THE

NEW AGE

A WEEKLY REVIEW OF POLITICS, LITERATURE, AND ART.

No. 1266] NEW SERIES. Vol. XX. No. 7. THURSDAY, DEC. 14, 1916. [Registered at G.P.O. as a Newspaper.] SIXPENCE

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
NOTES OF THE WEEK	145
FOREIGN AFFAIRS. By S. Verdad	149
THE PRESENT POSITION AND POWER OF THE PRESS (I—IV). By H. Belloc	150
THE PERMANENT HYPOTHESIS—VI. THE COLLECTIVIST ALTERNATIVE. By S. G. H.	151
NATIONAL GUILDS AND THE DIVISION OF POWERS. By G. D. H. Cole	153
INDUSTRIAL GUILDS IN JAPAN (Reprinted by kind permission from the "Times" Japanese Section)	154
AN INDUSTRIAL SYMPOSIUM. Conducted by Huntly Carter	156
(20) Mr. C. H. Grinling.	
(21) Mr. Thomas Johnson.	
(22) Mr. A. J. Penty.	
READERS AND WRITERS. By R. H. C.	157
ON POWER AND THINGS. By Ramiro de Maeztu	158
LETTERS FROM IRELAND. By C. E. Bechhofer	159
WE MODERNS. By Edward Moore	160
A DEFENCE OF FREE TRADE. By Henry J. Northbrook	162
VIEWS AND REVIEWS: EUG-ELLICS. By A. E. R.	163
REVIEWS	164
PASTICHE. By Triboulet, Ruth Pitter, Fred Kay, Francis Andrews, Wilfrid Thorley	165
LETTERS TO THE EDITOR from Lord Rhondda, National Guildsman, H. W. Wright, S. H. Rudd	166
MEMORANDA (from last week's NEW AGE)	167
PRESS CUTTINGS	168

NOTES OF THE WEEK.

WE observe that the same error is being made concerning the real causes of the fall of the late Coalition as was made concerning the origin of the war. People who had never before thought of foreign affairs, or who imagined that foreign affairs were the exclusive preserve of diplomatists, came naturally to the conclusion that only within the events of the few days that preceded the declarations of war need the explanation of the war itself be looked for. More careful students, however, were aware that in actual fact the causes of the war were to be sought in a series of acts extending over a long period of years, and arising from a single policy pursued by Germany which in itself involved war as a condition of its fulfilment. The events of the twelve days that immediately preceded the outbreak of the war were thus rather the consequences and manifestations of the causes of the war than the causes of the war themselves. Similarly we may say that except for their determination of the moment of the fall of the Coalition, the events of the last few days have been in no real sense the cause of it. The Coalition, indeed, was doomed from its birth; and it required only some accident or unusual jar to bring it tumbling down. As long ago as June, 1915, we predicted in these columns exactly what has now come to pass. Mr. Asquith, we said, had come to the end of his ideas long before the war had ceased to make demands for fresh ideas. And the next Ministry, we went on to say, would not have Mr. Asquith for its chief, but Mr. Lloyd George. This, it may be remarked, was eighteen months ago; before, that is, many of the military and other events had occurred to which people are now disposed to attribute the unpopularity of the late Coalition. But if what has now happened to the late Coalition might have been, and, in fact, was, foreseen over a year ago, none of the events subsequent to that date can be regarded as its true cause. We therefore acquit both Mr. Lloyd George and Lord Northcliffe of any worse crime than that of being instruments of the fall of the Coalition. It would have fallen by other, perhaps cleaner, hands if not by theirs.

Nor are we disposed to attribute the fall of Mr. Asquith's Government to the conduct of the war on land and sea. As we have already remarked, the unpopularity of Mr. Asquith's Government began to be apparent long before the series of misfortunes, culminating in the fall of Bucharest, occurred; and, as we shall now remark, far greater reverses than any we have yet known might be sustained without of necessity bringing a Government into contempt. The assumption, indeed, that a Government necessarily becomes unpopular on account of military and naval reverses is one that both flatters and at the same time insults the public opinion of a great nation. Its flattery lies in the fact that a far greater judgment in military affairs is attributed to the people in general than either they claim or can be credited with. And its insult lies in the implied inability of an English public to endure reverses without making scapegoats of the responsible directors. Neither of these suppositions is based upon anything substantial. In the first place, it is astonishing with how little effort of judgment the military events even of the present war are followed by the vast mass of the population. Aware, as they are, that things are not what they seem, and that none of us is seised of anything like all the facts necessary to a reasonable judgment, the general public is disposed to accept the judgment of the Government in all these matters, and to suspend its own almost indefinitely. Heads, of course, are shaken from time to time over events that on their face appear to be disastrous; but he would be flattering the public, as we say, who attributed the unpopularity of a Government to military reverses and to military reverses alone. And, in the second place, it is to regard the English public as a people altogether without historic sense to imagine that the fact of reverses in a great war must needs unman us. Reverses, on the contrary, are expected and fully allowed for. The number and magnitude of the allowable and endurable reverses are, indeed, astonishing when we recall what they already have been. Is a public opinion that accepted with calmness the affair of the Dardanelles now panic-stricken by the fall of Bucharest? Does Mr. Churchill still walk safely amongst us, and has Mr. Asquith to hide for his life? The suggestion, we repeat, is contemptible, that the

late Coalition has fallen on its military record. A far worse military record would still be compatible with popularity, provided that the essential condition of confidence was not lacking.

* * *

To what, then, if not to its conduct of the war, is the unpopularity of the late Ministry due? Dismissing as only secondary and tertiary causes the guttersnipings of the Northcliffe Press, we may say that the real cause of the failure of Mr. Asquith's Government has been his failure to maintain public confidence at home. In military and naval affairs, as we say, a people has only an indirect means of judgment. Unable, both in fact and by consent, to pass judgment directly upon the technical conduct of the war, the public is forced to judge the unknown by the known, the conduct of the war abroad by the conduct of affairs at home. And no course is, in fact, more sensible and just. If we see plainly before our eyes, in matters we can understand, intelligence, energy and efficiency displayed, so that none of us can fail to realise that a powerful will is at work, the assumption is inevitable, and would be held against all appearances, that the same will is actually at work in matters beyond our cognisance. The war must, we conclude, be under proper conduct, despite all appearances to the contrary, since it is under the same control as home-affairs wherein we have nothing to complain of. And confidence is then established. But if, on the other hand, in matters wherein we can judge, since they are under our eyes, the conduct of a Ministry is marked by vacillation, weakness, inefficiency and blundering, the assumption that the same faults are at work in the conduct of the war is equally inevitable; and all the reverses which, under other circumstances, we should cheerfully endure are now attributed to weakness, and become sources of indignation with the Ministry responsible for them. And from this point of view how have matters stood with the late Government? Is it not the fact that in all its conduct of home-affairs, with exceedingly few exceptions, its acts have been characterised by every fault that could be imagined—weakness, inefficiency, delay, inadequacy, compromise, pandering to private interests, vacillation? Look back, if you will, over the truthful weekly records we have made of the doings of Mr. Asquith's Government at home, and discover, if you can, more than one or two occasions when we have been able to praise them. Nor is it the case that we are harder to please than the public in general, or wilfully read black where public opinion would read white. Our judgment, as events have now proved, has been the judgment of the nation, and upon matters, we repeat, within common knowledge. And it was, therefore, no less fair than inevitable that having made it in matters we understand, we should apply it to the Ministry's conduct of the war.

* * *

As evidence that it is by the social and home criterion that the public judges the conduct of the war, we may point to the fact that it is Mr. Lloyd George, and not a military genius, who is allowed by public opinion to succeed Mr. Asquith. If it were the case that the public had passed military censure upon the late Government upon military grounds, the call, we may be sure, would have been for a military dictatorship, or, at least, for a War Council composed mainly of soldiers and sailors. That, on the contrary, every proposed member of the new Council is a civilian is a proof that public opinion has judged that the remedy for past errors is not military but civilian. Nor is it supposed, in the very least, that Mr. Lloyd George's Government will apply itself directly to military affairs over the heads of the Army and Navy any more than Mr. Asquith's has done. No such supersession of the practical direction of our forces is, we are sure, contemplated. What, on the other hand, is expected is that the same type of intelligence, energy and efficiency with which Mr. Lloyd George is anticipated to deal with home affairs will be somehow or other applied to the conduct of the war as well. Things unseen will be managed with no less zeal and success than things seen. And the instinct, in our opinion, is profoundly right. For the first time in our history we are engaged in something more than a military war. The actual army is only a part of the nation, and it is the nation as well as the army that is engaged. The failure to realise that in this respect the present war differs from all preceding wars is the fundamental error of Mr. Asquith's Government. He and his immediate colleagues were under the obsession that the present national war could be conducted as if it were no more than one of the old dynastic or professional wars, with a minimum amount of attention paid to the nation, and by means of social shifts and expediencies designed merely to keep the nation quiet while the military war was being fought out. But no such half measures are suitable to a national war, a war, that is, of social quite as much as of military organisms. Nation to-day is arrayed against nation no less than army against army; and once more, therefore, we pronounce it a true national instinct that supersedes Mr. Asquith by Mr. Lloyd George. For what in the public mind does Mr. Lloyd George represent if not the promise, at any rate, of national as well as of military re-organisation—of military re-organisation *through* national re-organisation? Social re-construction is, in fact, our only war-gauge in a national war such as the present; and it is on Mr. Lloyd George's promise to secure it that he has come into power.

* * *

That this is the true moral to be drawn from the recent changes may be seen again in the most significant fact of all—in not merely the inclusion of the Labour Party within the new directing War Council, but in the common and obvious admission that must be made that the Labour Party is actually responsible for the creation of the new Ministry. It may be argued, no doubt—and we could argue it plausibly ourselves—that the Labour Party consented to the creation of the Ministry from the expectation of immediate jobs for many of its members, and in view of the elevation of status the co-operation of Labour with the State would bring about for the working classes. But these motives, we are certain, were not the only motives that induced the Labour Party to co-operate with Mr. Lloyd George, nor were they even the predominant and decisive motives. Exactly, on the other hand, as public opinion has seized upon the social policy of the late Government and made a criterion of it for passing judgment upon its military policy, the Labour Party has agreed to co-operate with Mr. Lloyd George in pursuing a better social policy as a condition and guarantee of a better military policy also. Look, for confirmation, at the list of demands made of Mr. Lloyd George by the Labour Party as a condition of its support. Not one, you will see, is of any technically military value; and none of the suggestions offered concerns the military conduct of the war. On the contrary, you would scarcely think that a war was being waged, or that the Labour Party were more bent upon winning it than any other party in the State, if the view were taken that only military measures are important in a national war. That, without exception, the demands of the Labour Party are for national re-organisation at home is evidence at once of the errors into which the late Government fell, and of the endeavours Mr. Lloyd George, in the opinion of the Labour Party, will make to avoid them. The co-operation of the Labour Party in the new Government is, in short, both a criticism of Mr. Asquith's Government and a promise of amendment for the future. It means that the nationality of the war is coming at last to be recognised; and carries with it the expectation (we will put it no higher) that England is to become at least as well organised socially as Germany.

The fact deserves to be emphasised that the Labour Party is really responsible for the formation of the new Government. Mr. Lloyd George, or even the Great Panjandrum of Printing House Square, cannot pretend that without the co-operation of the Labour Party it would have been possible for either of them, or for anybody else, to form a Government by himself. And this is one of the most momentous facts in English history. It marks, if we are not mistaken, the definite opening of a new era. Think of it, all those who have smiled at our past estimates of the importance of Labour, and at our insistence upon the dictum that economic power precedes and determines political power. For to what else but to the economic indispensability of Labour, and most clearly in the present war, does the Labour Party owe the position it now occupies, as the determinant not only of the creation of the Government, but of its policy as well? But it follows that since the Labour Party has had the casting-vote in the creation of the new Government, and still holds the casting-vote (for, needless to say, the resignation of the Labour Party would bring about the fall of the new Government more certainly than the resignation of any of its other constituent groups) the Labour Party must be prepared to accept the responsibility of every act of the new Ministry. It will be no excuse any longer for its members to complain that, after all, their numbers are so few and their power so inconsiderable that responsibility cannot fairly be attached to them. They have all the power of the indispensable partner, and must accept all the responsibility belonging to it. Nay, what is more, they must be ready, if events appear to necessitate it, to exercise their power even to the extent of forcing the defeat of the present Ministry and taking supreme charge of the nation and the war themselves.

* * *

We shall have plenty of opportunities to discuss in detail the measures for social re-organisation which Mr. Lloyd George's Government is under promise to bring in. On the other hand, we cannot be too explicit concerning the principles they must contain, and the measures of value to be applied to them. And these it is not too early to consider in brief at this moment. We observe, for example, a tendency in the suggestions that have been published to regard the measures to be adopted as sufficient when they are merely temporary expedients; and to think of social re-construction in terms of the estimated duration of the war only. Nothing can be more shortsighted, or better calculated to repeat the very errors from which the late Government suffered, and to which it owed its fall. The first principle to be applied to the new measures is that they must be as fit to subserve the ends of peace as the ends of war. In other words, their aim must be to become permanently incorporated in our national organisation. Good sense no less than good theory dictates this course as the most statesmanlike policy to pursue; for who knows, in the first place, how long the war may last, or in what state the world may be left when this war ends? And, in the second place, is it not now common knowledge that the best organisation for war is likewise the best organisation for peace: and vice versa? Plato, in this respect, has been confirmed in our own day. Thus the proposed nationalisation of our coal resources, of our shipping, of our food-supplies, and of our wealth must be carried out, not for the duration of the war only, but for good. Temporary nationalisation, while it may tide over a few months' difficulties, will assuredly not put us in a posture of sound national defence, and still less in a posture to continue the war as long as we please, and to be prepared for an immediate sequel of war if need be. The permanency of national service for everybody is, in short, the thing to aim at even in "temporary" legislation. Next, we require of the Labour Party now in power that it keep before its eyes the value of status and the need to transform the very conception of the servile status now associated with its class. Is it too much to ask of a party that has risen to power on the wrongs of an economic class that, once in power, it shall do its best to right them? Only upon that condition, in fact, will the nation tolerate the spectacle of Labour leaders like Mr. Henderson directing the fortunes of the State. For he is not there for his own glory, but for the glory of the class that sends him. And if it be objected that in saying this we are guilty ourselves of class-feeling, and of urging it upon Labour leaders who might otherwise be thinking nationally, our reply is (and recent events surely bear us out) that the welfare of Labour, including above all the elevation of its status, is the very substance and substratum of the welfare of the State. This which before has been a pious affirmation is now seen to be a simple fact.

* * *

The most dangerous of all the proposals under discussion by the new Ministry is the proposal to establish a Ministry of Labour. We can only say of this that if once the idea is put into effect, the difficulty of undoing it will require another revolution to surmount. Drawing a contrast between the Liberal and the Labour Parties, the "Westminster Gazette" remarked last week that the Liberal Party "do not, like the Labour Party, represent an organised body of the community whose co-operation must be had as an organisation: they represent, on the other hand, principles and opinions widely held by all classes." The criticism is just, and we have often made it. The Labour Party is, indeed, almost as much of an anomaly in a national system of politics as would be (and is) a party of coal-owners or of railway-directors. On the other hand, it is precisely to remove this anomaly and the conditions that produce it that the Labour Party has entered politics at all. And to create now a Ministry of Labour and to equip it with powers over the proletariat exclusively would just as precisely be to stereotype the anomaly and to immortalise what our contributor "S. G. H." has named the "permanent hypothesis." The differentiation of legislation that is necessarily implied in the establishment of a Ministry of Labour is a differentiation of an economic class pure and simple. It advertises to the world that there not only exists in our midst a class of person different from the classes of active citizens, and needing, therefore, to be specially legislated for; but a class whose permanency is taken for granted, and whose status is fixed for all time. But is it not needless to say that this is exactly what the Labour Party as a *political* party exists to challenge and to abolish, namely, the permanent hypothesis that assumes the unalterability of the present status of the wage-earner? But it follows that the Labour Party cannot then consent, with its eyes open, to the establishment of a Ministry which in its very title affirms and confirms the hypothesis Labour intends to destroy. The latest news, we are glad to see, is that Mr. Henderson is to be a Minister without a portfolio. We may therefore hope, for another hour or two at least, that no Minister of Labour will be appointed.

* * *

So far, it may be said, we have considered the new Ministry as if it were composed exclusively or mainly of members of the Labour Party. There are other groups to be taken into account that are by no means negligible. And this, of course, is true, and we will proceed to rectify our omission. But, to begin with, it should be remembered that it is an axiom with political thinkers that a Government must take and keep the colour of its source, and depend for its existence upon the same kind of means that brought it into existence. Is the new Ministry born of impatience with the conservatism and delay of the old Ministry; and does it owe

its existence to the support of the Labour Party? Then, infallibly, it must incline in what may be called a revolutionary direction, and more and more towards dependence upon the Labour Party and the Labour policy. This becomes the more certain when we examine closely the circumstances in which and from which the new Ministry has sprung. There cannot be the smallest doubt that Mr. Asquith became obsolete from the moment that he hesitated to inaugurate the radical social changes necessary to the winning of the war: at the moment, in short, when his revolutionary zeal had run out. And equally, there can be no doubt that Mr. Lloyd George owes his elevation to his greater zeal and elasticity in the revolutionary direction; in other words, to his greater capacity for advancing to the Left in politics. Putting these two facts together and adding to them the fact they imply, namely, a public demand, in view of the national circumstances, for more revolutionary social measures than any that Mr. Asquith dare bring in—what is the horoscope of the new Ministry but indicative of a progress Leftwards? Slowly, it may be, or, it may be, swiftly; but, in any event certainly, the new Ministry will be driven to social measures calculated to set on end the hair of men who retain their prejudices of only a few months ago. Nothing can stop the movement that has now begun. Social revolution or failure are the alternatives before the new Ministry.

* * *

We have perhaps jumped a step or two in our reasoning towards the foregoing conclusion. Let us return and consider them. It is obvious that in his new Government Mr. Lloyd George has attempted to combine the two extremes of politics, the extreme Right of conservatism, and the extreme Left of socialism. May it not be, it will be asked, that the Right will control the Left, rather than the Left the Right; or, again, that both may coalesce to create the system of industrial organisation that combines both extremes in the form of National Guilds? Would to Heaven that the second of these two were, in our opinion, probable, and that the party of the State and the party of Industry could unite in such a beneficent reconstruction. Contemplation, however, of the intelligence and good-will of both parties forbids us to entertain the hope that this is anything but most improbable; and we are, therefore, left with the second best, which is to hope, as we believe, that the Right must give way to the Left. But how is that possible, you ask? Once more we reply that we are dealing only in speculation, and that all that we are casting is the horoscope of the new Ministry. Suppose, for example, that in the opinion of the Labour section of the Ministry and in Mr. Lloyd George's opinion as well, a certain radical measure of social re-organisation becomes necessary, indispensable to winning the war. And suppose that the Unionist—which is to say, the Capitalist section, objects—what is to be done? Compromise, after all, has its limits; and, moreover, it was by too much compromise that the last Government fell. Will Mr. Lloyd George and the Labour section compromise, or will the Unionist section? If it is the first we can safely say that the fall of Mr. Lloyd George will be certain and speedy; for what is his only virtue but his unwillingness to compromise, and what is his main strength but the support of the Labour Party? If, on the other hand, the Unionists must compromise—to what extent and how often, we may ask, are they prepared to do it? Until all the demands of the Labour Party have been met? Until, as we should insist, not a profiteer remains in national industry? But that, as we say, is improbable. Long before, indeed, anything like a radical reconstruction is put in hand, the Unionist Right of Mr. Lloyd George's Government will be disposed to bolt. And long before the first decisive fundamental change is made in the relations of Capital and Labour they will have bolted.

Whither, and what then? The answers to these questions depend upon two factors: the state of the war and the temperature of the national will to victory. If, on the one hand, the war appears to be coming to an end upon its present lines, so that it might seem that a lesser revolution than that proposed by Mr. Lloyd George and the Labour Party would suffice, the bolting section of his Cabinet would undoubtedly ally themselves with the present official Liberal opposition, and form with the latter a new Coalition to displace the Government of Mr. Lloyd George. But, on the other hand, if the war should then show no signs of coming to an end, but, on the contrary, should appear to be making further demands for thorough-going Labour and Socialist legislation—the successful repetition by Mr. Lloyd George of his present movement towards the Left would become almost inevitable; in other words, we should be faced by what would amount to a Labour Ministry with Mr. Lloyd George at its head. Yes, fantastic as it may sound, we are positively within easy speculating distance of the advent in England, as in Italy, France and Australia, of a Labour Ministry. And there ought, for sensible people, to be neither horror nor even surprise at it. The fact has been brought home to our doors by the war that labour, after all, is the last refuge as it is the first foundation of nation and of Empire. And the more prolonged, the more profound and searching the war, the more certainly will this truth be realised. What will there then be to horrify us in the frank recognition of the fact, and in the assumption by Labour of the responsibility of its power? And again we may point out—not without a touch of malice—that in propagating the present war and in insisting so loudly upon the necessity of fighting it to a finish, the capitalist parties have really been calling up a spirit, stronger far than their own, and one which they will find it hard to lay at their discretion—the spirit, namely, of the English working classes, the spirit of the English folk. Unless steps are at once taken or Providence interposes to end the war by means short of an English victory, it is not, we believe, the English Labour Party that will cry halt first. If, as we have often said, the price of victory over Germany is the industrial re-construction of England, it is not the English working classes that will object to the paying of it. And their present co-operation with Mr. Lloyd George, who appears to offer it, is the evidence.

DREAM SONG.

(From the French of Gabriel Vicaire, 1848-1900.)

You ask me whom in dream I see?
It is the King's daughter, pardie!
And all for me are her love sighs.
Away, sweetheart, the moon doth rise.

In robe of satin white she streams;
She hath a silver comb that gleams.
The moon is high as grass unmown.
Away, sweetheart, I am thine own.

She hath a mantle all of gold,
While my poor homespun's worn and old
Away, sweetheart, to Blissful Copse.
The moon's above the willow tops.

As boys will snare a bird with glee,
Her soft white fingers fold on me.
The moon is in the boughs o'erhead.
Away, sweetheart, and weave thy thread.

Thanks be to God, I well am ware
The boon is sweet that lovers share.
My love is lovely; fond am I.
Away, sweetheart, the moon is high.

WILFRID THORLEY.

Foreign Affairs.

By S. Verdad.

LET me return to a question which I touched upon last week. It has been seen that when we set out from the rather vague phrase "crushing German militarism," and seek to translate it into terms of action, we are met by varying opinions with regard to the method of putting the theory into practice. Many people are content to leave these words "in the air," without trying to carry their signification further. But, as I sought to show last week, certain things are essential if German militarism is to be crushed; and one is that Germany shall be weakened in such a manner that she will not again venture to wage war at will. When we speak of the "aims of the Allies," we do not mean objects to attain which each individual member of the Grand Alliance joined the war. We mean, rather, aims which, in the judgment of the Allies, it is necessary to attain before Germany can be weakened in such a way that we can call her militarism "crushed," or "wholly and finally destroyed."

* * *

Russia and Constantinople provides an excellent text for us. Several weeks ago I called attention to the fact in these columns that M. Miliukov and other representatives of the Duma, who had been visiting England, stated on their return to Petrograd that the Allies had definitely agreed to acknowledge Russia's right to possess Constantinople and the Straits. There was, incidentally, a claim regarding Poland. Both claims have been definitely emphasised in the Duma since I last wrote. M. Trepov, the new Premier, in the most explicit terms demanded Posen and Constantinople; and these demands, he added, "Germany will never grant until she is beaten to her knees." This was intended as a warning to Germany in the first place; and, in the second, as a repudiation of the alleged pro-German sentiments in the Government of which members of the Duma had complained. Constantinople, therefore, must now be looked upon as Russia's chief aim in the war. How is this aim regarded in this country? To the average unthinking Briton it is only natural that Russia should seek this means of securing her southern ice-free port, especially as on previous occasions, when Russia herself was not actually involved in war, her export trade through the Dardanelles suffered considerably owing to the closing of the Straits by the Turkish authorities. Well and good. But to some people Russia's possession of Constantinople is almost a calamity, as witness last Saturday's "Nation":—

> The essential element in the Russian demand for the Straits must be satisfied, but we believe it can readily be satisfied without literal possession. . . . On its merits we hold that the neutralisation and disarmament of the Straits and the elimination of any exclusive military control of them, whether Turkish or German, is a better solution of this problem of communications than a Russian annexation. Precisely because it would be a "scrap of paper" we prefer it. . . . Freedom of navigation through all the world's narrows and canals must not depend on the grant of a single Power, but of an international guarantee.

* * *

As "all the world's narrows and canals" obviously refers to the Panama Canal as well as to the Dardanelles, it may be worth while reminding the "Nation" writer that freedom of transit through the Panama Canal was guaranteed by an international agreement, which met the demand for disarmament by providing that the entrances should not be armed, and that no armaments were to be erected on the Canal at all. But the United States—the country that lays more stress on international agreements than any other—never hesitated to tear up this treaty; and the Panama Canal has been heavily fortified. No nation prevented her; no nation was strong enough to do so. No matter what Power has the Dardanelles, the Straits will be fortified; and the internationalisation solution would break down hopelessly in practice—it has broken down even when discussed academically in theory. Russia would never allow her vital existence to depend upon a scrap of paper; and no international guarantee would suffice for her. Germany has made the world doubtful of the value of scraps of paper—more's the pity.

* * *

But why, it may be urged, is it in our interest to substitute for Turco-German control of the Straits Russian control? After the war, it may be said, Russian interests may conflict with ours. This is a much more practical objection, but one easy to answer. In the latter part of the last century Russia was feared because of the danger to India. But if Russia had the Dardanelles given and guaranteed to her by "literal possession"—the precise contrary of the "Nation's" recommendation—her thoughts, commerce, interests, and sentiments would inevitably flow towards Asia Minor and away from India and Persia. Further, the cynical saying of the late Lord Salisbury must be remembered, namely, that it would be to our advantage to see Russia in Constantinople, as the Germans would spend the next hundred years in trying to get her out again if she were once established there. This is plain; transparently clear since the agitation about "Central Europe." But a Russia threatened by Germany at Constantinople would necessarily be a Russia driven to depend upon England and France; and a Germany menaced by Russian influence in the Balkans, thanks to the possession of Constantinople, would be a Germany with little time to spare for renewing a campaign against the British Empire. And this bond of interest common to ourselves and to Russia would considerably assist in maintaining the Grand Alliance after the war. Above all, Russia's possession of Constantinople ensures the fulfilment of one of our own aims in the war—the destruction of German militarism through the severance of connections in war time between the Central Empires and the Bagdad Railway.

* * *

It is not being overlooked, I hope, that Germany is far from satisfied with the results of this war, and that her military party means to wage another as soon as she recovers. A great modern factor in bringing Germany to a sense of reality is the blockade. But even if Germany were completely cut off by sea; even if she were unable to import goods via Holland, Denmark, Sweden, and Norway, she could still draw vast supplies from Asia Minor over the Bagdad line; and German publicists of all shades of opinion, whether they belong to the "Central Europe" school or not, look forward to the time when Germany will be able to obtain at least her essential supplies of raw materials from Asia Minor—supplies, as the "Berliner Post" hinted six months ago, developed by German labour, German management, and German capital. Indeed, the through route from the Central Empires to Asia Minor has considerably interfered with the efficacy of the blockade even in the present war. The blockade has been effective enough (with proper disrespect to the "Times" and the "Daily Mail") so far as oversea traffic was concerned; but not twenty navies could stop supplies on their way from the rich lands of Asia Minor to the barren marches of Brandenburg.

* * *

For these reasons the Russian aim of getting complete possession of Constantinople and the Dardanelles may be regarded as an aim of our own. This war will have been lost if we do not weaken the German Empire; and we cannot weaken that Empire better than in lopping off its Allies and its sources of supplies. That may, perhaps, explain to some Russian politicians why they have been unwittingly talking nonsense, about getting Constantinople "by negotiation," and why the "Nation" is also in the dark.

The Present Position and Power of the Press.

By H. Belloc.

I propose to discuss in what follows the evil of the great modern Capitalist Press, its function in vitiating and misinforming opinion and in putting power into ignoble hands; its correction by the formation of small independent organs, and the probably increasing effect of these last.

I.

About two hundred years ago a number of things began to appear in Europe which were the fruit of the Renaissance and of the Reformation combined : Two warring twins.

These things appeared first of all in England, because England was the only province of Europe wherein the old Latin tradition ran side by side with the novel effects of protestantism. But for England the great schism and heresy of the sixteenth century already dissolving would long ago have died. It would have been confined for some few generations to those outer Northern parts of the Continent which had never really digested but had only received in some mechanical fashion the strong meat of Rome. It would have ceased with, or shortly after, the Thirty Years War.

It was the defection of the English Crown, the immense booty rapidly obtained by a few adventurers, like the Cecils and Russells, and a still smaller number of old families, like the Howards, which put England, with all its profound traditions and with all its organic inheritance of the great European thing, upon the side of the Northern Germanies. It was inevitable, therefore, that in England the fruits should first appear, for here only was there deep soil.

That fruit upon which our modern observation has been most fixed was *Capitalism*.

Capitalism proceeded from England and from the English Reformation; but it was not in flower until the early eighteenth century. In the nineteenth it matured.

Another cognate fruit was what to-day we call *Finance*, that is, the domination of the State by private Capitalists who, taking advantage of the necessities of the State, fix a mortgage upon the State and work perpetually for fluidity and anonymity and irresponsibility in their arrangements. It was in England that this began and vigorously began with the first true "National Debt" and the first "National Bank"—the Bank of England.

Another was that curious and certainly ephemeral vagary of the human mind which has appeared before now in human history, which is called "Sophistry," and which consists in making up "systems" to explain the world; in contrast with Philosophy which aims at the answering of questions, the solution of problems and the searching out the truth.

But most interesting of all just now, though but a minor fruit, is the thing called "The Press."

Let us consider what exactly it means : then we shall the better understand what its development has been.

II.

"The Press" means (for the purpose of such an examination) the dissemination by printed sheets of news and suggested ideas.

News, that is, information with regard to those things which affect us but which are not within our own immediate view, is necessary to the life of the State.

The obvious, the extremely cheap, the *universal* means of propagating it, is by word of mouth.

A man has seen a thing; many men have seen a thing. They testify to that thing, and others who have heard them repeat their testimony. The Press thrust into this natural system (which is still that upon which all reasonable men act whenever they can upon matters most nearly concerning them) two novel features, both of them exceedingly corrupting In the first place, it gave to the printed word a rapidity of extension with which repeated spoken words could not compete. In the second place, it gave them a *unanimity* and a *similarity* which were the very opposites of healthy human news.

I would particularly insist upon this last point. It is little understood and it is vital.

If we want to know what to think of a fire which has taken place many miles away, but which affects property of our own, we listen to the accounts of dozens of men. We rapidly and instinctively differentiate between these accounts according to the characters of the witnesses. Equally instinctively, we counter-test these accounts by the inherent probabilities of the situation.

An honest and sober man tells us that the roof of the house fell in. An imaginative fool, who is also a swindler, assures us that he later saw the roof standing. We remember that the roof was of iron girders covered with wood, and draw this conclusion : That the framework still stands, but that the healing fell through in a mass of blazing rubbish. Our common sense and our knowledge of the situation incline us rather to the bad than to the good witness, and we are right. But the Press cannot of its nature give a great number of separate testimonies. These would take too long to collect, and would be too expensive to collect. Still less is it able to deliver the weight of each. It, therefore, presents us with one crude, or, at the most, a few crude affirmations, all of a type. These, as I have said, are further propagated unanimously and with extreme rapidity.

If this be true of news and of its vitiation through the Press, it is still truer of opinions and suggested ideas.

Opinions, above all, we judge by the personalities of those who deliver them : by voice, tone, expression, and known character. The Press eliminates three-quarters of all by which opinion may be judged.

So much for the Press, even in its infancy, when each news-sheet still covered but a comparatively small circle; when distribution was difficult, and when the audience addressed was also select and in some measure able to criticise whatever was presented to it.

In this early phase, moreover, the Press was necessarily highly diverse. One man could print and sell a thousand copies of his version of a piece of news, of his opinions, or those of his clique. There were hundreds of other men, who, if they took the pains, had the means to set out a rival account and a rival opinion.

III.

Side by side with the development of Capitalism went a change in the Press from its primitive condition to a worse. The development of Capitalism meant that a smaller and a yet smaller number of men commanded the means of production and of distribution whereby could be printed and set before a large circle a news-sheet fuller than the rest. When distribution first changed with the advent of the railways the difference from the old condition was accentuated, and there arose perhaps one hundred, perhaps two hundred "organs," as they were called, which, in this country and the Lowlands of Scotland, told men what their proprietors chose to tell them, both as to news and as to opinion. The population was still fairly well spread; there were a number of local capitals; distribution was not yet so organised as to permit a paper printed as near as Birmingham even, to feel the competition of a paper printed in London only 100 miles away. Papers printed as far from London as York, Liverpool or Exeter were the more independent.

Further the mass of men, though there was more intelligent reading (and writing, for that matter) than there is to-day, had not acquired the habit of daily reading.

It may be doubted whether even to-day the mass of

men (in the sense of the actual majority of adult citizens) have done so. But what I mean is that in the time of which I speak (the earlier part, and a portion of the middle, of the nineteenth century), there was no reading of papers as a regular habit by those who work with their hands. The papers were still in the main written for those who had leisure; those who for the most part had some travel, and those who had a smattering, at least, of the Humanities.

They were often written *by* men of less facilities. But the people who wrote them, wrote them under the knowledge that their audience was of the sort I describe. To this day in the healthy remnant of the State, in the villages, much of this tradition survives. The country folk in my own neighbourhood can read as well as I can; but they prefer to talk among themselves when they are at leisure, or, at the most, to seize in a few moments the main items of news about the war; they prefer this, I say, as a habit of mind, to the pouring over square yards of printed matter which (especially in the Sunday papers) are now food for their fellows in the town. That is because in the country a man has true neighbours, whereas the towns are a dust of isolated beings, mentally (and often physically) starved.

IV.

Meanwhile, there had appeared in connection with this new institution, "The Press," a certain factor of the utmost importance. Capitalist also in origin, and, therefore, inevitably exhibiting all the poisonous vices of Capitalism as its effect flourished from more to more. This factor was *subsidy through advertisement*.

At first the advertisement was not a subsidy. A man desiring to let a thing be known could let it be known much more widely and immediately through a newspaper than in any other fashion. He paid the newspaper to publish the thing that he wanted known, as that he had a house to let, or wine to sell.

But it was clear that this was bound to lead to the paradoxical state of affairs from which we began to suffer in the later nineteenth century. A paper had for its revenue not only what people paid in order to obtain it, but also what people paid in order to get advertisement through it. It, therefore, could be profitably produced at a cost greater than its selling price. Advertisement made it possible for a man to print a paper at a cost of 2d. and sell it at a 1d.

In the simple and earlier form of advertisement the extent and nature of the circulation was the only thing considered by the advertiser, and the man who printed the newspaper got more and more profit as he extended that circulation by giving more reading matter for a better-looking paper and still selling it further and further below cost price.

When it was discovered how powerful the effect of suggestion upon the readers of advertisements could be, especially over such an audience as our towns provide, a chaos of isolated minds with a lessening personal experience and with a lessening community of tradition, the price for advertising space rapidly rose. It became a more and more tempting venture to "start a newspaper," but at the same time, the development of capitalism made that venture more and more hazardous. It was more and more of a risky venture to start a new great paper even of a local sort, for the expense got greater and greater, and the loss, if you failed, more and more rapid and serious. Advertisement became more and more the basis of profit, and the giving in one way and another of more and more for the 1d. or the ½d. became the chief concern of the now wealthy and wholly capitalistic newspaper proprietor.

Long before the last third of the 19th century a newspaper, if it was of large circulation, was everywhere a venture or a property dependent wholly upon its advertisers. It had ceased to consider its public save as a bait for the advertiser. It lived entirely on its advertisement columns.

(To be continued.)

The Permanent Hypothesis.

A Critique of Reconstruction.

VI.—THE COLLECTIVIST ALTERNATIVE.

IT was not unnatural that the spectacle of the State intervening in trade and industry, controlling the railways, the munition factories, and now the South Wales mines, purchasing wheat and sugar in gigantic quantities, and generally nosing into everything, should lead many to think that, after all, State Socialism must be the way out. We must admit that we have learnt much by these gigantic State experiments—particularly what to avoid. If we go about with our eyes open, we cannot but be struck with the errors committed and the wastage incurred. Of course, it may be ascribed to the rush and bustle of war. But the question ever recurs whether, had our industries been organised on a Guild basis, far greater efficiency and less waste would have resulted. When the war is over, the story of the "Mauretania" will become a classic. And I am waiting with considerable curiosity to hear the inner history of the appointment of the Food Controller. As I write, his name has not been disclosed nor his functions defined.

I am not now concerned with the situation as it is in war time, but if State intervention during war is to be held up to our admiration, it is not irrelevant to criticise it, even as a war measure. One conclusion seems to have been reached: that, however incompetent our Bureaucracy may be in administration, it has proved its capacity as a merchant. With unlimited State credit behind it, it has bought raw material to great advantage, and therefore—so runs the argument—when Peace comes, let the State continue to buy for all industries; to act as broker, in short. This is the State Socialist's unconscious reply to the Garton Memorandum, which specifically reserves the purchasing of raw material and the marketing of the finished products exclusively to the employers.

The general discussion, then, on Reconstruction brings us to some unanimity. It is agreed that Labour must have a voice in workshop management. It is agreed that this share in control must be vested in the Trade Unions. Even trade policy is to be, in some degree, the subject of discussion, in which Labour shall be heard, in the Joint Committees or the Industrial Councils. Nor is that all: "This inter-relation of functions," says the Memorandum, "constitutes a real partnership between the persons concerned in any business, whether as investors, managers, or workmen, or in any two or all of these capacities." It is unhappily evident that when the Memorandum says "real partnership" it does not actually mean it; but at least the idea of a partnership of some sort is mooted as feasible. Assuming the concession of partnership, it comes to this: that such partnership shall be excluded from its share in the raw material—by the Employer, according to the gospel of Garton; by the State, according to the State Socialist. If, then, workshop control is the compromise between Capital and Labour, we have yet to decide whether we have a preference for the private or the State control of raw material. Is it a question of policy or of principle?

As things are, of policy only, I think. But the State Socialist may force the basic principle. He may, and probably will, contend that the State, in its own interest, must buy not only for industries as they are,

but for the Guilds when they are formed. Now, the National Guildsman will without any reservation declare that the Guilds must buy for themselves. On that issue, he is prepared to fight as a matter of principle. But short of a Guild, with industry only quasi-democratised, it is quite open to him to declare for the continuation of the private purchase of raw material in preference to State brokerage. In such circumstances, it is purely a question of policy.

It is a difficult dilemma. The whole theory and spirit of National Guilds runs counter to State intervention in industry; but equally it denounces private control. When this subject was recently discussed at a Guild meeting, a prominent Guildsman roundly declared that the State is the enemy. His case is that the Bureaucratic appetite grows by what it feeds upon; that every accretion of economic strength makes the State, as such, less disposed to hand over its functions when the Guilds demand it; that when the crisis comes, it will be easier to deal with the private capitalist than with the Bureaucracy. But is it a sound contention? Does it not, in fact, exaggerate the power of the State and under-estimate the power of the Employer? Which enemy has the more powerful defences? And have we considered a possible combination against us of both our enemies? It will be granted, I think, that the Bureaucracy and private Capital have more in common than Labour has with either. Superficially, it would seem as though in politics Capital and Labour have fought against the State and the Junkers. But they did not fight as friends. Throughout that struggle, Labour was the cat's paw and not the friend of the manufacturers. That battle has been won and lost. Labour was the loser; the manufacturers won and promptly inter-married and generally coalesced with both the Bureaucracy and the landed interests. For my part, I think it enormously important that Labour shall never again play the part of cat's paw for the employers. It is certainly prudent to assume that there will be close and subtle co-operation between Bureaucracy and Capital, until the Guilds are strong enough to dictate their own terms. When that time comes, if we have to snatch the control of raw material from Capital, it can rely upon the covert support of Bureaucracy; if we have to take it from the State, the covert support of Capital will not be so powerful, because it will already have been weakened in its economic power, to the extent of its loss of rent, royalty and profits on raw material. I think, therefore, without being dogmatic on the point, that the Bureaucracy is the easier prey of the two.

This business of raw material is vastly important. It plays to-day the part in industry formerly played by land. Rent is, at bottom, the economic power exercised by one possessor over another—the other generally being the labourer. With the control of raw material, a possessor can frustrate any industrial policy or hold up an industry or a single undertaking indefinitely. When the Garton Researchers reserve raw material to the employers, they know very well what they are doing. Suppose the Joint Committee or the Industrial Council adopt a line repugnant to the Employers, the Employers can speedily exact submission by withholding raw material. If the Employers can do it, the State can do it. But the Employers can do it quickly and vindictively; that is hardly possible to the State. But there is another aspect of the question. The available raw material in Great Britain—coal, mainly—is already "bespoke"; the State can hardly interfere without a complete subversion of the prevailing conception of property. The bulk of our raw material—cotton, wool, timber, wheat, hides, silk, rice, meat—comes from abroad. It is therefore closely related to transport, not to mention banking. How long would the State, the purchaser of raw material, submit to private shipowners and private bankers? One step leads to another; where would intervention stop? Now it is an important, though not a vital, part of the case for National Guilds that the organised industries can carry on their work much more efficiently than can the State. I suggest that the community would demand efficiency, and that if Guild organisation proceeded apace, the Guilds would, in the fullness of time, inherit all that organisation which the State had previously seized from the Employers.

Yet another consideration must weigh heavily in the State balance. With the control of raw material taken from the Employers and their industries democratised to the extent of works control, is it not certain that we are limiting the Employers' power to maintain wagery? Have we not taken a step towards the destruction of the permanent hypothesis? And again, if we succeed in finally saddling each industry with the maintenance of its own unemployed, dealing a shrewd, if not a vital, blow at the competitive wage-rate, we have travelled much more rapidly towards the Guilds than if we had left the control of raw material to the employers. The policy, then, for Guildsmen to pursue is to concentrate now on works control and be ready to press for industrial as distinct from State maintenance the moment unemployment threatens to become acute.

We are now confronted with a family quarrel, for Guildsmen are not agreed as to the logical outcome of workshop control. One group contends that it must stop there; the other that it leads to representation on the Directorate. The first argues that Labour must not, in any circumstances, concern itself with profits, must not touch the accursed thing, which it would do if its representatives became Directors. It is morally repugnant to them. The second group remains unconvinced. In the first place, so it contends, you may put your men on a Directorate without touching, or being responsible for, profits; that directors have other functions, notably the power to control management, and therefore Labour's power in industry is pro tanto strengthened. But both groups are agreed that all and any representation must come from the Trade Unions; they are not minded to tolerate a second edition of the South Metropolitan Gas Company—always a menace difficult to exorcise. In forming an opinion on this point, which is partly ethical, it is well to bear in mind our immediate object, which is to secure economic power for the workers. Unless this economic power be obtained, we shall never effect the transition; we shall be compelled to live in abstractions. Now every increase in Labour's economic power means a relative decrease in Capital's economic power. Further, it is not essentially immoral for Labour to concern itself with the distribution of surplus value. In fact, the more surplus value returns to Labour the less remains for the exploiter. But inasmuch as there are vital moral elements in the crusade for the establishment of Guilds, notably the passion for freedom (now only possible through the economic medium) and the natural piety that sees in labour a sacred thing and not a mere commodity, it is of first importance that no section of Labour shall ever find itself so circumstanced that it is to its advantage to maintain wagery, because it has obtained a *remunerative* share in the control of its own particular industry. I am not prepared to deny the possibility of such a development; but is it not rather remote?

In "National Guilds" (p. 240) there is an imaginary conversation between a deputation from an incipient Guild and the Directorate of a public company. The deputation bluntly demands half the profits and asks that the cheque be made payable to the Guild. The General Manager then suggests a profit-sharing scheme with the company's own employees. The deputation rejects any private arrangement of that character. It also rejects any increase in prices "because that would only victimise our fellow-workers." For the life of me, I can see no objection in principle to this drastic procedure. It is assumed in this case that the profits

are £100,000, and the incipient Guild demands £50,000, which sum goes to the fighting fund. Is organised Labour either morally or economically weaker for the transaction? In my opinion, stronger in both senses. No doubt it is rather a crude way of doing it! no doubt a gradual integration of organised power would enable the workers to absorb the £50,000 by raising their consumptive capacity beyond the commodity wage-rate. Of the two processes, I prefer the second. But if the first opportunity presents itself, are we to to reject it? It seems to me it must only be rejected, if the transfer of the profits places the particular group of workers concerned in a privileged position. As the money is specifically allocated to the Union, I cannot see how any particular group becomes wedded to profit-mongering. Alas! Precious few opportunities for so easily annexing £50,000 will present themselves!

There is another reason in favour of representation upon directorates. The Guilds—at least as outlined in the book—postulate a hierarchy. There is no reason why this hierarchy (even when democratically elected) should be composed of middle-class administrators. If the competent workers are to man the hierarchy, they must be trained in administrative work. Certainly a part of that training must be directorial in character.

The industrial problem, even from the Guild point of view, is not so simple that we shall not be constantly confronted with difficulties and dilemmas. In the two dilemmas here discussed, I provisionally favour: (a) a preference for State over private control of raw material; and (b) for representation on the Directorate as the logical corollary to workshop control. But are the two points not related? Suppose that Labour had considerable, if not adequate, representation on the Directorate, would it not modify my preference for State control of raw material? There is this to be noted: That in so far as such representation gives effective power to Labour, such power would be exercised to that extent over raw material, presuming it to be still controlled by the Employers. As the object we all have in view is to realise Guild organisation in the shortest possible time, such joint control over raw material might obviate any future struggle with the Bureaucracy, with its possible prolongation of the struggle. I am not dogmatic on either of the dilemmas cited; they both demand detailed analysis.

When State Socialists talk of the advantages of State credit in the purchase of raw material, I think they fail to realise that financially the Guilds could swallow the State budget for breakfast and be hungry at lunch time. The actual turnover of the Textile Guild alone would swamp the State expenditure. It is important that our Collectivist critics should learn that the Guilds are not little co-operative societies, but the summation of the industrial activities of the nation. It therefore follows that the State credit, upon which such store is set, is precisely the measure of the Guilds' credit. Nor need we fear any economic comparison between State and Guild administration. In quality, in efficiency, in productive capacity, in the spirit ruling over these things, the future is to the Guilds and not to the State.

Finally, let us not forget that Guildsmen are not Syndicalists; that they believe in the State as a great spiritual and intellectual force. "For the first time in the history of mankind he will clearly understand that nations, like men, do not live by bread alone. The intermixture of spiritual with economic considerations which now paralyses every State action will be, in form certainly and largely in substance, ended. By transferring the conduct of material affairs to the Guild . . . . statesmanship is left free to grapple with its own problems, undisturbed and undeterred by class considerations and unworthy economic pressure."

S. G. H.

National Guilds and the Division of Powers.

By G. D. H. Cole.

THE governing principle of the American constitution is that of the separation of the three powers—legislative, executive and judicial. Nor is this only a theoretical principle; for, in the main, the separation holds good in practice. The principle of our own government, on the other hand, is the combination of these powers. In theory, and practice, the judicial power, owing to the absence of a formal constitution, is subordinated to the legislature. In theory the executive is subordinate to the legislature, though it would perhaps be truer to say that in practice the legislature is increasingly subordinate to the executive. Whether we look to principle or to practice, it is at any rate true that with us legislature and executive are not two powers fundamentally distinct, but one power internally differentiated. The effect of this upon our working political theory is obvious. Legislature and executive may conduct internal struggles for mastery one against the other; but in relation to the mass of the people they present a united front. Representative government is exalted by them into a principle which practically carries with it the exclusion of the represented from an effective share in government. The division of powers, as theorists have often pointed out, ensures a recognition of the principle that sovereignty resides outside both legislature and executive: their combination readily results in the acceptance of the representative institution as sovereign.

When we speak of State Sovereignty, we may have at the back of our minds the idea that this Sovereignty belongs to the whole people; but we are thinking always of its exercise by the State as a complex of institutions—in a "democratic" country, of representative institutions. If the national institutions are in effect combined in a single machine, we think of Sovereignty as exercised by this machine, even if it belongs of right not to the machine, but to the people behind it. State Sovereignty, in the sense of governmental Sovereignty, therefore finds its only natural and complete expression in a system under which the powers of government are united in the hands of a single authority. The overweening claim of the State machine to the absolute allegiance of the citizen, called in this connection the "subject," is only possible under a system in which governmental authority is unified under a "Prince," whether that prince be a despot or a representative institution.

This has led some opponents of State Sovereignty to look favourably upon the division of powers between an independent legislature, executive and judiciary. But, in the case of the first two, which under modern conditions constitute the real problem, it is at once apparent that no such division is possible or desirable. The struggle for parliamentary government, which must be recognised as at least a phase in the European form of the struggle for political freedom, has centred round the demand of the legislature for control of the executive. If it has not secured that, it has at least welded the two into a single power, preserving their internal distinctness, but rendering them incapable of disintegration.

Nor is this to be regretted. A democratic country must be governed mainly by legislation, and those bodies in it which are legislative in character must preponderate. This is not true of a federal government such as that of the United States, though it is slowly becoming more true as America is drawn more into world politics; but it is true to a great extent of the States which constitute the Union. It is indeed only the federal character of the United States that makes the separation of powers workable. A society like our own must bind closely together the legislature and the

executive, because with the laws in constant change, legislation and administration lose their distinct character. There can for us be no solution of the problem of State Sovereignty by a division of legislative and executive power.

How, then, are we to realise, for such a Society, the benefits of the separation of powers? How are we to re-affirm popular Sovereignty, and, in so doing, re-establish the individual in his fundamental rights? The main business of government for us is the making and modification of laws which serve as the basis of administration. If this seems a commonplace, it must be remembered that it would not seem so in all places or in all times. We live under a reign of national law, and this seems to involve the unification of the making and administering of law under a single ultimate authority.

We must, then, seek our division of powers by the light of a new principle. We must recognise that the control of legislation and administration cannot be divorced, and, if we are to find a cleavage at all, we must make a new cut. In fact, we must separate the powers of government not horizontally, but vertically. Every important act of government, or at least every internal act, passes through the successive stages of legislation and administration. The old doctrine of the separation of powers is based on the principle of a division by stages: the legislative stage is to be divorced from the stage of administration. The new doctrine must be that of division by function: the type, purpose and subject-matter of the problem, and not the stage at which it has arrived, must determine what authority is to deal with it.

This involves a new conception of the nature and relationship of legislation and administration. Many writers have remarked the tendency of recent political changes to devolve administrative functions upon bodies standing outside the State machine, or only loosely connected with it. But no such tendency has shown itself in the strict sphere of legislation, and there the State has preserved its sole competence. It has devolved administrative power; but the devolution has been accomplished by the grant of the State, and has been subject to recall by a sovereign Parliament. It has been a method of convenience, and not a recognition of a new principle.

Nevertheless, it is a beginning, which the close connection between legislation and administration under modern conditions renders doubly valuable. It is not a recognition of a new principle, but it does open the door to such recognition. It is, in fact, the first step in a division according to function not only of administrative, but also of legislative, competence.

For nothing less than this the new theorists of the division of powers must stand. The Guildsman must claim for the Guilds, not only administrative, but also legislative functions. Their law must be as sovereign in the industrial sphere, exercised through the Guild Congress, as the law of the State must be sovereign in the political sphere. And, while laws are enforced at all, it must be no less enforceable. Where now the State passes a Factory Act, or a Coal Mines Regulation Act, the Guild Congress of the future will pass such Acts, and its power of enforcing them will be the same as that of the State.

This leads at once to a new conception of the judiciary, which in this country now hovers between independence and dependence on the State. Attention is often drawn, in connection with the separation of powers, to the position of the Supreme Court of the United States; but the independence of the Supreme Court is based on the existence of a written constitution, which the legislature has no power to alter without an appeal to the people. Apart from that, the American Federal Courts merely apply and carry out federal law, as the British courts apply and carry out British law. In principle, they are subordinate to the legislature.

What, then, will be the position of the judiciary under the Guilds? It will have two sets of laws to carry out—State law and Guild law, each valid within its sphere, and co-ordinated, where need arises, by the Joint Congress of the Guilds and the State. It is not desirable to divide the judiciary, as it is desirable to divide legislation and administration, because the judiciary is concerned, not with policy, but with interpretation of policy already decided.

Guild theory involves, then, the division of the "legislative-executive power" according to function between the State and the Guilds; but it preserves the integrity of the judiciary, making it an appendage neither of the State nor of the Guilds, but of the two combined.

The arguments for a balance of powers between the State and the Guilds were set out in my previous article on the question. In this article I have attempted to show how this balance would work out constitutionally. It involves a revolution in our theory of government; but it also provides the only means of realising in practice what has been clear in theory to many political students—a separation of powers which will be effective against the absolutist claims of modern legislative assemblies. A balance of power is essential if individual freedom is to be preserved; but no balance is possible unless it follows the natural division of powers in the Society of to-day. Politics and economics afford the only possible line of division, and between them the power of legislation and administration can only be divided on the basis of function.

Industrial Guilds in Japan.

(Reprinted by kind permission from the Japanese Section of the "Times" of Sept. 2, 1916.)

THE spirit of association for the promotion of mutual interest that has characterised the progress of man in all ages occupies in the development of Japanese civilisation a position no less prominent than in other countries. The whole Empire is covered by a network of well-organised associations that forms a veritable armour against all inimical approach. Influenced by the peculiar temperament of the Japanese race, the animating principle of the earlier guilds was the preservation of craft and trade secrets, which in some cases were limited to families, but in general stood for community interests.

The true history of these institutions in Japan has for the most part remained as much neglected as, until recently, the history of such guilds was in Europe. Japanese guilds, as at present organised, differ from the craft guilds of older days in that they are avowedly and distinctly associations for the promotion of industrial and commercial interests. Indeed, the marvellous industrial development of Japan in modern times is due in no small measure to the assistance of the numerous guilds everywhere existing for the encouragement and protection of commerce, industry, and agriculture. The industrial guilds especially have a far-reaching educative value, lending impetus to activity and production to a degree not fully appreciated by strangers.

Recently all Japanese guilds of this nature have been remodelled on a modern basis, a movement that has no doubt been the result of European influence. When the late Viscount Shinagawa visited Europe some years ago he was much impressed by the effect of such organisations on commerce and industry; and after his return to Japan, in co-operation with Viscount Hirata, he had the local guilds reformed and made uniform with a national system. These two patriotic leaders started out by promoting credit associations, to which the people promptly and sympathetically responded; and in 1898 a Bill was laid before the Imperial Diet for the legal establishment of industrial guilds and credit associations, the measure not receiving the assent of the

Legislature until 1900, though it has been twice revised since with a view to greater efficiency.

The national guilds being now placed under Government auspices the progress of their establishment grew apace until the number of them was so great that it soon became necessary to establish a central association representing the individual guilds of the Empire. The last report of these guilds that I have had an opportunity of examining gives the number now supporting the Central Association as 1,020 and 46 allied associations. The growth of the movement along modern lines is regarded as very satisfactory, their rapid development being largely due, no doubt, to the tremendous expansion of industry that set in after the war with Russia, resulting in a remarkable increase in the number of industrial guilds as well as in their promotion of national wealth.

By the year 1909 Japan had to reorganise the Central Association of Industrial Guilds on a basis of greater efficiency to meet the needs of the increasing number of branches throughout the country, the constitution of the guilds allowing the registration of all sympathisers as members; and now there are few, if any, guilds in the country that are not members of the Central Association. To facilitate operations and to keep pace with the increased interest in industry the authorities were obliged to establish branches of the Central Association in important centres like Kyoto, Osaka, Yokohama, Kobé, and Nagasaki; and there are now offices in two "Fu" and thirty-seven prefectures. Indeed, the time is not far distant when there will not be in the Empire a prefecture without a branch of the Central Association.

The Central Association devotes most of its attention to educating the public to take an intelligent and practical interest in the promotion of industry and in assisting producers in the production and sale of their output. The branch associations of the Central Association attend, for the most part, to the establishment and promotion of industrial guilds and affiliated societies. They also encourage sympathy among the various guilds; and at times they arrange lectures for the instruction of people in matters of industry. These extension lecture courses give systematised instruction in definite branches of industrial knowledge, and pupils are encouraged to take an entire course. As many as 4,000 lectures are given annually, and the students enrolled number many thousand. Every spring there is a general conference of all the industrial guilds of the Empire, when reports of progress are submitted, new ideas ventilated, and guilds worthy of special mention are accorded due recognition. The Central Association undertakes also to provide and train managers for the various guilds, and as this side of the work is directly under the patronage of the Government, the very ablest men are secured for the promotion of the nation's industrial interests. The total number of persons now members of industrial guilds is over 1,100,000, while the total annual expenditure of the guilds is some 3,000,000 yen.

It is not possible, of course, to estimate wholly the immense amount of good that has been done for industry by these guilds since their reorganisation on Western lines, but that they have had a marked effect on the promotion of output both from factory and farm, as well as in the selling of goods to advantage and the encouragement of thrift among the people, there is no room for doubt. In the purchase of suitable raw material, too, the guilds have proved most useful to enterprise. The total capital now represented by the industrial guilds of Japan is roughly estimated at 720,000,000 yen. Indeed, without the sympathy and assistance of these guilds many a small firm would have had to close down, as special attention is given to tiding firms of smaller means over crucial periods.

Not only in material but in moral ways as well, the Central Association makes a point of promoting wholesome development. The Central Association emphasises the point that its whole attention is not devoted to increasing the profits of the guilds and trading companies. Every member is encouraged to cooperate with every other in a humane and brotherly manner, the weaker and less fortunate being treated fairly and protected. In short, the Imperial Rescript on Education is made the fundamental principle governing the moral of the Central Association and the guilds under it. This aspect of its work is printed and circulated in pamphlets among members of the various guilds throughout the country.

In the past foreign merchants have complained of lack of uniformity in quality of output and insufficiency of supply in regard to manufactures ordered from Japan. The Central Association of Trade Guilds, as well as the Government, is devoting constant and careful attention to rectifying such evils as those complained of. All engaged in the same industry in any centre are required to become members of the local guild, which is under the supervision of the Central Association of Trade Guilds, and every member is required to bring his output up to the desired standard. Of course, the larger and more prosperous establishments are, for the most part, self-regulative, and there is no question as to the quality of their manufactures or as to their being able to fill any order undertaken; but in the case of numerous small manufacturers, who ply their trade in their own homes, and among whom contracts are often sublet, there is sometimes difficulty as to uniformity of quality as well as in regard to the quantity of output. But the law regulating industrial guilds is strict, and the authorities are doing everything possible to see that these domestic manufacturers comply with it, so as to equalise as far as possible the quality of their output. This official supervision extends not only to product, but to the material from which manufactures are made, as well as to the machinery and general equipment of the factory itself. All manufactures are subject to official inspection, and are adjudged fit or unfit for export. Goods rejected cannot be exported.

The system of careful supervision extends to capacity and liability for the fulfilment of contracts and orders received. Guilds are not permitted to undertake orders they may not be able to meet satisfactorily. Large contracts often must be divided among various establishments, but the guild officers see to it that uniformity of quality is maintained. There have been some irregularities owing to firms that manage to hold aloof in order to secure greater freedom, but, as this has been distinctly a menace to maintenance of uniformity in quality, the Government has brought forward further legislation to cover the case, and when this is enforced, as it soon will be, there will be no room for complaint in regard to special cases lacking uniformity of quality and quantity of output. Indeed, it is safe to say that there are few, if any, countries where authority takes so much pains to promote efficiency in industrial output as in Japan. More recently the Government has been taking steps to stabilise the country's commercial interests overseas, and for this purpose a more systematic co-operation of the national producers' guilds will be required. As a preliminary step the Minister of Agriculture and Commerce has called a conference of the supervisers of industrial guilds at his office in Tokyo, and has been consulting with them as to how best to arouse the guilds to greater activity and efficiency. At this conference it was decided that the economic strength of the guilds should be enhanced by authorising them to levy rates on members in the same line of industry, while eliminating those associations and societies too weak to be efficient. The Government will also aid financially those institutions in difficulty by bounties or by advancing

funds for relief. The Government will, moreover, render special assistance to guilds in their desire to study the requirements of foreign markets, and, at the same time, intervene still more emphatically in unifying all staple products and enforcing the necessary standards. Special attention is to be devoted to seeing that the regulations with regard to the conditioning of exports are observed, so that no inferior or unsatisfactory exports may prejudice the reputation of Japanese manufactures abroad.

An Industrial Symposium.

Conducted by Huntly Carter.

WITH a view to pooling the practical wisdom of the nation upon the main problems of the after-war period, THE NEW AGE is submitting the two following questions to representative public men and women:—

(1) What in your opinion will be the industrial situation after the war as regards (a) Labour, (b) Capital, (c) the Nation as a single commercial entity?

(2) What in your view is the best policy to be pursued by (a) Labour, (b) Capital, (c) the State?

(20) MR. C. H. GRINLING (*Woolwich*).

1. The industrial situation after the war:—(a) Labour will be divided. But there will be a deeper underlying unity. (b) Capital will be divided. The war of the trenches will have brought to birth a new insight into the life of Labour. There will be immense temptation to exploit the needs of the nation and the world. (c) The nation will be conscious, as never before in our history, of a common industrial goal. More serious efforts will be made to harness Labour and Capital alike to the service of the community. But extremes will be intensified.

2. The best policy to be pursued:—(a) By Labour: Freedom and the unity which freedom alone can give. The passing on of the burden of responsibility to officials should give place to democracy and the common shouldering of the burden. So will come the power as well as the claim of Labour to control the essential conditions of its own industrial life. Wages and hours should take second place. The development and co-ordination of all the hidden powers of woman, child, and man should come more and more to the front as fundamental aim. (b) By Capital: A true vision of the place of money in the world and its power over life for evil or good should be sought. Capital should place itself freely at the disposal of Labour in the interests of the State. Money should give place to Man. (c) By the State: The State should express the community life of the people from the point where the open democracy of individual and group life passes into representative government, owing to the pressure of numbers and the complexity of interests. Proportional Representation should be the basis of all phases of State organisation, and in industry regarded as essential.

(21) MR. THOMAS JOHNSON

(*Chairman, Irish Trade Union Congress*).

It is impossible to say what the industrial situation after the war will be in Ireland until we know who will be victorious. If Britain (and her Allies) wins, she may harden her heart against Ireland, in which case Ireland's economic interests will count little in determining the policy to be pursued by either Labour, Capital, or the State. On the other hand, if Germany (and her Allies) wins, the settlement may be such as to give Ireland some control of her economic policy. (What is food for England may be poison for Ireland. At this moment she is in such a position that British statesmen would sacrifice half the Empire to place England in—i.e., she produces more food than she consumes—and yet food prices are at famine rates, far above the reach of the working class in our towns and cities.)

Whoever controls Ireland's Government after the war ought to aim at stimulating agriculture by every possible means—State farms, co-operative colonies, compulsory tillage, punitive taxation of grass lands, etc.—and assist the development of those industries which are closely related to agriculture. But her produce must be devoted to feeding her own people first before she sends any to Britain. The English market must not be allowed to lure her foodstuffs for the private gain of her peasant proprietors until her own urban population are assured of enough to eat. Irish Labour will be "protectionist" on these lines. Possibly, also, the coming of the petrol-driven airship may revolutionise Ireland's position. We can grow potatoes for alcohol ad lib. Our Western harbours will be very convenient landing-places for a Transatlantic air fleet. The water-power of the Shannon may be utilised for generating electric energy.

An unfettered Irish Government may be able to do much to rejuvenate this country, and so I pray that "the nation (the Irish nation) may be a single economic entity."

(22) MR. A. J. PENTY.

I find it difficult to group my thoughts on industrial conditions after the war under the headings you suggest, but I will do my best to summarise my ideas in my own way.

For the moment all I can see is further disasters ahead, because I cannot discern any signs whatsoever that the people have learnt the lessons which one would have thought the war would teach them. Our national faith in materialism, with its concomitants of science and commercialism, still remains for the most part unshaken. So long as that faith remains, there can be no hope of a change for the better. This may be, of course, that for the moment we have little choice in the matter, and that, however much we may inwardly suspect the blessings of science and deplore the spirit of commercialism, we are yet compelled to make use of the one and to tolerate the other, in order to prosecute the war. When, however, peace is declared, the day of reckoning will be nigh at hand, and I should not be surprised whatever happens. To steer the ship of State over the troubled waters of the ensuing years will need the exercise of statesmanship of the highest order, and I think it is questionable whether it will be available.

There will, in the first place, be an unemployed problem of prodigious dimensions to cope with, for the demobilisation of the forces and the closing of the munition factories make this inevitable. What should be done? Well, I think that as many of the workers as possible should be put upon the land, and, with this end in view, the wages of agricultural workers should be made equivalent to those of industrial workers. This is the one thing to be done, but such a revolution would require time to give it practical effect, and in the meantime the people would need to be fed. If the Government are wise, they will deal boldly and firmly with the food problem, or I feel sure there will be an outbreak of physical violence. Public bodies and individuals possessing surplus wealth should be urged to spend freely. Many of the Greek temples were built to mitigate the stress of unemployment. A generous expenditure of surplus wealth would get back money into circulation, and upon success in this direction most things depend.

Meanwhile I would draw attention to another danger which threatens us—"Scientific Management." Fabians and capitalists appear to be agreed that our one hope lies in increasing the volume of production, and to this end they advise the adoption of "Scientific Management." What these wiseacres leave us in doubt about is how this increased output of goods is to be disposed of. The same people who advocate an increase of output also tell us that after the war there will be a decreased purchasing power among the belligerent nations. How they reconcile these conflicting ideas, and how any wise statesmanship is to be based upon them, I am entirely at a loss to understand. Yet these ideas are very widespread. I am meeting them everywhere. Perhaps some day, when we no longer do our thinking in watertight compartments, we shall come to understand that the disease which has inflicted the modern world is one which might be described as "industrial gluttony," and that just as the glutton, by reason of his greed, fails to benefit by the food he eats, so a community which produces in excess of real needs (as ours does) remains poor because its organs become incapable of assimilating its produce.

The most hopeful event, I think, is the appointment of a Food Dictator to fix prices. I hope this is the first step towards the establishment of a Political Dictator, for of such our country is in sore need. Only a dictator could deal with the complex problems which our society presents. Further, the fixing of prices appears to me to be the first step towards the establishment of Guilds, as it will lay the foundation on which they may be built.

Readers and Writers.

It has recently been said that the essay is no longer cultivated. No, but it grows wild in great profusion. As easy to write as a sonnet, the essay is at the same time as difficult a form to perfect. Mere ease of writing (or of reading either) is no proof of the possession of a style; and it is a fact that the emptiest and least satisfying of modern writers are easy and even pleasant to read. None is more so, perhaps, than "Alpha of the Plough," whose collection of essays contributed to the "Star" are now published in a shilling volume, "Pebbles on the Shore" (Dent). And none answers better to the description I have just given. We are told that "Alpha of the Plough" is "a well-known author who prefers to write under a pen-name in order to say what he chooses." Expectant of revelations or, at least, of candour beyond the discretion of a "well-known author," we read the essays only to find ourselves asking what need for concealment there was. There is nothing that might not be signed by any of a hundred "well-known authors" without risking his reputation either for discretion or the commonplace. It is all perfectly respectable and perfectly superficial.

* * *

That it is all readable, and even pleasantly readable, I have already insinuated. The "well-known author," in fact, knows the rudiments of his trade, and is well-practised in them. But the very skill of it becomes monotonous and ceases to give the pleasure art owes us, when we find one phrase succeeding another with the regularity and punctuality of a good train-service. Take this rather long extract for example and examine it:

> But if the solitude of Ypres is memorable, the silence is terrible. It is the silence of imminent and breathless things, full of strange secrets, thrilling with a fearful expectation, broken by sudden and shattering voices that speak and then are still—voices that seem to come out of the bowels of the earth near at hand and are answered by voices more distant, the vicious hiss of the shrapnel, the crisp rattle of the machine-guns, the roar of "Mother," that sounds like an invisible express train thundering through the sky above you. The solitude and the silence assume an oppressive significance. They are only the garment of the mighty mystery that envelops you. You feel that these dead walls have ears, eyes, and most potent voices, that you are not in the midst of a great loneliness, but that all around the earth is full of most tremendous secrets. And then you realise that the city that is as dead as Nineveh to the outward eye is the most vital city in the world. One day it will rise from its ashes, its streets will resound once more with jest and laughter, its fires will be relit, and its chimneys will send forth the cheerful smoke. But its glory throughout all the ages will be the memory of the days when it stood a mound of ruins on the plain with its finger pointing in mute appeal to heaven against the infamies of men.

* * *

I imagine that when our "well-known author" brought his essay on "A City that Was" to the conclusion just quoted, he put down his pen with a feeling of considerable satisfaction. Running his mind and eye over the general form, he could fairly flatter himself that it was complete and smooth and beyond the criticism of any of his fellows. The opening contrast of solitude and silence had been duly recalled some half-way through the passage and brought to a climax in paraphrase in the concluding sentence. Adjectives and nouns had been properly paired off. Onomatopœia, alliteration, cadence, variety of sentences and all the other tricks of the trade had been neatly attended to. And, finally, the atmosphere had been skilfully sustained by a succession of words in the same key, broken only and quite properly by the sudden and shattering discords that represent the bursting of shells and the noise of guns. Yes, it was a good piece of workmanship, and had all the trade finish. But —how does it appeal to us, the readers? How much delight can we get out of it? Let us see. The delight of literature being essentially the unexpected pleasure provided for us, we can classify literature according to its yield of this quality. Some literature delights us once and on a superficial reading, and then is exhausted. Literature of a higher order delights us over and over again before finally we are done with it. But literature of the very highest order is a perpetual source of delightful surprise that keeps us in a state of constant wonder. How is it with the passage I have quoted? I venture to say that there is not a single delightful surprise in it from the first phrase to the last. All, as I have said, runs with the smoothness, but also with the expectedness, of machinery. It is a lathe turning out phrases and words and thoughts that we are witnessing; it is certainly not an artist quiring like the cherubim. Analyse, if you will, the sentences one by one; and ask yourself if they contain a turn of phrase or even a word that is not taken from the shop-window. The solitude is memorable, the silence is terrible. There are imminent and breathless things, strange secrets, fearful expectations, oppressive significances, great lonelinesses, tremendous secrets, mute appeals. Why, not only anybody could have said as much, but anybody would—only somebody would have said it differently! And the impression conveyed is of the same order as the writing that conveys it: we are not in the least surprised to hear that Ypres is like that; we expected it to be like that; and we could very well have described it in the same manner without ever going to see it or hearing from a "well-known author" who has, he tells us, been there. But all this is to say that the description is not authentic, it is not original, it communicates no fresh feeling; in a word, it is not literature. And by that judgment, which I pass upon the whole volume and not merely upon the present passage, I am prepared to stand.

* * *

The method of criticism I have just applied very inadequately may be found set out most adequately in a volume by Mr. E. A. Greening Lamborn under the title of "The Rudiments of Criticism" (Clarendon Press, 2s. 6d. net). Mr. Lamborn, if I may say so, is a writer and a critic after my own heart. There is scarcely a word in his volume with which I do not agree. And his boldness takes my breath away by its frequent success. What courage it required of a man of letters to set before himself this sentence of Addison's, and what a success to have almost written up to it. "I could wish," said Addison, "that there were authors of this kind, who, besides the mechanical rules, which a man of very little taste may discourse upon, would enter into the very spirit and soul of fine writing and show us the several sources of that pleasure which rises in the mind upon the perusal of a noble work . . . which few of the critics besides Longinus have considered." Mr. Lamborn has perhaps not given us so complete a work as Longinus, were he living, might write; but then he has written for a less cultured age, an age that needs to be taught the rudiments of criticism and appreciation. For such of my readers as modestly confess themselves to be not without a touch of the age—and truly none escapes except by grace and good works—the present volume will bring the means of absolution.

R. H. C.

On Power and Things.

"R. H. C." is invariably kind to me. He is a very distinguished member in the Christian partnership of kindness. Unfortunately virtues clash among themselves, and kindness and truth do not always travel together. He has really understood the main thesis of my contribution to THE NEW AGE and of my book, "Authority, Liberty and Function." I should like to have written his words: "Both Authority and Liberty are alike concerned, not primarily to secure justice or to maintain and increase the sum of common goods, but *to preserve someone's inviolability.*" That is excellent. Neither Authority nor Liberty is a social principle, but purely individual. They cannot bridge the abyss between the individual and society.

I wish I could agree with his criticisms. But I cannot, and I ask him to ask himself if he can agree with them after reflection. I have said, for instance, that each of the three social powers (economic, political, and military) is an aspect of social power in general, and "R. H. C." objects as follows:

> To protest that in tracing political and military power to an economic source we are in danger of reducing them to impotence is a wise enough proceeding, since it serves to correct the impression that economic power is the only power; but to affirm that they do not stand in any relation of dependence upon economics whatever is to fall into the other extreme.

"R. H. C.'s" kindness here blinds his reason. Either military and political powers are powers or they are merely appearances of power and "realities" of impotence. Either they are reducible to economics or not. "R. H. C." cannot escape the dilemma.

I have acknowledged that there is a relation of dependence between the three powers: a relation of reciprocal interdependence. They are in the same relation as the different forms of energy in the physical world. And the empirical proof of my assertion lies in the fact that they are transmutable into one another; military power transmutes itself into economic power (Prussia), economic into military (England), political into both (perhaps the present China).

"R. H. C." may construct a definition of economics which comprises military, political and all the other possible social powers. But then we are arguing over words. His economics will then be a "cratology" or science of power in general and not a science of specific economic power. A cratology is possible because power is a reality. A deductive science of economics has been found as impossible as a deductive science of war or of politics, because there is no other substance in them than power in general. Power is a reality with many sides and fundamental unity; the different sides of power are not realities, but precisely sides, aspects, surfaces, appearances, something more than names, but something less than realities.

Political Economy was to the Greeks very literally the science of the regulation of the affairs of the State. The matter of their Political Economy was not economic power, in the sense of "R. H. C." but power in general. "R. H. C." may say that economics is the science of wealth. But, what is wealth? If he reflects on wealth he will be bound to say that wealth is property. I do not say that it is private property, for property may be collective property. What I do say is that wealth is property and nothing else. There is nothing in the concept of wealth that is not implied in the concept of property, and nothing in the concept of property that is not implied in the concept of wealth.

If "R. H. C." analyses what he means by property he will soon find that in the concept of property—not only in private property, but also in collective property—there is implied the concept of a proprietor. Economics does not deal, and cannot deal, with wealth if abstraction is made of the proprietor, for wealth without a proprietor is not wealth, but purely Nature, and belongs to natural science and not to economics. And the concept of property implies that of law, which implies a political order, implying also military power. I grant that property may fall into the hand of a thief, but this fact does not invalidate my argument. The fact that wealth is property has nothing to do with the legitimacy of the claims of its actual proprietor. There must be always somebody—an individual or a collective somebody—with legal claims to every kind of property. And that is enough to prove that economic power (property) is absolutely inseparable from that of political and military power. You cannot think of the one without the other, and if you believe that you are thinking so, you deceive yourself.

And yet, although in abstract reasoning I must maintain my idea of the fundamental unity of the different temporal powers in every society, I am far from disputing the favourite formula of THE NEW AGE: "Economic power precedes political power." If by this is meant that the English democracy ought to take first and particular care of the just distribution of economic power, I agree. When a democracy takes care of the distribution of political and military power, but leaves economic power to take care of itself, the inevitable result will be political democracy, but the economic oppression of the masses. Good illustrations of this assertion may be found in all English-speaking countries, with the exceptions of Australia and New Zealand.

But when a democracy falls into the other extreme of taking care only of economics, and letting politics take care of themselves, the result will be an amelioration in the standard of life among the poor, but it will be paid for by political slavery. You are already thinking of the connection between the triumph of Kaiserism in the German Government and the triumph of the economic interpretation of history among the German socialists.

My disagreement with "R. H. C." does not affect my practical agreement with his policy. The poor of England have been far too careless about the distribution of economic power. But the point of the primacy of this or that temporal power does not affect my main thesis. What it does affect is the second objection raised by "R. H. C.":

> Are not both my colleagues ("A. E. R." and myself) wrong, or, rather, only half-right, the one in asserting that only things unite, and the other in maintaining that only men unite? To sum the matter up, is not the distinction that drawn by a recent contributor between a partnership and a fellowship? Mr. de Maeztu is all for partnership. "A. E. R." is all for fellowship. A good society combines both.

And "R. H. C" quotes with approval the remark by Mr. Bertrand Russell: "The two chief sources of good relations between individuals are instinctive liking and common purpose."

It seems to me that Mr. Russell's remark has nothing to do with the question. We are discussing the nature of associations, and not merely that of good relations. The most stable associations in the world comprise individuals who do not like each other. But even if fellowship were by itself a sufficient ground for an association, it would always be a partnership—a partnership in fellowship. You may object—it has been already objected to me—that I am giving to the relation "fellowship" a reality apart from that of the fellows, and that there is no fellowship without the fellows. To which I reply that there are no fellows without the fellowship. You may believe that fellowship is a human "ejection," but let me believe that it is, on the contrary, a self-subsisting reality which men have to partake of, if they are to be fellows.

And, please, do not quote on this point Mr. Bertrand Russell against me, for the following are Mr. Russell's words:—

"It will be seen that no sentence can be made up without at least one word which denotes a universal. The nearest approach would be some such statement as

'I like this.' But even here the word 'like' denotes a universal." ("The Problems of Philosophy," page 146).

"Liking," then, is a universal. People who like each other partake in the universal "like," and "universals are not thoughts, though when known they are the objects of thoughts." The thinkers of the present century believe, again, in the reality of universals, like the dark Middle Ages. There are other realities besides bodies and minds.

But to prove the thesis that "every human society is a society in something," you need not appeal to the realistic philosophy. It is a self-evident fact. Can you name one single society that has not something which is its essence? Is there a club without the common purpose of the club? Or a Church without the dogmas and the traditions of the Church? Or a nation without the nation? Are we going to say that England is exclusively composed of the Englishmen of the day? But it is obvious that England existed before any of the present Englishmen were born, and let us hope that England will survive them all. I believe these examples are enough to illustrate the assertion that the essence of every society transcends its members, and that the primacy in every society belongs to something apart from its members. Again the primacy of things!

This truth is elementary, but it has been forgotten under the influence of humanistic ideas: Renaissance, Reformation, Revolution. Man has been made the centre of societies, either the average individual or the man in authority, that is to say, the man capable of imposing his will upon others. And the practical consequences have been fatal. Once you forget the thing in the constitution of a society, you get either the powerless individual, and no society at all, or the oppression and exploitation of man by man and a society founded on exploitation and oppression.

To avoid the dilemma Rousseau invented the myth of the common will. Rousseau is one of the fathers of the modern State. You may read in Mr. Bosanquet's "Philosophical Theory of the State":—

"Where two or three are gathered together with any degree of common experience and co-operation, there is pro tanto a general will."

You may be pretty certain that there is *not* such a thing. If you and I combine together for a common end there will be the end, the "thing" in common; there will be a thing willed in common; but there will not appear a third absurd person called common will. There are not collective souls; there are collective things, common things. Every society is a commonwealth, or there is no society at all. If you suppress the common thing, you are you and I am I and that is all.

As a matter of fact, you cannot suppress the common thing, for we are born and bred in common things, but you can forget them in the constitution of societies, in the formulation of their laws. I believe that Saint Thomas is the last classic that mentions the word "thing" in the definition of law. But if you cease to consider the law as the regulation of the relations or the functions of the individuals in respect of common things, you are bound to see the law as purely and simply an expression of force, unless you fall into the modern superstition of believing in collective souls or in common wills. You do not escape the power of things, for that is impossible, but you fall either into oppression or into anarchy.

But I am tired of repeating that a just and stable society can only be founded on the general acknowledgment of the primacy of things over the will or wills of individuals. The dissolution implied in the liberal principle and the oppression inseparable from the authoritarian principle have brought the English and the
tarian principle have brought the English and the Germans into their present state. RAMIRO DE MAEZTU.

Letters from Ireland.

By C. E. Bechhofer.

ONCE upon a time I used to go into bookshops in Dublin and Belfast, and, amazed first to find THE NEW AGE displayed most frequently and prominently of all the English reviews, buy an armful of Irish weeklies. Then I would take them to my hotel, send for a corkscrew and try to read them.

The "Irish Homestead" is quite different from all the others, and is, indeed, hardly to be classed with them. As the organ of the Irish Agricultural Organisation Society it is almost entirely concerned with technical matters, such as Creamery Management, Bee-keeping and Dairy Bacteriology. But what makes the paper noteworthy is A. E.'s editorial articles. The farmers for whom he writes read neither books nor serious papers, and it is far from easy to introduce ideas to them. I take a typical paragraph from one of A. E.'s "Talks with an Irish Farmer":—

Nobody who has known the Irish considers them less naturally endowed with intelligence than the people in countries like Holland, Denmark, and Belgium; indeed, they wonder how a people so quick as the Irish have so little to show in comparison. Now, the trouble with us Irish is that we neglect the use of our most precious gift, our intelligence. We rely on the vote, the cudgel, the rifle, to win our ends, whereas we should use the intellect and imagination we are endowed with, and we will never come to anything, we will always be defeated in our objects, always be worsted in the game, until we begin to use our intellect and imagination together about our country and to think out its problems as deliberately as the designer in one of the great shipyards in Belfast works out the design for one of the great Atlantic liners they build. . . . I would wish you to think less of the past and more of the future, and to regard yourself as a Builder of the future Ireland.

A more pretentious weekly is "New Ireland." When I read it first, it was proposing a grand new political idea. This was a means of re-establishing the discipline of the Irish representatives at Westminster. Mr. Redmond and his followers, "New Ireland" told us, were ceasing to consider the opinions of their constituents, and consulting no one but themselves in politics. The way to remedy this, it said, was to make the Irish members pay their £400 a year into the funds of a central body at Dublin, which would hand it out to them again only if their Parliamentary conduct was satisfactory. How the members are to be persuaded to come up for judgment, who is to judge them, and by what standards—these questions "New Ireland" did not consider. The idea I imagine to be in the writer's mind is one which a prominent member of the staff of "New Ireland" recommended to me in conversation. This is the Referendum: the Irish members are not to take part in any division at Westminster before they have consulted their constituents. I told the journalist the delight I felt in imagining the suspension of all business at Westminster while the voters of County Cork meditate upon a vote of supply. My frivolity perhaps accounts for the frequent editorial references in a later issue of "New Ireland" to "strangers to the age-long traditions of this country," and "the rawest stranger to the country." Another wonderful notion I learnt from the same source was that Home Rule will not be delayed much longer, because the English Labour Party will insist upon its enforcement!

More amusing is a weekly absurdity called the "Catholic." The title is intentionally ironic, since the Catholicism the paper represents is in virulent opposition to Roman Catholicism. Mr. Kensit is the Pope's most adoring admirer, in comparison with the editor of the "Catholic." This is a typical comment:—

THE FIRST QUALIFICATION FOR A REBEL.

Judging by the late rebellion, this seems that he be a Roman Catholic. Roger Casement joined the Church of

Rome before his execution; the so-called "Countess" has registered herself as a Roman Catholic in Mountjoy Prison, and is receiving the ministrations of a Roman Catholic priest, and James Connolly, despite our quotations from his pamphlet elsewhere, was reconciled to the "one true Church." These are very significant facts, and worth pondering.

I have not yet bought a second copy of the "Catholic," nor of the Gaelic League's paper, "An Claidheamh Solius." The price of this latter is stated on the outside to be a "pinginn"; I got it for two halfpennies. Since practically the whole paper is in Gaelic, a language of which I know as little as does the majority of Irishmen, I got no satisfaction from it. There was, however, a leading article in strange English on "Roumania and Ireland," which, after stating that the Balkan Peninsula was now the "real home of die-hard languages," said :—

When the roads of political and industrial progress are barred, the road of education lies free before us if we choose to follow it. That is the road the Gaelic League asks the people of Ireland to follow.

P. P. P. P. P. Phonetic power precedes political power! And the advertisements in the paper show that it is arousing surely of the country the spirit.

I quote one :—

GAELS,
Send your Shirts and Collars, etc., to
THE NATIONAL LAUNDRY CO.,
Dyers and Cleaners,
DUBLIN.

Another prominent weekly, the "Leader," has a vocabulary which is not mine. This is a specimen of its prose :—

What a crushed old "tame" this Mr. Gilhooly is to be sure. Some time ago Mr. John Gilhooly, Clerk to the Bantry Board of Guardians and son of the M.P., together with another man, waited on a Protestant minister and his wife, Rev. Canon O'Grady, for the purpose of getting permission to hold what they called a mixed dance in the Protestant schoolroom. Their request was not successful. The Bantry Board of Guardians is, we understand, practically run by Mr. James Gilhooly, M.P., father of the Clerk; Mr. Cotter, and Mr. B. O'Connor, J.P., local manager to Mr. William Martin Murphy. My dark Rosaleen!

And this of its verse :—

Green sentiment looks very queer with men who let John Bull
The longitude of Ireland here away to England pull.
But Irish Ireland needn't fret o'er conduct so perplexed,
For she has mighty forces yet that cannot be annexed.

Another distressful paper is the "Irish Nation." This is its message :—

THE MIRACLE OF IRELAND.

Seven hundred years! and not yet crushed! Beside the miracle of Ireland, the miracle of the Jews pales to evanescence. Hard and oppressive though the Egyptians were, the Jews have survived and are a nation though scattered broadcast through the world, a nation with a noble, national ideal. The Irish, thanks to the nobility which our ancestors by the practice of high and noble ideals relinquished to their descendants, and thanks, too, to a religion that inspires fortitude and patience in the midst of calamity, the Irish to-day are still there, there, with a vengeance. Their yearnings after complete liberty are only whetted by disappointment and strengthened by delay. The spirit lives! It lives in Ireland, it lives wherever Irishmen have made their home.

In Belfast I have discovered a paper called the "Irishman," which seems not so much a review as an editorial monologue. However, I rank it above the last four papers I have mentioned, because it does sometimes realise that Ireland's economic situation is connected with her political future and past. More I cannot say for it.

We Moderns.

By Edward Moore.

DECADENCE.—The decisive thing, determining whether an artist shall be major or minor, is very often not artistic at all, but moral. Yes, though it shock our modern ears, let this be proclaimed! The more "temperament" an artist has, the more character he requires to govern it, to make it fruitful for him, if he would not have it get beyond control, and wreck both him and itself. And, consequently, the great artists show, as a rule, less "temperament" than the minor; they appear more self-contained and less "artistic." Indeed, they smile with a hint of irony at the merely "artistic."

It is, perhaps, when the traditions of artistic morality and discipline have broken down, when the "temperament" has, therefore, become unfettered and lawless, that decadence in art is born. The sincerity of the artist, his chief virtue, is gone—the sincerity which commands him to create only under the pressure of an artistic necessity, which tells him, in other words, to produce nothing which is not genuine. Without sincerity, severity and patience, nothing great in art can be created. And it is precisely in these virtues that the decadent is lacking. A love of beauty is his only credential as an artist, but, undisciplined, it degenerates very soon into a love of mere effect. An effect of beauty at all costs, whether it be the true beauty or not! That becomes his object. Without a root in any soil, he aspires to the condition of the water lily, and, in due time, becomes a full-grown æsthete. Is it because he is incapable of becoming anything else? Has he in despair grown "artistic" simply because he is not an artist? Is Decadence the most subtle disguise of impotence? And are decadents those who, if they had submitted to an artistic discipline of sincerity, would never have written at all? Of some of them this is true, but of others it is not; and in that lies the tragedy of Decadence. Wilde himself was, perhaps, a decadent by misadventure; for on occasion he could rise above decadence into sincerity. "The Ballad of Reading Gaol" proves that. He was the victim of a bad æsthetic morality, to which, it is true, he had a predisposition. And if this is true of him, it is true, also, of his followers. A baleful artistic ethic still rules, demoralising the young artist at the moment when he should be disciplining himself; and turning, perhaps, someone with the potentiality of greatness into a minor artist. By neglecting the harder virtues, the decadents have made minor art inevitable and great art almost impossible.

The old tradition of artistic discipline must be regained, then, or a new and even more severe tradition inaugurated. A text-book of morality for artists is now overdue. When it has been written, and the new discipline has been hailed and submitted to by the artists, who can say if greatness may not again be possible?

DECADENCE AGAIN.—How is the dissolution of the tradition of artistic discipline to be explained? To what cause is it to be traced? Perhaps to the more general dissolution of tradition which has taken place in modern times. When theological dogmas and moral values are thrown into the melting-pot, and the discipline of centuries is dissolved into anarchy, it is natural that artistic traditions should perish along with them. Decadence follows free-thought: it appears at the time when the old values lie deliquescent and the new values have not yet arisen, the dry land has not yet appeared. But this does not happen always: the old traditions of morality, theology, politics and industry are overthrown, the beginnings of a new tradition appear tentatively, everything fixed has vanished, the wildest hopes and the most chilling despair are the common possession of one and the same generation—but, throughout, the artistic tradition is held securely and

confidently, it remains the one thing fixed in a world of dissolution. Then an art arises greater even than that of the eras of tradition. The pathos of the dying and the inexpressible hope of the newly born find expression side by side; all chains are broken, and the world appears suddenly to be immeasurable. Is this what happened at the Renaissance?

WILDE AND THE SENSUALISTS.—The so-called Paganism of our time, the movement towards sensualism of the followers of Wilde, is not an attempt, however absurd, to supersede Christianity; nor is it even in essence anti-Christian. At the most it is a re-action—not a step beyond current religion into a new world of the spirit, but a changing from one foot to the other, a reliance on the senses for a little, so that the overlaboured soul may rest. And there is still much of Christianity in this modern Paganism. Its devotees are too deeply corrupted to be capable either of pure sensuousness or of pure spirituality. They speak of Christ like voluptuaries, and of Eros like penitents. But it is impossible now to become a Pagan: one must remember Ibsen's Julian and take warning. Two thousand years of "bad conscience," of Christian self-probing, with its deepening of the soul, cannot be disavowed, forgotten, unlived. For Paganism a simpler spirit, mind and sensuousness are required than we can reproduce. We cannot feel, we cannot think, above all, we cannot feel without thinking of our feelings, as the Pagans did. Our modern desire to take out our soul and look at it separates us from the naïve classic sensuousness.

What, then, does modern sensualism mean? What satisfaction does it bring to those, by no means few in number, its "followers"? A respite, an escapade, a holiday from Christianity, from the inevitable. For Christianity is assumed by them to be the inevitable, and it fills them with the loathing which is evoked by the enforced contemplation of things tyrannical and permanent. To escape from it they plunge madly into sensuality as into a sea of redemption. But the disgust which drives them there will eventually drive them forth again—into asceticism and the denial of the senses. Christianity will then appear stronger than ever, having been purged of its "uncleanness." Yes, the sensualists of our time are the best unconscious friends of Christianity, its "saviours," who have taken its sins upon their shoulders.

There still remain the few who do not assume Christianity to be inevitable, who desire, no matter how hopeless the fight may seem, to surmount it, and who see that men have played too long the game of re-action. "To cure the senses by the soul and the soul by the senses" seems to them a creed for invalids. And, therefore, that against which, above all, they guard, is a mere relapse into sensualism. Not by fleeing from Christianity do they hope to reach their goal; but by understanding it, perhaps by "seeing through" it, certainly by benefiting in as far as they can by it, and, finally, emancipating themselves from it. They learn that the soul no longer exists out of which grew the flower of Paganism, and that they must pass through Christianity if they would reach a new sensuality and a new spirituality. But their motto is, Spirituality first, and, after that, only as much sensuality as our spirituality can govern! They hold that as men become more spiritual they may safely become more sensual; but that, to the man without spirit, sensuality and æsceticism are alike an indulgence and a curse. That the spirit should rule—such is their desire; but it must rule as a constitutional governor, not as an arbitrary tyrant. For the senses, too, as Heine said, have their rights.

PATER AND THE ÆSTHETES.—How much of Pater's exclusiveness and reclusiveness was a revulsion from the ugliness of his time—an ugliness which he was not strong enough to contemplate, far less to fight—it is hard to say Perhaps his phase of the Decadence may be defined as largely a re-action against industrialism, just as that of Wilde may be defined as largely a re-action against Christianity: but, in the former case as in the latter, that against which the re-action was made was assumed to be permanent. Indeed, by escaping from industrialism instead of fighting it, Pater and his followers made its persistence only a little more secure. It is true, there are excuses enough to palliate their weakness: the delicateness of their own nerves and senses, making them peculiarly liable to suffering, the ugliness and apparent invulnerability of industrialism, the beauty and repose of the world of art, wherein they might take refuge and be happy. Art as forgetfulness, art as Lethe, the seduction of that cry was strong! But to yield to it was none the less unforgiveable: it was an art traitorous not only to society but to art itself. For what was the confession underlying it? That the society of to-day and of to-morrow is, and *must be*, barren; that no great art can hereafter be produced; that there is nothing left but to enjoy what has been accomplished! Against that presumption, not the Philistines but the great artists will cry as the last word of Nihilism.

Pater's creed marks, therefore, a degradation of the conception of art. Art as something exclusive, fragile and a little odd, the occupation of a few æsthetic eccentrics—this is the most pitiable caricature! To make themselves understood by one another, this little clique invented a jargon of their own; in this jargon Pater's books are written, and not only his, but those of his followers to this day. It is a style lacking, above all, in good taste; it very easily drops into absurdity; indeed, it is always on the verge of absurdity. It has no masculinity, no hardness; and it is meant to be read by people a little insincerely "æsthetic," who are conscious that they are open to ridicule, and who are accordingly indulgent to the ridiculous; the Fabians of art. To admire Pater's style, it is necessary first to put oneself into the proper attitude.

THE AVERAGE MAN.—In this welter of dissolving values, the intellectuals of our time find themselves struggling, and liable at any moment to be engulfed. A few of them, however, have snatched at something which, in the prevailing deliquescence, appears to be solid—the average man. Encamped upon him, they have won back sanity and happiness. But their act is nevertheless simply a re-action; here the real problem has not yet been faced! What is it that makes the average man more sane and happy than the modern man? The possession of dogmas, says Mr. G. K. Chesterton; let us therefore have dogmas! But, alas, for them he goes back and not forward. And not only back, but back to the very dogmas against which modern thought, and Decadence with it, are a re-action, nay, the *inevitable* re-action. What! has Mr. Chesterton, then, postponed the solution of the problem? And on the heels of his remedy does there tread the old disease over again? Perhaps it is so. The acceptance of the old dogmas will be followed by a new re-action from them, a new disintegration of values therefore, and a new Decadence. The hands of the clock can be put back, it is true; but they will eventually reach the time when the hour shall strike *again* for the solution of the modern problem.

And that is the criticism which modern men must pass upon Mr. Chesterton; that he interposed in the course of their malady to bring relief with a remedy which was not a remedy. The modern problem should have been worked out to a new solution, to its own solution. Instead of going back to the old dogmas, we should have strained on towards the new. And if, in this generation, the new dogmas are still out of sight, if we have meantime to live our lives without peace or stability, does it matter so very much? To do so is, perhaps, our allotted task. And as sacrifices to the future we justify our very fruitlessness, our very modernity!

A Defence of Free Trade.

A VERY ingenious book by Mr. J. A. Hobson sets forth the case against tariffs and an economic war "after the war" extraordinarily well ("The New Protectionism." Unwin. 2s. 6d. net). To readers of THE NEW AGE most of the arguments used will hardly be fresh, for the subject was dealt with editorially in these columns immediately after the sessions of the Economic Conference in Paris last June, and the essential pros and cons are alike. A résumé of Mr. Hobson's book will not, nevertheless, be without value. His definition of the "New Protectionism" is brief and useful :—

The New Protection differs from the Old in seeking to superimpose the present war map of the world, with its divisions of belligerents, allies, and neutrals, upon the Protectionism of 1903-1905, which sought to combine protection for British industries with a closer business connection between the self-governing Dominions and the Mother-country. To extract a definite intelligible shape for this New Protectionism out of the general rhetoric in which it is embedded by most of its exponents is no easy task. (P. ix.)

The "moving and moulding spirit" of this policy Mr. Hobson believes to be "the evident desire of groups of business men to exploit the emotions of friendship and antagonism generated by the war and the immediate economic exigencies of the situation in order to get a public policy which will yield them a private profit." The effects of a policy of boycott and economic war against the Central Empires are clearly summed up :—

In the first place, by narrowing the area of our free external markets, it would diminish the total gains of British industry and commerce, and render more precarious the livelihood of a population and a trade dependent for existence upon large and assured access to varied sources of oversea supplies. Secondly, by breaking Europe into two nominally independent but really hostile and competing economic systems, it would foster conflicts in all parts of the world, maintain and feed the bitter memories of this war, stimulate the maintenance and growth of armaments, and render another war inevitable. (P. xvi.)

In succeeding chapters Mr. Hobson combats the fallacies that Protection is "an instrument of defence" (p. 16), that a cessation of trade between England and Germany would damage Germany without affecting England (pp. 27-28), and that "key" industries can be protected by tariffs (p. 46). Further, he emphasises facts with which most of our business men are already reckoning, as, for example, the difficulty we should be placed in if extreme measures against Germany resulted in an alliance, economic or otherwise, between Germany and influential neutral countries, such as the United States; and, again, the absurdity of supposing that our markets were freely opened to Germany before the war for any other reason than our own gain (pp. 30 foll.) The "four-decker" tariff proposition has already been rejected by such an Imperialistic organ as the "Round Table"; Mr. Hobson gives it its quietus. How, indeed, could it ever have been considered as possible or practicable to lay down separate tariffs for goods from the Empire, from our Allies, from neutrals, and from the Central Empires? In his third chapter ("the tangles of a tariff") Mr. Hobson discusses the absurdity of these suggestions. No system of tariffs, as he justly points out, could possibly assist the "defence" of this country, though it might very well diminish that "opulence," which has stood the Allied cause in such good stead since the outbreak of war. It is difficult to see, again, how a tariff could make the United Kingdom itself self-supporting, considering the enormous supplies of foodstuffs and raw materials we are forced to import.

Another good point is made by Mr. Hobson in this connection (p. 51), namely, that exclusive dependence on our Oversea Dominions for foodstuffs and other necessaries would not reduce submarine or other risks in time of war, while it would, by limiting the sources of supply in time of peace, cause grave fluctuations in supplies and prices. A table is quoted (p. 98) showing that in normal times less than half our supplies of wheat and flour come from our Oversea Possessions. Again, the extreme protectionists hardly realise that our present Allies would not care for the differentiation between them and the Dominions, and still less would neutrals relish the extra duties imposed in their case. Before proceeding we take leave to remind Mr. Hobson that there is no such country as that which he mentions on p. 52, viz., Austro-Hungary, though there is an adjective Austro-Hungarian formed from the country it stands for, Austria-Hungary—quandoque bonus dormitat Hobsonus.

Nor is our author less incisive and earnest in his advocacy of the policy of the open door. England, he insists more than once, owes her Empire to this attitude of tolerance. He looks forward, apparently (p. 127), to a continuance of exploitation after the war, but exploitation based, not on international animosity and suspicion, but on international agreement :—

We cannot revert to strictly private enterprise, Governments looking on with folded arms, while private companies, with armed forces of their own, fasten political and economical dominion upon rubber or oil or goldfields in Africa or South America, enslaving or killing off the native population, as in San Thome or Putumayo, and using up the rich natural resources of the country in a brief era of reckless waste. The only alternative is to advance to a settled policy of international agreement for securing, if possible, that this commercial and developmental work shall in future be conducted on a basis of pacific co-operation between the business groups in the respective countries under the joint control of their Governments. (P. 128.)

Here is the flaw. Take that passage in conjunction with this :—

The capitalists who rule German industry, trade, and finance are out for profits, not for political aims, and their success would have been impossible on any other terms. Like business men in every other country, they get what use they can from the Government in the way of education, transport, tariffs, and diplomatic pressure. But the suggestion that German traders, bankers, colonists are merely advance agents of the German State is one of those impositions upon credulity which would not have been possible in any other atmosphere than that of war. (P. 79.)

As I have tried to show by arguments taken from German sources in a series of recent articles, these statements are not altogether accurate. That the German Government does keep a strict hand on certain German emigrants, particularly business men with capital, it is idle, in the light of now notorious facts, to deny. The story of the development of the Deutsche Bank alone would contradict this assumption that Mr. Hobson lays down; and in addition to the Deutsche Bank there are hundreds of financial and industrial enterprises under the direct or indirect control of the German State. Further, what is this about development on the basis of pacific co-operation under State control? Has Mr. Hobson, I wonder, ever attempted to follow the Bagdad Railway negotiations? Or the development of banking in Guatemala? The Bagdad Railway is, from our point of view, by far the more important; and it is a question on which we tried at least six times to come to some sort of agreement with Germany. In vain: because Germany each time specifically repudiated the policy of the open door—not only in Asia Minor, but in Africa, in China, and wherever she had the power to use power. Mr. Hobson's theoretical case is admirable, sound, lucid. The one obstacle in the way of its practical application is the German Empire. A man who can write and think so clearly must surely recognise this; but he has done little, I fear, to instruct the public with regard to this outstanding difficulty.

HENRY J. NORTHBROOK.

Views and Reviews.

EUG—ELLICS.

AMONG the writers who cannot write, Mr. Havelock Ellis takes first rank. His "Study of British Genius" is one of the most interesting documents in existence, but it owes nothing to the Graces; and although these essays* are not elaborately statistical (they are more correctly described as criticisms and interpretations of statistical inquiries), Mr. Ellis does not take the first step to Parnassus. He advocates good breeding in a style that is not distinguished, and shows that eugenics is really democratic; for the sign of good breeding was good manners, and the good manners of a literary man are his style. Mr. Ellis is so dubious of distinction that he does not back his fancy but his facts; the good breeding that he advocates is based on certainty, and will be productive of efficiency, but not distinction. A man who will judge a civilisation by a birth-rate and a death-rate must govern a society by a law of averages; all men are normal, all men are equal, all men are mortal, will be written on the Tablets of the Law in the State purified by eugenics. We shall be so well-bred in a hundred years that, as Ibsen desired, every man in the land will be a nobleman, animated by the highest quality of harmonic stimulus, and speaking the language of "dead perfection." It is unfortunate that Mr. Ellis accepts civilisation as a continuous process of development; Mr. Edward Carpenter regarded it as a disease, and a eugenist particularly ought to consider rather more deeply the fundamental question of civilisation. There is a state called "euphoria" that immediately precedes collapse; and when we reflect that the civilisation pictured by Mr. Ellis is a state of increasing health and decreasing fertility, the suspicion that it is racial euphoria is not easily allayed.

Certainly, there are apparent contradictions in the teaching of this volume. Dealing with the question: "Is War Diminishing?" Mr. Ellis shows us that war had a beginning, and will probably have an end. There is no war in Nature, there is no war among primitive men. "War is a luxury, in other words, a manifestation of superfluous energy, not possible in those early stages when all the energies of men are taken up in the primary business of preserving and maintaining life." In other words, it is civilisation that makes war possible, and the prevalence and the growing intensity of war are more decisive denials of the dysgenic effects than are furnished by any inquiries into the statistics of population. But this fact invalidates Mr. Ellis' conclusion that war will disappear; every improvement in social conditions, every relaxation of the strain of vital processes, maintains, and probably increases, the quantity of superfluous energy. Let the eugenist have his own way, let him abolish the "unfit," diminish to extinction the racial poisons, develop birth-control to such perfection that every child is born perfect and is maintained perfect, and, on Mr. Ellis' own showing, you will have a race so charged with superfluous energy that war will probably be the permanent occupation of a large number of them. It is true that Mr. Ellis thinks that his civilisation will end in an International Law Court, but the vital facts suggest that it will end on the battle-field. The Spartans practised birth-control, but they did not refrain from war; the Chinese apparently do not practise birth-control, but their neighbours are in no danger from them. Even if we admit Mr. Ellis' contention that "war only hits a carefully selected percentage of 'fit' men," the conclusion is the same; increase the number of fit men and you increase the probability of war.

There are contradictions, too, in Mr. Ellis' advocacy of birth-control. It is true that we are not herrings, and until Mr. Ellis raised the question, none of us thought that we were. Oysters, perhaps, but not herrings! But at one time he seems to accept the Malthusian argument that it is necessary to exercise control over birth to prevent the increase of the population; at another time, he shows us that the population increases more surely when methods of birth-control are used. There is a question, too, that may well be addressed to Mr. Ellis, because it is based on one of his own investigations. In "A Study of British Genius," he showed that "not only ability, but idiocy, criminality, and many other abnormalities specially tend to appear in the first-born. The eldest-born represents the point of greatest variation in the family, and the variation thus yielded may be in either direction, useful or useless, good or bad." Does it not follow, therefore, that the small family system would tend to produce a greater proportion of variability in either direction among the survivors than the large family system with its usual concomitant of a high death-rate? Is it really eugenic to advocate the small family, instead of the selection of parents? For at the same time that Mr. Ellis approves of women entering industry, tells us that "it is not a dangerous innovation, but perhaps merely a return to ancient and natural conditions" (civilisation by going backward), he also tells us that "forty per cent. of married women who have been factory girls are treated for pelvic disorders before they are thirty." As a feminist, Mr. Ellis is contented to stand aside and say that women will find their own level in industry if we leave them alone; as a eugenist, he offers such women his prescription of voluntary sterility, with which any reasonable person will agree. But why enlarge the reference of the prescription to the whole race, more particularly as, in another essay, he says: "It is only by such a method as the segregation of the hopelessly feeble members of society, and by allowing the others to take all the risks of their freedom and responsibility even though we strongly disapprove —that we can look for the coming of a better world"?

There is another fact of which an advocate of birth-control as a social policy should take notice, more particularly if he is a eugenist. "A non-productive people," says M. Faguet, "placed beside peoples very prolific or only more prolific than it, is quietly and continuously invaded by them. France, between Germany and Italy, loses one peaceful battle a year to Italy and two to Germany. . . . 'Rome has become a Greek city,' said Juvenal; with much less hyperbole I could say, urban France has become German and Italian." If the low birth-rate of France is the sign of its high civilisation, as Mr. Ellis contends, what guarantee have we that France will maintain its lead in civilisation when its vital structure is being quietly varied in this way? How much of the energy of France that Mr. Ellis praises so justly is due to this infusion of German blood? And why should not the high birth-rate of Germany which Mr. Ellis deplores be a characteristic symptom of that "irrepressible energy" that, in another essay, he declares the Germans have manifested for more than fifteen hundred years? Mr. Ellis is much more interesting than he is convincing, for the Malthusian test of civilisation would be the ratio between population and food, and the only eugenic test is not lack of quantity but degree of quality. Mr. Ellis is not quite clear in his standards of judgment.

A. E. R.

* "Essays in War Time." By Havelock Ellis. (Constable. 5s. net.)

Reviews.

The Rise of Edgar Dunstan. By Alfred Tresidder Shepheard. (Duckworth. 6s.)

The war has quickened interest in a number of prophecies, most of which cannot be traced beyond August, 1914, or even so far as that. The Tolstoi prophecy of the coming of Anti-Christ is one of them; Tolstoi's daughter has formally denied the authenticity of this prophecy. But the Anti-Christ idea remains; Nietzsche identified himself with this mystical personage, Da Vinci and innumerable others have been accused of being he who should bring the world to disaster, and there is enough meaning, at least, in the idea to make a subject for a couple of novels, and Mr. Shepheard promises us a sequel to this. Mr. Shepheard's conception of the Anti-Christ is not the usual dramatic one; his Anti-Christ will bring disaster to the world by doing nothing, will be a man who will probably pass unnoticed through the world, an obscure solitary person who has always refused a spiritual conflict, whose soul has died not of satisfaction, but of inanition. The book is full of literary reminiscences; Balzac's "Peau de Chagrin," Merejkowski's "Forerunner," and so on, all are utilised by Mr. Shepheard. Perhaps the nearest to Mr. Shepheard's conception is to be found in Browning's "The Ring and the Book."

I think he will be found (indulge so far!)
Not to die so much as slide out of life,
Pushed by the general horror and common hate
Low, lower—left o' the very edge of things,
I seem to see him catch convulsively
One by one at all honest forms of life,
At reason, order, decency, and use—
To cramp him and get foothold by at least;
And still they disengage them from his clutch.
"What, you are he, then, had Pompilia once,
And so forwent her? Take not up with us!"
And thus I see him slowly, surely edged
Off all the table-land whence life upsprings
Aspiring to be immortality.
As the snake, hatched on hill-top by mischance,
Despite his wriggling, slips, slides, slidders down
Hill-side, lies low and prostrate on the smooth
Level of the outer place, lapsed in the vale:
So I lose Guido in the loneliness,
Silence and dusk, till at the doleful end,
At the horizontal line, creation's verge,
From what just is to absolute nothingness—
Lo, what is this he meets, strains onward still?
What other man deep further in the fate,
Who, turning at the prize of a footfall
To flatter him and promise fellowship,
Discovers in the act a frightful face—
Judas, made monstrous by much solitude!

Mr. Shepheard's Anti-Christ is Guido without the initial crime, and his idea is expounded chiefly in monologues by one of the characters, monologues of much interest to those who like a literary treatment of theological speculations. Edgar Dunstan himself seems to be qualifying for the unenviable position of the second lost soul; but that, we presume, will be made clear in the sequel. A peculiarity of this novel is its two styles; as a humorist, Mr. Shepheard uses the anecdote far too often; some of his chapters are little more than collections of "cuffers." But his style become vivid and dramatic when he touches literature and theology; it touches the imagination, sets the reader speculating whether, after all, "there is something in it," and conveys the same sense of reality that the "Peau de Chagrin" did. Indeed, Mr. Shepheard has discovered the flaw in the "Peau de Chagrin" image of the spiritual life; the skin shrank with every satisfaction, but did not expand with every self-denial. There are times when Maurice Jelf reminds us of Wilde's Vivian in "The Decay of Lying"; he does often seem "prepared to prove anything"; but he holds fast to his Baptist theology, and the play of ideas is very gratifying. It is a remarkable subject handled, perhaps, too fluently, but making this one of the most interesting and speculative stories that we have read for a long time.

The Great Push. By Patrick Macgill. (Herbert Jenkins. 2s. 6d. net.)

Mr. Macgill has undoubtedly "arrived"; the first edition of this book numbers twenty-five thousands, and more than one edition will be required. For Mr. Macgill has the habit of success; in three years he has found his public and established his position among those fortunate few who are reprinted more than once. It is a success that is really astonishing, for Mr. Macgill is not, and never will be, a writer. His idea of humour is to say to a Cockney: "Excessive alcoholic dissipation is utterly repugnant to dignified humanity," a phrase that would surprise others, although not for the same reason. His idea of pathos is to recount baldly a few of the injuries he has seen inflicted upon men by shell-fire, and then to ask, like little Peterkin, "What is the good of it all?" Mr. Macgill's success cannot be attributed to his style; it is most clearly a success of character. He has enough stolidity to observe suffering without excessive emotional reaction (most of this book was written on the scene of action), and the same stolidity enables him to set down as mere matter of fact what he has observed. Consequently, he is franker than most writers would be, and, at the same time, less horrible because less imaginative. He does not know what these things mean; he says so himself. He differs from his fellows in the ranks only by being able to put on paper the record of their sayings and doings. He does not interpret, he expresses; and the simplicity with which he expresses himself is the guarantee of his authenticity. He records a thing not because it is good, bad, or indifferent, but simply because it happened or was said; thus he recorded the trench proverb: "The wages of sin and a soldier is death," for exactly the same reason that he reports no less than four times what a soldier said about a fire; he heard it four times, and the trench proverb is a trench proverb. These things happen, and down they go on paper; and in this way the story of "The Great Push" at Loos is told. He writes of what he knows, and the only trace of sophistication is to be found in his Peterkin questionings of Fate. They are really no more than conventional apologies for the intrusion of what might be considered unpleasant facts, and they save him from the reproach of insensibility. Mr. Macgill, although he is only twenty-six years of age, is an "old soldier," and he knows the tricks of his trade.

The House. By Henry Bordeaux. Translated by Louise Seymour Houghton. (Dent. 6s.)

This is a study of French provincial life, as it appeared to and affected the development of the son of the House. The conflict between the traditional and Rousseau-esque views of life is worked out in this boy's history, the antagonists being his father and his grandfather. The grandfather's return to Nature takes the form of a refusal to accept responsibility for anything, a dislike of enclosures and high roads, a preference for Mozart, and a not very recondite or systematic astronomy—in short, the life of a dilettante. He taught the boy the word "freedom" in the fields, and finally introduced him to politics and the café; and subtly the boy was turned against his father, and his destiny as head of the House. Very delicately is the conflict within the House indicated, for the grandfather's irony is as graceful as it is imperturbable; and the conflict becomes public when both father and grandfather become candidates for the mayoralty. An epidemic gives the father a chance of proving not only the necessity but the value of government; and although he dies at the end, the boy has shouldered his task, and left Rousseau to the rabble. The domestic scenes are admirably done, and the mother, and Aunt Deen, the father and grandfather, are memorable studies.

Pastiche.

A BALLADE.

Dedicated to a Delegate at the next Trade Union Congress.

The mighty rivers often take their rise
In little puddles on a mountain side;
An acorn gives the oak of greatest size,
But on that point let botanists decide.
The early walls of Rome were not so wide,
As crinolines in good Victoria's reign,
So have a care, and do not, sir, deride
The notion in a Labour leader's brain.

A man was robbed, so great was his surprise
That to the robber in his plight he cried:
"I do not want my purse, I like your eyes,
And what I spend I might have misapplied,
But when you rob me next time have less pride,
And, honest sir, let me my limbs restrain
By my own will." The thoughtful man had tried
The notion in a Labour leader's brain.

So from the person let our thoughts arise
To things imperial, for the clouds divide
And show us Labour's future in the skies.
Although the bees may have their goods denied
To serve superior stomachs, they abide
In workshops they control, and yet they strain
In servile toil. 'Tis said the hive supplied
The notion in a Labour leader's brain.

ENVOY.

O delegate, the greatest thought may hide
Behind the thickest skull of toughest grain,
A world in seed, too small to be espied—
The notion in a Labour leader's brain.

TRIBOULET.

ENCHANTED.

Of wight waylaid of fairy, and of enchantment enchainëd,
What singeth one unto the height of heaven?
"This man boldly hath battled and this refrained";
Oh, easily maketh a little man
The lay of a Lollard courtesan!
But for a witching and a spell must a seemly song be given.

. . . .

The long and lingering eventide
In the wood did gild the grass;
And she like to a shining bride,
To a moveless flame did pass,
And dead leaves were fashioned brass;

Thou Perkin, as men callëd thee,
Fully well didst know thy doom:
As stilly and as silently
As eglantine doth hold her bloom
Goldenly upon a gloom;

And with foreknowledge did go
To the castles of thy kin,
That for lessening of their woe
Have no soul and little sin:
Prithee keep thou safe within!

Free of murder and of malice
Flowereth the common weed:
From a featly fashioned chalice
Faery foxglove sows her seed,
And is a royal herb indeed:

Didst thou of her purple reap,
That thou mightest never turn
To a warmly thatchëd sleep,
And the cottage hearths that burn
Peat and furze and forest fern?

Ay, perchance: what is a fire
Made of turves, of heavy smoke,
Smouldering in a cabined byre,
To the fires of faery folk
That the husbandmen invoke?

Pacing down the alleys green
Thou didst go, and now art lost
The beeches and the briers between,
And the dewy tracks are crossed
Only by thy gentle ghost.

The large-eyed cony followeth
Where do walk thy quiet feet,
And, unfearing of her death,
Culleth her accustomed meat
In the evening passing sweet.

The cloud beside the hill doth stand:
Thou beyond them both dost dwell
In a far and faery land,
Yet dost sit beside the well
Darkling in the dimpled dell.

Thou dost turn thy wildling look
Gravely on a passing face;
Never man, in any book,
That most still regard may trace:
Stay thou for a little space
Blessing all the neighbour place.

RUTH PITTER.

THE JESTER.

When like a welcome death
Night comes to the withered day,
Though with your latest breath,
Sing, love, a roundelay.

Laugh if they say to thee,
"Thou art naught but fated clay";
'Tis but a mockery—
Love, sing thy roundelay.

Though all may be foretold,
Your doomed heart—this dying day—
Dance, for thy cheek is cold,
Sing, love, a roundelay.

FRED KAY.

ON GUARD.

Dreams come upon me that I see
The self I left behind
Go singing, striding, fine and free,
Adown the answering wind—
The smoothened pathways of my quest
All blossomed, intertwined.

The wonder weird of night is filled
With phantom sounds that fall
Upon my soul till I be thrilled
Of the wild bird's call
That rises lonely to the stars
When the mist moves over all.

The spirit of my daughter moves
Before my feet in laughter. Going
She sings of lisping things she loves,
Of waving fields and trees a-blowing;
My heart beats swift with sudden joy
Of grief and glory interflowing.

A voice is near my soul to-night,
A voice whose deeper tone
Is fine as music's softer flight
Where love and sound are one;
She walks with me beside the tents,
And I am not alone.

God broods above us like a cloud,
The earth is filled of Him,
From here where I go tramping loud,
To yonder darkened rim—
Yea, on beyond the elms that dream
I' the distance shrouded dim.

Myself of yesterday be still
The keeper of my soul,
Since Love may fail him to fulfil
The vision of his goal;
Be these I love beside my path
To keep my spirit whole.

FRANCIS ANDREWS.

"COGITO ERGO SUM"; OR, MORE VORTICULATIONS.

(With Apologies to Shi-King and the Poundites.)

I write—and the Muddy Ink
drips from My Shilling Fountain Pen;
the sheet—is covered with Liquid blots
that Shine ecstatically.

I speak—to a Romantic Greengrocer
in middlesex street;
and his voice—sounds less gently THAN
the sweet cadences of a newsvendor.

I think—of the nocturnal orbs,
—Bright Luminous Hyperboles.
A black unearthly stillness of the grave—is felt
upon the Carmine lips of the Pyramids.

I shout—for the sunlight reveals
a million JOYFUL parallelograms
silhouetted against the chill horizon
in the spacious globules of the Atmosphere.

I dream—of the arabian nights and the ghetto;
and an italian organ-grinder breaks his Knee
in a glorious quest for Virile Energy
—and the Sparrows gurgle at the putrefaction.

I love—a girl with cubic eyelashes,
and Green Iambic cheeks.
Her lips—are like Over-ripe pomegranates;
and it is there a thousand philosophers are decimated.

she—has a little Brother named mal-ka.
she—possesses an exacerbated parasol.
she—loves a Mogul's Bootblack who paints flowers on her legs.
—and one day she will charge me with the theft of her little Red Poodle.

. . . .

I write—after the style of the Golden Sculptors
in imitation of POUND—in prosodaic versification.
and i could continue thus
until the Resurrection.

C. S. D.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

LORD RHONDDA'S PSYCHOLOGY AND OTHER THINGS.

Sir,—In some not altogether flattering references to myself, in your issue of November 30, you say, "Frankness combined with a capacity for lying is one of his outstanding characteristics," and endeavour to support the charge by quoting a few detached remarks made by me at various times which you consider evince a lack of consistency. May I be permitted to try and reconcile them? It is quite likely I may have once said that, if I were a collier, I should in all probability be a Socialist, for I should not then have had the knowledge and practical experience of the application of economic principles to the industries of the country which I now possess. My employees know well that I am a convinced Individualist, and, while I am glad to number very many Socialists among my friends, I believe them to be in the main as wrong-headed as they are sincere. My reason for speaking of the "Times" correspondent as "saturated with Socialism" and writing with "a pen dipped in undiluted prejudice" was because I felt it desirable to remove the impression sought to be conveyed by the editor of that journal that the special articles were written dispassionately and with "a judicial mind." That they bore internal evidence of prejudice is, I think, sufficiently established by the following extract:—

"What is it that makes South Wales the industrial storm centre of Great Britain, and why is it a fruitful ground for food agitation and peace propaganda? The answer is simple. Subject a fiery and educated people to a soulless, dehumanised, commercial machine, for the extraction of gold out of labour, and you will inevitably breed a seething discontent which must somewhere find an outlet."

You go on to suggest that the statement I once made that enlightened self-interest is the stimulus of progress in material things is inconsistent with my remark that no man ought to be allowed to make a profit out of the war. Whether we like it or not, and however we may wish it to be otherwise, it cannot be denied that the conduct of nine men out of ten is actuated not by altruistic considerations but by a desire to advantage their families and themselves, and for that reason I expressed the view that the Government should step in and not allow anyone to derive a direct benefit from the necessities of the nation. I confess I quite fail to see here any inconsistency. It is this inherent and unalterable weakness in human nature that must always prove the insuperable obstacle to the permanent adoption of a Socialist policy. Were all men as good and kind as you, Mr. Editor, and myself, moved only by a spirit of humanitarianism, the world would be a far nicer place, and, believe me, I would become a Socialist to-morrow.

You point to me as typical of South Wales coalowners, and quote with approval the allegation of the "Times" correspondent "that the miners do not believe a single word they say. Their distrust is complete and irrevocable," and in turn I will ask you to reconcile that statement with the fact that I have enjoyed the confidence of the miners of South Wales over a longer period, in a larger measure, and over a wider area than any man now living, miners' agents not excepted. The evidence of this, briefly stated, is that, soon after leaving college, I was returned by ballot at the head of the poll out of twenty candidates for an area covering practically the whole of the Rhondda Valleys. In 1888 I was returned unopposed for Merthyr, the largest mining constituency in the United Kingdom. From 1892 to 1906 I held the record for the largest majority ever given to any candidate in Parliamentary history. This I secured without the support of any political organisation for a constituency in which none of the voters were in my employ. In 1906 I obtained a 30 per cent. heavier poll than that given to the late Mr. Keir Hardie, the Socialist candidate, and double the number of votes polled by the other Liberal candidate. In 1910, when I stood for Cardiff, I received more votes than any candidate of either party has ever done before or since. There is no evidence to show that I have since lost the confidence of the miners in any degree. On the contrary, the receptions I get when I attend public meetings were never so cordial as they have recently been.

You express a wish to see a full-length study of my "extraordinary psychology." I am afraid I cannot oblige you, but I enclose a study by Mr. Vernon Hartshorn, the well-known Socialist leader of South Wales, which may help you, and also the letter upon which his study is based, to use as you may think well. Whenever I feel a bit out of conceit with myself, which I admit is not often, I take Mr. Hartshorn's article out of my safe and linger lovingly over its perusal. It at once makes me feel bucked up and quite my old self again. The main criticism I have to offer is that Mr. Hartshorn does not give any indication of how the acceptance of "the national asset" is to be forced on unappreciative statesmen; my own unaided, but none the less strenuous, efforts to that end, extending over a period of well-nigh a quarter of a century, having egregiously failed.

RHONDDA.

* * *

PROPERTY AND SECURITY.

Sir,—In last week's NEW AGE, Mr. Belloc says:—"Most men, I think, would, in England, now rather have a good 'berth' at £500 a year under a large corporation than £250 drawn from salary and £250 from property, which property they would have to manage,

and watch, and which, as is the very nature of property, would be subject to fluctuation in value."

It is, of course, a matter of opinion, not to say guess-work; but I venture the precisely opposite opinion. I believe that nine-tenths would chose the £250 salary plus £250 from property. For one good reason at least: the £250 from property is a measure of security against unfair treatment, dismissal, or bad health, involving the loss of the "berth."

And may it not be that it is this security—not necessarily "property"—which is the real property most men seek? If so, what becomes of Mr. Belloc's argument?

NATIONAL GUILDSMAN.

* * *

"THE NEW AGE."

Sir,—Some time ago one of your contributors remarked upon the seeming apathy of many of your readers, their silence raising doubts in the minds of those who write for the paper whether they are hitting the mark and carrying their readers with them, or wasting ammunition because they haven't the range.

Well, Sir, silence does not always imply indifference; more often than not its cause may be diffidence, difficulty in expressing oneself, or several other things. But as regards myself, having read THE NEW AGE each week for the last four years and over, with a great deal of pleasure, it is only fair to write and say so.

The weekly commentary upon public affairs in "Notes of the Week" I have all along thoroughly appreciated on account of its acute criticism and the high-standard of national culture and well-being underlying it.

I have particularly admired your fairness—that readiness to give opponents a hearing, and those, also, who cannot obtain one elsewhere. Is it South Africa or the Gilbert Islands, Turkey or Ireland, which suffers injustice at the hands of politicians or the Press? One can generally rely upon finding in the columns of THE NEW AGE a fair statement of the case for the accused—sometimes the first intimation that they have a case at all.

Another feature which appeals to me strongly is the catholicity of the subject-matter of your paper. No subject is tabooed, while frankness and courage in the treatment of awkward topics are what one has learned to expect. It is here that the absence of commercial considerations in the editing of the paper has rendered it, in my opinion, unique. One becomes conscious that the Editor is out for quality—and gets it. What other journal, I wonder, would have published that autobiography of a fish out of water which appeared under the title of "A Modern Document"? Probably few would appreciate it, and ever divine there a record of the difficulties of an unfledged member of the Coming Race.

The National Guilds propaganda is, however, the crown of THE NEW AGE. I have learned to recognise here a constructive idea of the first order, the projection in concrete proposals of the underlying ideal referred to above, and their reception, taken as a whole, by the articulate classes of this country throws into relief that ready appreciation of genius, that love of justice and mercy, that true greatness of heart and mind, so characteristic of the latter-day Imperial English.

Some of the men in my hut, marvelling that a man should spend the price of two pints of beer a week upon a paper, and that one having but a small circulation, have asked about its aims and objects. This question I have found rather a poser. None of them happened to be a trade unionist; all were mentally biased by the halfpenny Press. This has suggested to me the desirability of a short pamphlet setting forth the principles underlying the Guilds' propaganda, together with the proposals themselves. (Perhaps such a pamphlet is already in existence?) It should be written to reach the intelligence of the average men and women of to-day.

H. W. WRIGHT.

* * *

A QUERY.

Sir,—I note that it is possible for a constructor of rabbit-hutches to become a Cabinet-maker. I also know that rabbits possess a nasty habit of consuming their young.

I wonder, therefore, if it is possible for rabbit-hutch constructors to eat their Cabinets?

S. H. RUDD.

Memoranda.

(From last week's NEW AGE.)

Until, man for man, our ruling Executive is superior to the ruling Executive of our enemies, all the valour and sacrifice of our soldiers and workmen will be in vain.

We must make it the criterion of value in our estimates of any proposed legislation whether it is designed to last.

You cannot feed forty million people on back gardens and the mere leavings of the landlords.

It is essential that our organisation should be superior to that of our enemies.

Create National Guilds—and at once we have an organisation capable of carrying on the war for a century if need be. What is more, its value for peace would be no less.—"Notes of the Week."

So far as the determining mass of the commonwealth is concerned, the institution of property has disappeared.

When the common will in a community demands a thing not forbidden by material circumstances, the thing can be and is done.

The House of Commons will never again direct the affairs of this country.

I can see no instrument of action that is not in the hands of a few very rich men, nor among these anyone who could so much as understand what the reconstruction of Property in the masses might be.—H. BELLOC.

I distrust the automatic effect of large sums of money. The man who can own and use large sums of money for any great length of time and not be morally and intellectually disturbed by it is a very rare individual.—UPTON SINCLAIR.

The facility of Collectivism is anything but a proof of its effectuality.

The advocate of a guild organisation is under an obligation to consider, not merely a class, but the general conditions of a stable society.—W. ANDERSON.

The trade unions should determine that they will unite, not to fight capital, but to control it.—MRS. VICTOR V. BRANFORD.

A dramatic critic who did not accept every opportunity of seeing "Hamlet" performed would not be worth his salt.

Mr. Baynton is an actor to watch.—JOHN FRANCIS HOPE.

Perfection must needs be independent of the opinions formed of it.

The ideal short story must contain an episode which, like a nugget of gold in quartz, can be detached from its context and mounted as something complete in itself.

Oh, for an art critic who can read drawings as we others read print!

To love one's country is easy; really and truly to do her a good service is sometimes dangerous, often unpopular and always difficult.

Irony begins as a disguise, and ends as the reality. It begins as Voltaire and ends as Anatole France.—R. H. C.

Every Dependency has the Government its economics deserves.—C. E. BECHHOFER.

The representative system and the permanent Civil Service have given to democracy what it never had before, a political structure, have raised democracy from the invertebrate to the vertebrate class of Government; and the people, like the King, reigns—but does not govern.—A. E. R.

PRESS CUTTINGS.

The American Federation of Labour has unanimously passed a resolution refusing to obey court orders based on the dictum that labour is property. The matter is important, in view of the threatened strike of the railway employees if the eight-hour law is not enforced.—"The Brooklyn Eagle."

IS "PANEL DOCTOR" AN OFFENSIVE TERM?

At a meeting of the directors of the Edinburgh Royal Blind Asylum, held yesterday, Dr. Shoolbread, one of the members, objected to the term "panel doctor" which was used in the minutes. He saw no reason why they should be called panel doctors because they had panel patients. For example, he himself was also doing private work. It did not matter whether a medical man was a National Insurance man or not, and he objected most strongly to the term. It was pointed out by Dr. Burns and other members that no such reflection was meant as was in Dr. Shoolbread's mind, and that the minute would be changed.—"Glasgow Herald."

Lord Rhondda has a dual personality. He is a sort of industrial Jekyll and Hyde. He is both an industrial organiser and a capitalist, and the functions of the two are quite distinct. The capitalist pure and simple is a non-producer. In so far as Lord Rhondda is an organiser of industry, a man whose talents enable wealth production to be made more efficient, he is a producer, a worker, and a public benefactor. But in so far as he is a capitalist, a mere owner of wealth and drawer of profits, he is a public menace. As an organiser his real motive for working is not the accumulation of wealth, but the desire to "do good in his time." He is also under the influence of the instinct which compels him to find his greatest happiness in work, which keeps his talents active. His power and influence to do good would be immeasurably greater if he worked for the State in the interests of the whole nation. The material reward to which he would be entitled could be as easily and equitably arranged between him and the State as his director's fees are now fixed by the company whom he serves. A born organiser will work as well for the State as for a motley crowd of shareholders who have nothing in their character to inspire lofty enthusiasm or idealism. Would not the position be far more stimulating and dignified? Would it not be a far more attractive position to a man with Lord Rhondda's ideals? It is really pathetic that Lord Rhondda should throw the cloak of his own organising talents over the mediocrity of shareholders to protect them against the charge of uselessness. The possession of capital does not confer natural talent or genius or even average intelligence upon the possessor; even the shrewdness or cunning which enables a man to invest his money in a paying concern has no inherent social value.

It amazes me that Lord Rhondda can assert that men will work better for private shareholders than they will for the nation. These are days when the deeds being done for the social ideal of mere nationality eclipse anything ever attempted on behalf of capitalism.—MR. VERNON HARTSHORN in "South Wales Daily News."

There are old men yet dwelling in the village where I remain which have noted three things to be marvellously altered in England within their sound remembrance, and other three things too much increased. . . . The third thing they talk of is usury, a trade brought in by the Jews, and perfectly practised by every Christian, and so commonly that he is accompted but for a fool that doth lend his money for nothing. In time past it was *sors pro sorte*—that is, the principal only for the principal; but now, beside that which is above the principal (properly called *Usura*) we challenge *Fœnus*—that is, commodity of soil and fruits of the earth, if not the ground itself. . . . Help, I pray thee, in lawful manner to hang up such as take *centum pro cento*, for they are no better worthy as I do judge in conscience. Forget not also such landlords as used to value their leases at a secret estimation given of the wealth and credit of the taker, whereby they seem (as it were) to eat them up, and deal with bondmen. . . . I am sorry to report it, much more grieved to understand of the practice, but most sorrowful of all to understand that men of great part and countenance are so far from suffering their farmers to have any gain at all that they themselves become graziers, tanners, butchers, sheepmasters, woodmen, and *denique quid non*, thereby to enrich themselves, and bring all the wealth of the country into their own hands, leaving the communalty weak, or as an idol with broken or feeble arms, which may in a time of peace have a plausible shew, but when necessity shall enforce have a heavy and bitter sequel.—"Holinshed's Chronicles" (1587).

The policy for the Conduct of the War which Organised Labour would oppose to that of Mr. Lloyd George and Sir Edward Carson is not the negative one which is associated with Mr. Asquith's presidency over a divided Cabinet, but one of a real organisation of the whole resources of the nation—land, investments, and business as well as labour—and the compulsory service of all classes, irrespective of the property or social status they have hitherto enjoyed; the elimination of all "profiteering," and the provision, directly from public funds, for all alike, of a subsistence and conditions no more unequal than those of the several ranks and grades of the Army. This policy Organised Labour would apply not to the railways only, but successively to the production of food from the land and the extraction of coal from the mine; to the importation of all our necessaries, and the management of our merchant navy; and to the whole business of retail distribution—at present conducted with so scandalous a waste of labour. In each of these directions, as a result of amalgamation and the suppression of the present great incomes drawn in rent, interest, and profits, there would be (as the War Office and Ministry of Munitions have found) a saving of cost as well as a vast economy of labour. In short, to cope with this war, the nation must cut out the "fat" of private enterprise and luxurious living. This policy of the Conduct of the War—not inferior in vigour to that somewhat fragmentarily adumbrated by Sir Edward Carson, and economically far more sound than that of Mr. Lloyd George—has been, so far, expounded only modestly and hesitatingly by the Labour Party in the House of Commons. But it is the only one which will maintain the British working class whole-heartedly in favour of the continuance of the war; and it is one to which, in one department after another, any British Cabinet will, by the daily march of events, inevitably be driven. The question is whether it will be adopted in time to win the war.—"The New Statesman."

The hard case of the Rover Company is perhaps one of the tragedies of the war. Its success just prior to the outbreak of hostilities was phenomenal, and in 1914 it earned the handsome profit of £136,974, but national necessities diverted it from continuing the remunerative career on which it appeared to be permanently launched and the profit fell to £65,501 in 1915, and this year to £61,098. These results are being borne with fortitude: if the Rover Company is not doing much for shareholders who purchased their shares at anything up to £4, it is at least doing a great deal for the country.—"The Motor Trader."

Subscriptions to THE NEW AGE are at the following rates:—

	United Kingdom.		Abroad.
One Year	**28s. 0d.**	...	**30s. 0d.**
Six Months	**14s. 0d.**	...	**15s. 0d.**
Three Months	**7s. 0d.**	...	**7s. 6d.**

All communications relative to THE NEW AGE *should be addressed to* THE NEW AGE, 38, *Cursitor Street, E.C.*

Published by the Proprietors, THE NEW AGE PRESS, LTD., 38, Cursitor Street, Chancery Lane, and Printed for them by BONNER & Co., The Chancery Lane Press, 1, 2, and 3, Rolls Passage, E.C. Agents for South Africa: Central News Agency, Ltd.