own stables, not to speak of those of the Rajah and his Brahmin placed at their service. Just as Mr. Simmonds was handing Mrs. Simmonds into the omnibus they heard their names called. "Simmonds Sahib! Simmonds Mem Sahib!" And in another more even voice, "Mister and Madame Simmonds!" It was the Rajah of Nagapare (fifteen guns) and Krishnaswami, in a motor car driven by the Rajah. He rapidly explained that the Rajah, feeling their absence so keenly and remembering their kind invitation, had suddenly formed a decision to visit England. Receiving, after some delay, permission from the Vicerey to take a holiday outside his own dominions. The next morning Mr. Simmonds received a card as Their Excellencies Mr. and Mrs. Simmonds and, with Misses MacBuchanan and Mrs. Simmonds reached Bombay, homeward bound.

Their Excellencies Mr. and Mrs. Simmonds and, with Misses MacBuchanan and Mrs. Simmonds reached Bombay, homeward bound. One fine day about four months later, Mr. and Mrs. Simmonds were walking along Regent Street. Somehow, they were disappointed with England. All that magnificent celebrity wherein they had basked at Nagapore was gone. Here they found more than ten unimportant individuals among millions of their peers. "Thank God!" muttered Mr. Simmonds savagely, only another month! They reached Piccadilly and hurried to catch an omnibus which was standing there. Oh, the ignominy of it! At Nagapore they had six horses in their own stables, not to speak of those of the Rajah and his Brahmin placed at their service. Just as Mr. Simmonds was handing Mrs. Simmonds into the omnibus they heard their names called. "Simmonds Sahib! Simmonds Mem Sahib!" And in another more even voice, "Mister and Madame Simmonds!" It was the Rajah of Nagapare (fifteen guns) and Krishnaswami, in a motor car driven by the Rajah. He rapidly explained that the Rajah, feeling their absence so keenly and remembering their kind invitation, had suddenly formed a decision to visit England. Receiving, after some delay, permission from the Vicerey to take a holiday outside his own dominions. The next morning Mr. Simmonds received a card as Their Excellencies Mr. and Mrs. Simmonds and, with Misses MacBuchanan and Mrs. Simmonds reached Bombay, homeward bound.

One fine day about four months later, Mr. and Mrs. Simmonds were walking along Regent Street. Somehow, they were disappointed with England. All that magnificent celebrity wherein they had basked at Nagapore was gone. Here they found more than ten unimportant individuals among millions of their peers. "Thank God!" muttered Mr. Simmonds savagely, only another month! They reached Piccadilly and hurried to catch an omnibus which was standing there. Oh, the ignominy of it! At Nagapore they had six horses in their own stables, not to speak of those of the Rajah and his Brahmin placed at their service. Just as Mr. Simmonds was handing Mrs. Simmonds into the omnibus they heard their names called. "Simmonds Sahib! Simmonds Mem Sahib!" And in another more even voice, "Mister and Madame Simmonds!" It was the Rajah of Nagapare (fifteen guns) and Krishnaswami, in a motor car driven by the Rajah. He rapidly explained that the Rajah, feeling their absence so keenly and remembering their kind invitation, had suddenly formed a decision to visit England. Receiving, after some delay, permission from the Vicerey to take a holiday outside his own dominions. The next morning Mr. Simmonds received a card as Their Excellencies Mr. and Mrs. Simmonds and, with Misses MacBuchanan and Mrs. Simmonds reached Bombay, homeward bound.

Their Excellencies Mr. and Mrs. Simmonds and, with Misses MacBuchanan and Mrs. Simmonds reached Bombay, homeward bound. One fine day about four months later, Mr. and Mrs. Simmonds were walking along Regent Street. Somehow, they were disappointed with England. All that magnificent celebrity wherein they had basked at Nagapore was gone. Here they found more than ten unimportant individuals among millions of their peers. "Thank God!" muttered Mr. Simmonds savagely, only another month! They reached Piccadilly and hurried to catch an omnibus which was standing there. Oh, the ignominy of it! At Nagapore they had six horses in their own stables, not to speak of those of the Rajah and his Brahmin placed at their service. Just as Mr. Simmonds was handing Mrs. Simmonds into the omnibus they heard their names called. "Simmonds Sahib! Simmonds Mem Sahib!" And in another more even voice, "Mister and Madame Simmonds!" It was the Rajah of Nagapare (fifteen guns) and Krishnaswami, in a motor car driven by the Rajah. He rapidly explained that the Rajah, feeling their absence so keenly and remembering their kind invitation, had suddenly formed a decision to visit England. Receiving, after some delay, permission from the Vicerey to take a holiday outside his own dominions. The next morning Mr. Simmonds received a card as Their Excellencies Mr. and Mrs. Simmonds and, with Misses MacBuchanan and Mrs. Simmonds reached Bombay, homeward bound.

The next morning Mr. Simmonds received a card as follows:

"H.H. Rajah of Nagapare [here followed several letters] and Mr. Minopati Krishnaswami Ayengar, M.A. (Cantab.), present very humble compliments to Their Excellencies Mr. and Mrs. Simmonds, and with certain hesitation due entirely to violence of respectful veneration wherein they esteem them, beg to put themselves in and recover their honour'd and revered disposal. They will be delighted, nay more, enraptured to accommodate them in their suite at Hotel Cecil and to have almost in the most pleasurable company at resorts of pleasure and profit in metropolis.

"(Signed) M. K. Ayengar, Esq., M.A. (Cantab.)"

Mr. Simmonds was terribly offended at this offer, but, as Mrs. Simmonds said, it was kindly meant, no one would ever know, and she did so want to do the shows in town properly before she went back. It was not, she said, as if they were at Bombay or in the hills.This was really quite another matter. So they accepted the Rajah's invitation, greatly to his gratitude and delight, and he and the over-cultured Krishnaswami entertained them very sumptuously for a whole month.
by a similar ideal, and, in consequence, achieved a "glory" of its own, while Imperial Rome, replacing the ideal by another, attained a "grandeur" of its own. There is a vast difference in the meaning of the two words, "glory" and "grandeur", all the difference, in fact, between the two ideals representing the conflicting geniuses of the two nations. Possibly it was the soul of the word grandeur which gave birth to an antagonistic conception of government, and a multitude of pairs of opposites which have served to keep mankind in a state of warring elements. Thus Caesarism and the rule of the sword came to be preferred to the Mediterranean culture of Greece, to which we may owe the idea of the state, of the institutions of government, and of the principle of equality in its purest form. The rule of the sword is a virus which preys upon the world, dissipation and weakness by unity, concentration and strength. If we seek deep enough we shall find that the movement is, moreover, based upon an endeavour to encourage Man to unite the various characters of Nature and his own characters in his representative God, as of old. So it is really based on a generalization, whence re-emerges the gods of Nature—personality and occupation at their best and highest. Apollo, Dionysus, Pallas Athena, Poseidon, each prepare to be present to particular men only partially or through one region, or partly speaking, is a region unfolding. Set him in an unsuitable region and he will perish of hunger or be devoured. Let him breathe upon his own region, and it will at once become a living fount of subsistence, whence he can derive all materials necessary to food, shelter, clothing, transport and recreation. In short, he will become a true Nature economist in place of a false political one. Le Play's theory receives some support from another theory which I heard Professor Fleury formulate here, in France. It seems that for some time past the professor has been classifying the Welsh people, and has discovered that they are capable of being divided into four definite survival types—Paleolithic, Neolithic, Bronze and Norse, or mountain, valley, plain and coast types. These types have distinctive characteristics, and the solution of the social problem. The fact of the matter is that the two theories are implicit in their proposals is a pre-Roman rule of the sword, a basis of a new and refreshing system of society and morals, a renewed and renewing psychology. We have a proposal that Man shall reproduce his own world in the likeness of his own God; surround himself with a Nature which is the objective rendering of his soul at its purest; understand and become understood according to the measure of his soul-achievement; regard labour at its highest and best as its own reward, and so live in communion with the total soul of things as expressed in his surroundings.

HUNTLY CARTER.

Views and Reviews.

I WORK, THEREFORE I VOTE.

Mr. Asquith's recent announcement that he can no longer deny the women's claim to vote is a triumph for Senor de Maeztu's "functional principle." It is true that Mr. Asquith did not enunciate the theory of the deserving of women's suffrage, but he has been advocating the fable of the gods having divided Man into men that he might be more helpful to himself. He observes that the gods have given to men the various faculties and qualities necessary to make them fit for the various tasks assigned to them. Each man has his own region, or, strictly speaking, is a region unfolding. Set him in an unsuitable region, and he will perish of hunger or be devoured. Let him breathe upon his own region, and it will at once become a living fount of subsistence, whence he can derive all materials necessary to food, shelter, clothing, transport and recreation. In short, he will become a true Nature economist in place of a false political one. Le Play's theory receives some support from another theory which I heard Professor Fleury formulate here, in France. It seems that for some time past the professor has been classifying the Welsh people, and has discovered that they are capable of being divided into four definite survival types—Paleolithic, Neolithic, Bronze and Norse, or mountain, valley, plain and coast types. These types have distinctive characteristics, and the solution of the social problem. The fact of the matter is that the two theories are implicit in their proposals is a pre-Roman rule of the sword, a basis of a new and refreshing system of society and morals, a renewed and renewing psychology. We have a proposal that Man shall reproduce his own world in the likeness of his own God; surround himself with a Nature which is the objective rendering of his soul at its purest; understand and become understood according to the measure of his soul-achievement; regard labour at its highest and best as its own reward, and so live in communion with the total soul of things as expressed in his surroundings.

HUNTLY CARTER.
is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female; ye are all one on the Register.

This is Señor de Maeztu's second political triumph; his first was, as everyone will remember, compulsory military service for men. But success has its obligations; if Señor de Maeztu's relation with the Prime Minister of this country is that of the centurion to the soldier: "Do this, and he doeth it"; obviously we ought to address all our inquiries to Señor de Maeztu. The first inquiry that occurs to me relates to plural voting. The cry: "One man (or one woman), one vote!" is clearly wrong; if the right to vote is not derived from personality as defined by law; but if we vary the cry to: "One function, one vote"; shall we, or shall we not, be committed to a scale of plural voting? What is a function, and what right appertains to it? For example, a woman is a woman, and is not, therefore, entitled to a vote; but she is also a daughter, and, the filial relation entails certain duties in certain circumstances. Is the filial relation to rank as a function, and should it carry a right, and, if so, what right? The same woman may be a wife, and a mother; she may also be a war-worker. Is she entitled to a vote for each of these functions; if she is not, then the right to vote is based upon the legal definition of personality, which is a definition, which is right.

I hope that Señor de Maeztu will not be angry with me, and call himself "a dirty foreigner" because I do not so quickly understand his system as Mr. Asquith does. I do really want to understand these ideas, and the only way I can understand is by asking questions, and having my misapprehensions corrected. Again and again we have been told that we must limit the man in the function, which brings us back to Bentham: one function, one man, one right. But if the man only has six functions, let us say, six functions, do six functions equal six men or one man, do they entail six rights or one right? Is the right, as well as the person, limited by the function; has a wife, for example, only the right to be a wife, or has she the right to vote as a wife? The mere statement of the question answers it; the right to vote does not attach to wifehood, because wifehood is a personal relation, not a function. But many functions are performed by a wife; the more accomplished the wife, the more functions she performs; she may be cook, housekeeper, jobbing tailor, gardener, house-decorator, piano-player, singer, and innumerable other things. Does a right attach to each of these functions, and if so, what right?

The question is really important, for on the basis of personality, vote, the women will have a permanent and automatic majority. But if we adopt the functional principle, "one function, one vote," it will always be possible for the men to obtain a majority. The functional principle will be a most effective stimulus both to politics and to production; the more functions that are performed, the more votes will be cast, and a quite healthy rivalry will be established between the Vesta-Tilley of the women and the versatility of the men. Cleverness will be measured by the number of votes cast, just as a Boy Scout congratulates himself on the number of badges that attest his proficiency in the performance of certain functions. Under such a system, men will regain that prehensility of which they were deprived, and which died; they will learn to perform a hundred functions at once, and as economic power precedes political power, the performance of their functions will be a qualification for the franchise. If they want to outvote the women, they will have to outwork the women, and by doing that by becoming as multiversal as the universe.

The name of man will be heard no more; instead, we shall speak of Walker, Taylor, Brewer, Skinner, Weaver, Baker, etc., or, more briefly, Board of Trade.

I am reminded, at this point, that Señor de Maeztu has declaring against the development of functions; he has insisted that examining courts should allot the functions to the men, a fact which implies an idea of an equitable distribution of functions. But as this system did not contemplate the disfranchisement of women, I hope that it is not binding on the believer. If the functions are to be allotted, and the rights with them, a gang of feminists on the Bench could increase the number of badges that attest his functions, and would place a greater number of functions upon women than upon men. The effect of this would be the handing over of the government of the country to the women; and Señor de Maeztu might find himself condemned to compulsory fatherhood option.

For if no other function were allotted to him, it would be a crime for him to publish his ideas or to enunciate the fundamental principles of politics. The Cabinet would thus be deprived of their chief guide to Truth, and would lapse into the erroneous ideas that inspired their erratic actions before the functional principle defined their purpose. To save his principle, Señor de Maeztu will, I think, have to sacrifice his Constitution and the compulsory powers that he has allotted to it.

Another question that perplexes me is the value of the vote. A vote, I know, is a vote; but will all votes have the same value? Is a good vote equal to a true vote, and are both of them greater than or equal to a beautiful vote? Surely not absolutely equal, valuable; or even if it be asserted that all functions have the same value, surely it must be admitted that there is a qualitative difference within the function. Writing, for example, may be equal to boot-making, but there is a difference between one writer and another. Does the functional principle insist that each writer has only one vote as a writer, does it insist that however men may differ as writers, they are all the same as voters; or does it give a numerical value to the qualitative difference? These are the questions to which we must turn our attention now. The functional principle has become practical politics.

A. E. R.

REVIEWs

Because I am a German. By H. Fernau. (Constable. 2s. 6d. net.)

We learn that this book has been prohibited in Germany, and there is really no reason why we should read what is too bad even for the Germans. It will be remembered that "I Accuse" had a considerable sale in this country, and presumably Herr Fernau thinks it possible to duplicate this success. Anyhow, he has simply defended "I Accuse." He has copied out the criticisms of it, and expounded in his own way most of the accusations and arguments of that anonymous pamphlet. There is, we suppose, a public for this sort of work, but we think that Germany. Certainly there is no need to prove to us that Germany wanted war with us, because we declared war on Germany; and all this playing with official documents is really beside the mark. If we assume that Germany was in no danger from the Triple Entente, it is easy to represent her as a mere aggressor. Germany's suspicion of the intentions of the Entente may have been excessive or unfounded, but there is no doubt that it was genuine, and was not of recent growth. Perhaps when we have won this war we shall be able to convince Germany that we never harboured any ill-feeling towards her, that instead of denying her a place in the sun we were really preparing two places in two suns for her. But we think that it will be easier to blow her to the moon than the sun and that she should read what is

The Kingdom of Heaven as Seen by Swedenborg. By John Howard Spalding. (Dent. 3s. 6d. net.)

Christ spoke words that nobody understood, but Swedenborg wrote books that nobody read. A whole host of commentators have fastened on the words of Christ, but the works of Swedenborg are scarcely known in this country. Yet it cannot be doubted that if Christ's words have any validity for men, Swedenborg's also have a claim to their attention, at the very
least. While Christ discovered the secret of the universe in Love, Swedenborg discovered the system of the heavens and the hells and the hearts of men as easily as a guide-book. There is practically nothing in modern science or modern religion that does not here fall into system, and if painstaking made good propaganda the New Church should benefit by Mr. Spalding's work. But we do feel, with Emerson, the lack of magic in Swedenborg, for his system hardly leaves the soul free to find itself.

Discovery: or, The Spirit and Service of Science. By R. A. Gregory. (Macmillan. 3s. net.)

There is a story of a Duke who prized the order of the Garter above all his other decorations because, he said, "there is no damned merit in that." Mr. Gregory, by his insistence that the spirit of discovery has no connection with utilitarian results, seems to us to adopt the same lofty position as the Duke. Science has become, even in our book, a Goddess, very rapt in expression and very robust in her physical proportions. It is unfortunate, though, that the spirit of Discovery did not inspire the author to discover something new about the pioneers of Science; his book tells us, for the nth time, all the familiar tales of the great men who applied the experimental method and published their results, in spite of all that piety and the police could do to prevent them. Nobody pretends now that a scientist is wicked, but he is probably shrewd and we may well leave the preaching of modesty, and disinterestedness, and perseverance, and the rest to school-teachers. Dear old Darwin, with his, "I have here a little thing on earthworms which I think you might publish," ought to be given a rest. Mr. Gregory will probably find some readers among the scholars of the secondary schools.

The Long Night. By Stanley Weyman. (Dent. 1s. 6d. net.)

This is a jolly bustling story of Geneva in the generation after Calvin, and it gives us all the customary and expected thrills. There is a fine villain, Bastrega, a spy, scholar, and soldier, who reduces the fourth Syndic to treachery and a prolonged course through a trickery concerning a supposed cure-all. There is a dear old lady who periodically becomes insane, and says "There is no God," a remark which, if known, would render her liable to be burnt at the stake as a heretic. There is, of course, the young lover with a sword and a college education, who supports the heroine in her great scenes. The poor heroine, who spends all her time concealing her mother's heresy from the people who know it, is at last accused of witchcraft, and stoned; but she is saved for the time by the hero. Defies the witchcraft outcry has completely developed, the treachery against the freedom of the city comes to a head; the hero distinguishes him by giving the alarm and dropping the torturills through his name, and giving great pot on Bastrega as he is fighting in the street, and breaks his neck, and the whole family deserve so well of the State that the charge of witchcraft is forgotten; and, at last, the lover has his lass. Oh! for a bright sword and a medieval book!

The Carthaginian. By Frank Taylor. (Murray. 1s. 6d. net.)

Hannibal is a figure who has been strangely neglected by poetic dramatists, and it would perhaps have been better if Mr. Taylor had let the Carthaginian remain a figure of history. Certainly, this handling of the last days of Hannibal adds no dignity to his memory; Hannibal, we hope and believe, did not end in a writer of blank verse and bathos, with a King's daughter screaming everything "by this pure kiss." We suppose that her habit of debate (she was her father's chief councillor), and Hannibal's staunch defender since (first he served Prussia), taught her this trick of describing everything as she wanted it to be judged; but she might have dropped her pose of perfection with a man who was moribund, and who died not remembering her but rehearsing one of his victories over Rome. The play reveals no remarkable poetic gift, nor any deep insight into character; but it uses some of the best-known tricks of stagecraft very effectively, and does not seem to be impossible of performance. But Lysandra—oh, Lysandra! She is as self-conscious of her own perfections as a Suffragette, or Mr. George Moore's Judith; she never tells her love until the last act, but her tale of her own perfection, her purity of motive, is endless, for she never misses an opportunity; worse than Nausicaa, who has become intolerably priggish since Samuel Butler discovered that she wrote the Odyssey.

The Diary of a Padre at Sufia Bay. By the Rev. Dennis Jones, C.P. (The Path Press.)

The Prebendary of Manchester Cathedral has discovered what our soldiers really want. It is not war, it is not peace, it is not more pay, or larger pensions, or beer, or tobacco, or many wives, or any of the things that coarse materialists might think; it is not even murders and mutilations, or traps and blunders. It is the Church of England and her priests. They need a simple philosophy of life. That is given them through the unadulterated Gospel teaching of the Church and its Prayer Book. They need Actual Means of Grace. That is provided for them through her Ministry [yus, pard] which is conversant with human life and its requirements. They need the simple rites of religion. These, too, she offers in the most simple and beautiful of forms. It is, at the same time, a body Catholic and Evangelical, in which the rights and liberties of the soul are preserved in the interest of eternal salvation. But Lysandra—oh, Lysandra! She is as self-conscious of her own perfections as a Suffragette, or Mr. George Moore's Judith; she never tells her love until the last act, but her tale of her own perfection, her purity of motive, is endless, for she never misses an opportunity; worse than Nausicaa, who has become intolerably priggish since Samuel Butler discovered that she wrote the Odyssey.

Tuberculosis and the Working Man: An Appeal to Friendly Societies. By Dr. Varriér-Jones. With a Preface by G. Sims Woolhead, M.D. (Heffer. 6d. net.)

This is a plea to Friendly Societies to relax their rules concerning sick-benefit, so that a tuberculous patient may not have to choose between idleness and over-work. By refusing to pay sick-pay to a man who does any work, the Societies are not only putting a premium on idleness, they are retarding the progress of the patient. Dr. Varriér-Jones argues on the basis of experience that a tuberculous patient ought to be allowed to work under medical supervision, and, at the same time, ought to receive a sufficient quantity of the right sort of nourishment. He cannot earn enough in the early stages of convalescence to feed himself properly if the sick-benefit is withdrawn entirely; if he declares off the sick-list too soon, he will only have a relapse, and if he stays on the sick-list too long, doing nothing at all but making misery, he will also have a relapse. Dr. Varriér-Jones argues directly in the interest of public health no less than those of the finances of Friendly Societies the rigidity of the rule must be relaxed to enable the doctor to graduate the activity of the man and to secure for him proper nourishment and rest. The case is well argued in detail, and is an excellent practical suggestion for the period during which full public responsibility for the expense of restoring is as well as of maintaining health is denied.
LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

NATIONAL CONTROL OF WEALTH.

Sir,—You have lately called attention to the urgent necessity of dealing with the question of national finance on broad and bold lines. As to the desirability of increased thrift, there can be no two opinions. How to bring that need home to the people, and at the same time disarm them from such a misuse of the government as it has evinced, is a problem which we must face. Should we by a house-to-house propaganda endeavour to collect as free contributions to State loans the sums needed to finance the war? Or should we seek to impose a constantly increasing rate of taxation? If so, how far can we go? So far as we use taxation, are we to look to income-tax, import duties, or State monopolies for great additions to our revenue? The consideration of the cost of the war seems to lead at once to the conclusion that we need all these methods, as well as any others that can be devised, but it is equally clear that no single measure of taxation can be proposed which does not at once arouse an opposition which, under present conditions, it is difficult, if not impossible, to overcome. On the other hand, the method of loans, so simple at the beginning of the war, becomes increasingly difficult as it proceeds; and the rise in the rate of interest is a plain signal that we are far from constituting an unlimited resource. In addition, the growth of the National Debt threatens to create serious social and industrial dangers for the future, and we ask in vain from what source the nation's obligations can ultimately be discharged, and upon what class the payment of the annual interest can permanently be imposed.

It seems to me that any war cannot be successfully conducted unless the business of the country is under such close Government control that each man must hold his working-class incomes, are under our present laws and supposed ability of the recipients to pay; and finally a Register, the canvass of men of military age, and the sailors.

The incomes of all persons earning a certain sum we may raise by loans, we cannot be far off the time when even for the payment of interest we shall need to raise far larger sums by taxation than any practical proposition hereafter, and then, can we find the broad and bold principle which will recommend taxation to the nation? The various proposals made so far merely touch the fringe of the question, and the revenue raised by all of them together would meet a mere fraction of our necessities.

We have been unable to find men for our armies without asserting the principle that each man must hold his property, savings, the comforts of life, the prospects of our children—all these are large elements in our civilisation. The phrase "national control of wealth" may appear vague. Its practical application may be illustrated as follows:

(i) Local Committees would be charged with the regular canvassing of the War Loans. Income-tax payers would be expected to contribute towards it in proportion to the surplus of their income over their needs, and ultimately this expectation would be converted into a legal obligation.

(ii) Essential trades, such as those concerned with the supply of bread and milk, would be locally organized, and overlapping prevented. Ultimately this organisation would aim at economising labour, and securing regular supplies at reasonable prices.

(iii) Businesses unprovided for because of the summoning of their owners to military service would be cared for, and restored to them on their return. In large businesses State partnership would be introduced. The profits of the owners being limited to those received at the beginning of the war, and competition eliminated, all increased profits would be available for war purposes.

(iv) The control of railways and dockyards would be used as a means for the taxation of luxury trades, such as those in furniture and alcoholic drinks, for which greatly increased freight could be charged without injury to the public.

Thus this system would not only embrace every method at present suggested for public revenue, but would set voluntary bodies everywhere at work to ascertain the directions in which still further increases are possible. The attempt to estimate the sums which could be raised on these lines. So far as I can ascertain, there exist nowhere any figures upon which such an estimate could reasonably be based, and the true intent for many years past on studying the conditions of peace, have never equipped themselves for the task of realising the possibilities of a prolonged war. Therefore the first step in the direction proposed would be the establishment of a National Census of Wealth and Industry, which for a time would be worked on purely voluntary lines, thence and onwards.

When the results of the Census are tabulated and reported upon by Commissions representing various interests, the material will be available for large and comprehensive reports, the whole movement appears to me to be an essential and necessary corollary to the movement for obligatory Military Service. It would save Parliament from premature conflicts which tend to wreck party divisions, and I think it is based on one of those general ideas which (if once they obtain a hold upon the imagination of the people) will supply a force capable of beating down petty obstruction.

It must in any case appear presumptuous to put forward a scheme so general and far-reaching as that which I have suggested, with the ramifications of which the ramifications extend to every industry in our great Empire. If there are any who still hug individualistic doctrines and think it enough to put forward a scheme which may at first appear to be difficult, and I shall be amply rewarded if this rough sketch calls forth a more adequate treatment of the subject from any who may have made a special study.

Whether or not my suggestions are in the right direction, I feel convinced that the present control of our national wealth, and the determination to use it for our war purposes, we possess a means, possibly the only means, of bringing to an end the present struggle in a manner consistent with the safety of the Empire. If there are any who still hug individualistic doctrines, and think it enough to put forward a scheme which may at first appear to be difficult, and I shall be amply rewarded if this rough sketch calls forth a more adequate treatment of the subject from any who may have made a special study.

Since this letter was first written, the question of food supply has become pressing to a degree which should fairly be called alarming. Through a policy of drift we are becoming more and more entangled in the vicious circle of rising prices and falling wages. In this direction there is no hope. We need a National Food Commission which will invoke the aid of all who are engaged in food supply, and boldly face the question of prices to the whole population on food rations. Every week of delay is increasing the danger.

EDWARD V. ARNOLD.
**THE VICIOUS CIRCLE.**

Sir,—For the miners to keep alive the "vicious circle" by strike after strike in the pit is not only immoral and futile, but such action can never gain public sympathy and support. The great strikes of the future appear to resolve themselves into a combination which seems too formidable for the producers to successfully attack. Now, it should be the object of the strikers to alienate the consumers from the owners, and to gain their support. For the consummation of this desire the mining industry is particularly adaptable. Instead of the strike being one for more wages, let it be for the lowering of prices. The issue will then be final between the owners, with the consumers from the owners, but to gain their support.

Sir,—I find it strange that amongst all your subscriptions to the British public by the British Press, as we surely must, then the restrained and quiet determination which marked out Great Britain as the very bulwark of freedom, humanity and justice has been replaced by a boasting, contemptuous attitude, reminiscent of Germany in her worst moments. Read the Hibbert, becoming the intellectual pastime of the British Isles. The spirit of bombast and jingoism is creeping in, threatening to lose us, in neutral eyes, to the level of our foes. Demands for reprisals of a revolting nature, which would have been rejected a year ago as the proposals of bounders and cranks, are backed up by public opinion in an unmitigable mood. We are so used to reprisals that affect inanimate things like property, or which do military damage. It is giving away no secret to state that in many cases our reprisals for Zeppelin raids have been so severe as to give pause to the enemy. Every time Zeppelins raids London, or a German aeroplane squadron drops bombs on unfortified towns in France, a systematic series of reprisals is carried out by bombing the towns of military importance on the other side of the line. Is this the kind of war we are pursuing? We are pursuing a wise course, and morally we are unscathed. Nor can I see any objection to the confiscation of enemy property as such in England or France, believing as I do that the war should be conducted with the utmost consideration. But when in reply to the infamous murder of Captain Fryatt, the Press proposes to make Germany pay for his life in terms of the country-house, surely we must have sunk deep to allow the suggestion to pass unheeded? Let us fight hard to prevent the threatened re-institution of the old Icelandic law of payment for murder. Let us, as Mr. Asquith bids us, wait patiently until we can meet out with justice punishment to those responsible.

The Army, though heated by wild sights and the strange terror of battle, shows infinitely more of the real humanity than our pig-sty Press. As soon as prisoners are taken in battle, provided they are quiet and obedient, they are treated by everybody with the utmost consideration. The very men who with difficulty restrained themselves from bayoneting them a few minutes ago will now offer them cigarettes, bread, or water. The humane spirit is the finest reply to the barbarities of the enemy. It shows him that while we fear nothing that he can put against us, we are desirous of treating him at least as well as we treat ourselves. History will note this to our credit.

But what of our infamous Press (which, thank God, is ephemeral)? Photographs, interesting enough otherwise, are turned into a shame by the letterpress underneath them. A brave, though unscrupulous, foe is called a coward. Now this is the very last thing in the world I would call the average German. He has no great liking for the bayonet (though he does use some of the better troops have wielded it well enough), and because of this, he resists by every means in his power our attempts to draw him into the open. Who blames him? Soon we will see that he is not the one to give in, and then he will fight like a wild beast in a corner— as you or I would fight in like circumstances.

These British sneers and insults are not to the liking of the Army. They lower our self-respect and make us wonder whether we are fighting for the England of tradition or for a powerful financial group. Questions and whispers are going the round of all ranks from privates upwards, and these mutterings forebode an unpleasant time for those who have set out to undermine the confidence of the country in our efforts.

Sir, this letter is too long already, so I will only add that we must be ready to take the frustration of uncooperative situations by the teeth and in its place.

M. BRIDGES ADAMS.

**BEFORE THE FRONT.**

Sir,—I find it strange that amongst all your contributors not one has as yet remarked on the change in the national outlook which has gradually become pronounced during the last six weeks. If we are to judge
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Men's eyes are beginning to turn very anxiously to the problems of Capital. A post-war state is more prepared for it than Labour, and there are three or four developments on which a close watch should be kept. The trade unions. They were warned a solemn pledge that their code of restrictions should be restored, and now they are being seduced or threatened into this promise back into the hands that offert it. "On the one hand, you have the cyclists on one side, the whole armour of trade union regulations and, on the other, a common reactionary." MR. G. K. CHESTERTON to Mr. H. G. Wells, in "The New Witness." They can win the unclassed middle class to Socialism. I know this was so, I also knew why it was so; and it can be put almost in the same category as the Conservative out of sheer impatience. Revolution, like every other sort of war, is a weary business; and we are not impatient enough to rebel. Though merely on the mental plane, it has something of the monotony of spade-work and sentry-go. It means being always ready to answer the same stale sophistries for the hundredth time, as I am answering your stale sophistries for the hundredth time. It means being always ready to explain to any particular person facts which everybody else knows, as long as we are not will talk to you facts which everybody else knows. Long before a person of poetic temper has half begun such a process, he is in a condition of his own emotional reaction becomes a common reactionary. MR. R. K. CHURCHWARD to Mr. H. G. Wells, in "The New Witness."

At this moment our minds are all occupied with the war, and a united nation, with the whole nation is a soldier in the common cause. He is "Tommy" and a hero. But after the war is he to become again merely a drudge? His work is more difficult than ever; what is he not willing to give me when he comes back are we going to find him work that will be of worth doing for its own sake? That, no doubt, is our desire. I have discovered that he is a human being who will give his life for a cause; and he himself has discovered that too. Be sure that he will not be content to live in the same house of what no one wants. But he can be delivered from this waste only if the public no longer demands it of him, if they refuse to waste their money in wasting his. They must learn to feel the workman behind the work; to do that is to enjoy the work and to make the workman enjoy it too. It is to turn him from a striking into a soldier in the army of civilization and peace. A. CLUTTON BROCK.

I want the House to consider for one moment the debt we owe to Labour, skilled and unskilled. For forty years organised Labour has been endeavouring through the trade-union movement to win recognition for certain principles which are held to be necessary to secure a proper recompense and an equitable share in the control of industry. When the war broke out there were disputes in progress, and many grave industrial questions seemed likely to arise in the near future. The declaration of war required that a truce should be declared, and from that moment the time which might have been used as a period of negotiation in a大战 between Capital and Labour was consecrated to the services of the whole nation against the common enemy. But the cessation of disputes and the opening of responsible reforms which slowly emerged from the clash of conflicting interests do not exhaust the full measure of the sacrifices which organised Labour has made. The trade unions placed on one side the whole armour of trade union regulations upon which they had hitherto relied. For all the weapons slowly forged during long years of struggle—rules and customs relating to hours of labour, overtime, the right of entrance to trades, demarcation of industry, the regulation of boy labour, and the exclusion of women from certain classes of occupation—all these directly or indirectly bear witness to the readiness which might have tended to reduce output during the war. The Government asked Labour to put all these on one side. It was a great deal to ask. I doubt if any community has ever been asked for so much with a loyalty and statesmanship which cannot be overestimated, the request was readily granted. The trade unions required, and they were right to require, a scrupulous record and recognition of what they were concealing. It was promised to them as a right; but they will receive it only when they have embraced by an emotional reaction becomes a common reactionary. MR. MONAGHAN.