NOTES OF THE WEEK.

It is as well to have it in black and white that the sacrifice made by the Trade Unions when they suspended their rules and customs was enormous. And the contributor of the important series of articles on “The Trade Union Outlook” to the “Times” during last week is explicit and emphatic upon the point. “It is only just,” he concludes his survey, “that the magnitude of the sacrifice made by organised labour should be remembered,” and we may add that it is only wise as well. When we remember, moreover, the response that has been made by other classes to appeals for the casting off of their “fly-blown phylacteries” and the abandonment of their “ancient shibboleths”—to use Lord Rosebery’s phrases—the contrast between the attitude of Labour and Capital is the more striking, and, at the same time, the more encouraging. For what does this ability to make a clean and sudden break with the past imply but an astonishing flexibility of mind, itself the condition precedent of every prospect of revolutionary change and progress? The fact that an effort of such magnitude as the abandonment in a night of century-old traditions was within the compass of the working classes, is evidence that Labour is in its youth, and is still mouldable by its own resolution. The principle of growth is vigorously present, nor is it under the mortmain of tradition. But if this is the case, may we not also conclude that the future is with it? An economic class, in fact, that has proved itself able to cast off its traditions in response to new circumstances may safely be judged capable of anything. And there is literally no effort, we believe, in the direction of national reconstruction which Labour is not capable of making if the country likes to call for it.

Consideration must be given to the fact that the indebtedness of the nation to Labour cannot, however, be discharged by the mere restoration, even if that were possible, of the Trade Union conditions that prevailed before the war. The nominal debt, it is true, is clearly recognised, and we are glad once more to find it unequivocally stated in the articles to which we have referred. “The most explicit pledges,” says the “Times” writer, “were given, not once, but repeatedly; not to any particular trade union but to the Labour movement as a whole; not by one Minister only but by many, representing all sections of the Coalition Government; and not by the Government alone, but also by the Engineering Employers’ Federation, and by innumerable employers individually—that the rules and practices thus laid aside should be restored at the conclusion of the war.” The obligation is, therefore, admitted, and the matter is beyond doubt. But is there not something beyond mere restoration that is due to the Trade Unions? Over and above the restoration of the status quo—assuming, for the moment, that restoration is practicable—is not reparation or compensation enjoined by justice? The question is important from several points of view. In the first place, it is desirable that in view of the astonishing transformation of mind involved in the Trade Unions’ surrender of their privileges, public gratitude should be expressed in a more generous fashion than by simple restoration—for it is not an ordinary operation that the nation can accept it in the light of a duty discharged as a matter of course. And, in the second place, there is a considerable danger that in certain quarters mere restoration, or its exact equivalent, will be regarded, not as the repayment of a debt, but as itself a sufficient reward for sacrifice. On both these grounds, therefore, we ought to be on our guard against whittling down either the magnitude of the sacrifice made, or the obligation of gratitude which the nation has incurred. Restoration, we repeat, is not in itself more than the bare legal discharge of a legal obligation. It is in no sense a gift which carries with it any new obligation upon the recipient.

The subject, however, is complicated by the fact that restoration in the literal sense is impossible. Upon this point, too, we are glad to find the “Times” correspondent in full agreement with The New Age. Our readers may recall that from the first mention of the proposal to suspend the practices of Trade Unionism we declared that if once these practices were suspended they would never, because they could never, be restored. It was all in vain, we said, that pledges...
For the remoter need of the Labour movement, and the need for which even these immediate practices were only an adaptation of means, was neither wages nor leisure, neither security nor power of man. And the "Times" writer, with the experience of the suspension before him, confirms us. "We are face to face," he says, "with the unpleasant fact that the nation has given a solemn pledge to Labour which it cannot possibly fully restore. But it is impossible that the pledge so confidently made and so royally accepted cannot be re-deemed, is it not incumbent upon the nation, in view of the double obligation incurred—that of making the pledge and that of breaking the pledge—to see that, at least, Labour shall not be put at a disadvantage relatively to its pre-war condition, but, on the contrary, that Labour shall receive in lieu of the restoration that is impossible an equivalent of restoration together with something more than restoration? But what can such an equivalent be? And how are we to find in a completely new set of privileges a compensation for the privileges that have been surrendered, and that cannot be restored? The answer is to be found in the, think, in a just appreciation of the purpose and intention of the original and now abandoned practices of Trade Unionism, and in the concession, in place of those practices, of the purposes they were intended to serve. After all, it was not in mere wilfulness that the practices to which we refer were adopted during the pre-war period by the Trade Unions. They were not senseless regulations without an object and designed merely in a spirit of whim. On the contrary, examined closely—as, let us say, an economic Darwin might have examined them—they would be revealed as intelligent adaptations of the Labour organism both towards a particular environment and with a particular end in view. The equivalent, therefore, of their restoration must first of all take into consideration the purposes for which they existed; and it is obvious that unless it succeeds in placing Labour in at least as favourable a position relatively to that purpose, it is no equivalent at all, and still less a reward for sacrifice.

At this point, unfortunately, the able writer in the "Times" appears to us to be less sympathetic to Labour than elsewhere he has shown himself to be. It is clear that it is possible, in regard to any set of adaptations, to take either the one or the other set of views. We can view them as particular adaptations to an immediate environment; or we can examine them as adaptations made, it is true, for an immediate purpose, but made also for the more remote purpose of the organism itself. Among the ends of Trade Unionism, and for which the practices that grew up were designed, we ought, in short, to distinguish the immediate from the remote ends, and hence the practices designed for the one purpose from the practices designed for the other. And it is more important to do so, since the restoration of the equivalent of the first set of practices—all, that is, designed to meet an immediate need—is no guarantee whatever that the equivalent will be restored of the other set of practices which were designed to meet the remoter needs of the Labour movement. Now what were the needs designed to be satisfied by what we may call the temporary practices of the Trade Unions? They were, we agree with the "Times," the need for higher wages, shorter hours, security against unemployment, and better conditions of work. These, it is certain, were among the immediate and the most articulate objects of the practices and privileges that grew up among the Trade Unions. On the other hand, we shall be in error if we assume that the only or even the main objects of Trade Unionism; and still more, if we assume, as the "Times" writer does, that the satisfaction of these particular demands will be an equivalent for the surrender that has been made.
trol, as certainly in spite of Mr. Prothero as it might be because of him. And we are confirmed in this by the similar pronouncement that has just been made by Dr. Dernburg concerning the future of agriculture in Germany: "German agriculture," he said, "can never again be left entirely to private enterprise." And our forecast is based, not in the least upon any delusion we may be under that our ideas will prevail by their own force; for, as to that, it is our conviction that every idea necessary to social or individual perfection has long been a commonplace; in short, that what has never been lacking is right ideas, but only the appreciation of them. Our library, is based upon an easy and a reasonable calculation, upon the calculation that, as surely as men in general will provide against an impending rain by taking to shelter or overcoats, society in general will provide against an impending shortage of food by a particular concern for its agriculture. Now, what during the last quarter of a century or so, has been the outstanding feature of world-economics? It has been, we venture to say, the relative increase of industry at the expense of the relative decline of agriculture. Taking the world as a whole, we see that industry has encroached upon agriculture, and that it is still encroaching; with the inevitable consequence that as industrial products multiply and become cheaper and more accessible to everybody, agricultural products relatively become dearer and fewer. But to imagine that this tendency of things will long continue without involving us in difficulty is as foolish as to imagine that a nation like ours will allow itself to be indefinitely squeezed between the demands of the foreign producer and the demands of the home-producer. We cannot, it is obvious, control the profiteering of the foreign producer; but, as the war has shown, we must pay him practically what he demands. But our home-producers, who are under the nation's hands, and are themselves (though they often forget it) part of the nation, it is not only possible, but it will be necessary, to control. The war, after all, is only a brilliant epiphenome of the condition of dependence to which we were slowly being reduced; and as it has been proved desirable (though in Mr. Prothero's feeble hands impracticable) to organize agriculture as a national service during the war, we may be sure that after the war the desirability will remain and the necessity will continue to increase, until at last national control becomes practicable.

In connection to the Loan Campaign we find ourselves in the position of the military conscriptionists when contemplating the campaign for voluntary service. That is to say, we half-hope, half-fear, and altogether anticipate that the voluntary means of raising money will sooner or later break down. Our fear, we may say, is the consequence of the hope we entertain that by some means or other the war may not be brought to a lamentable end through lack of money, and by the apprehension that, as surely as men are coming to regard our troops from a distance. We see only the magnitude of the sacrifices they are called upon to make—the spirit with which they make them; while we are unaware of or indifferent to the grumbling and complaining that, of course, attend them. Here at home, on the other hand, we see each other's seamy sides at close quarters. And so impressed are we by the spectacle, that, in general, we refrain from making the demands upon our civilian population which our Generals make upon our soldiers as a matter of course. In short, we do not employ at home the war-spirit of the civilian population; and have in consequence a double grievance against them: we despise them for what they do, and we despise them for what they do not. If, however, we are anything like right in our diagnosis, the comparison is between troops about to go to the Front for the first time and under implacable orders to start; and a civilian population (we are thinking particularly of our wealthy classes) preoccupied, in a way, to go to the financial Front, and free to decide for themselves, and at leisure to invent excuses for delay. What soldier, under the same circumstances, might not be forgiven if he took advantage of the smallest excuse to put off doing his duty? On the other hand, what soldier would not desist himself for ever afterwards, the people who aided and abetted his excuses, and, above all, his superiors who refrained from resolving his fears by a command—if, in consequence of his hesitation, the war were lost or won in his absence? We believe that there is much the same state of affairs in the relations of our wealthy classes to-day. They know that their duty is to provide the State with money without counting the cost to themselves. They wish in their hearts to do their duty as splendidly as the troops are doing theirs. But they cannot make up their minds to volunteer, nor can they refrain from opposing every proposal to compel them. Nevertheless, they despise themselves for their cowardice; and no less do they despise the Government for pandering to it. No more popular or respected Government, in fact, could have been created than the one which should compel money to do its duty, as men have done theirs. It is in this sense that we interpret the "prolonged cheers" that followed Mr. Bonar Law's hint at Glasgow (Glasgow business men composing his audience) that if the voluntary system of recruiting money should fail, the Government would "adopt other means."
Foreign Affairs.
By S. Verdad.

The newspapers of January 1 contained the Allies’ reply to the German Chancellor’s Peace Note, and the papers of the 12th, the reply to President Wilson. In both documents particular emphasis is laid upon the German treatment of Belgium, and in the former, which is incorporated a special memorandum drafted by the Belgian Government itself. This sets forth that Belgium, by virtue of certain international treaties, enjoyed special guarantees of independence, that she had always scrupulously fulfilled her duties as a neutral, that her neutrality was grossly violated by Germany, and that her neutrality was in no way affected by the events of the latter part of 1913. In their reply to President Wilson the Allies again lay stress upon the flagrant German violation of neutrality with regard to Belgium, and the horrors which the unfortunate civilian population has had to endure, as was openly admitted by the Chancellor on August 4, 1914, and that “during two and a half years this injustice has been cruelly aggravated by the proceedings of the occupying forces which have exhausted the resources of the country, ruined its industries, and Serbia) by the fact that they were encouraged, and in many cases even instigated, by the German officers and non-commissioned officers whose duty it undoubtedly was to try, at least, to check them.

We have since taken so prominent a part in the war ourselves that these earlier events have become overshadowed and neglected. They are, nevertheless, vital factors in the war and, in the consideration of the terms of peace. It is only with an effort that England can recollect from time to time that Belgium, with the exception of a tiny strip of country, is entirely in the occupation of the enemy (together with several French Departments), and that among the more recent horrors of war with which the unfortunate country has been visited are the deportations of the civilian population to Germany in large numbers so that they may be used there for manufacturing war material—war material subsequently to be employed by the German armies against the unfortunate country. Other civilians, it should be remembered, have been forced from their homes to dig trenches for the enemy—work which, it should hardly be necessary to add, is wholly contrary to international law and custom. However much we may tend to overlook such essential facts as these, the British public may rest assured that they are not forgotten by the Belgians themselves, and are not likely to be.

As a proof of this statement, let me refer the reader to the resolutions passed at the meeting of the Belgian Labour Party at Brussels, and conveyed to the Belgian Minister for War, M. Vandervelde, at Havre, for his information, at the Allies’ Socialist Conference, on December 12 last. These Belgian workmen, forced either to remain in Belgium under German domination, or to work for the enemy in Germany itself, are naturally “adverse to a meeting taking place at the present moment with the Social Democrats of the Central Powers.” This resolution continues:—

Previous to any attempt at reconciliation, they consider that France and Belgium should evacuate Belgium. They further consider that they cannot meet the German Social Democrats unless they demand an explanation of their attitude (i) as regards August 4, 1914, concerning the ultimatum of August 2 and the violation of Belgium’s neutrality, and (ii) as regards the atrocities committed in Belgium amongst the unarmed civilian population. They formally reserve their judgment on the general attitude of Germany and Austro-Hungary regarding the various declarations of war which let loose this catastrophe, as well as the conclusions to be arrived at as to the composition, form, and future activity of the International.

Having dealt with the International, the Party considered a resolution with regard to the workmen. The members present unanimously decided that the Imperial Chancellor’s declarations were merely a peace manoeuvre “favourable to the Central Powers,” and they, therefore, repudiated any peace movement at the present time as useless and dangerous. Their own resolution respecting the peace movement went on to say:—

Should any theoretical and practical conclusions result therefrom, the Belgian Labour Party have no confidence in the manner in which these would be treated by the German Social Democracy, even should the German Social Democracy be well intentioned or animated now with better sentiments. The mistrust of the Belgian Labour Party is all the more justified, for at the present moment wholesale deportations of the workmen in Belgium—whether unemployed or not—are taking place, and hundreds of thousands of them are confronted without a trial with forced labour for the enemy’s profit, without the majority of the German Labour Party and Syndicates doing more than expressing to the oppressors in whose service they are a few vague and timid words of pity for their “brethren” (?), who are reduced to the most obvious slavery.

It seems to me that we should be no less interested in the third resolution of the delegates, namely, that referring to future peace. The delegates hope that the Conference will be unanimous in endeavouring to ob-
tain such measures as will be conducive to the successful prosecution of this defensive war, which cannot and must not end without the defeat of the aggressors. They consider that, politically, a durable peace cannot be ensured in Europe except by the realisation of the legitimate national aspirations of the oppressed and conquered peoples, but they resolutely declare themselves against any annexation which, under this pretext, would be contrary to the will of the populations freely expressed. The Belgian Labour Party gives its entire support to any action which has for its object (a) the establishment of compulsory arbitration, with its necessary international sanctions, namely, commercial and financial boycotting, and, if need be, recourse to force; (b) the preparation of their machinery, their raw material, their means of commerce, and their labour—shall have been re-established in their normal state.

These views seem to me particularly striking when considered in relation to the opinions expressed by the same party before the war. Belgium, I think, has always been rightly regarded by the European politicians as the home of the International; and my impression has always been that it would never have been possible for the Belgian Socialists to be so much more "international" in their outlook than the French and the German Socialists, had it not been for the peculiar conditions under which Belgium maintained her political existence. With her neutrality guaranteed by the artificial high cost of living, it believes that it is necessary to take precautions against unfair competition, and not to return to a regime of freer competition until the damaged industries—deprived of their machinery, their raw material, their means of commerce, and their labour—should have been re-established in their normal state.

This conception of the German Empire was systematically preparing, not merely for a vast war, but for a war waged "to break a treaty if such a document stood in the way of its interests." This was a point which could never be impressed upon internationals. By now they have all had their hands rubbed with the horrible experience of Belgium, some by the direct and bitter teaching of experience. I am indebted to the Belgian Bureau de Documentation (32, Grosvenor Place, S.W.), for the resolutions I have quoted, and to Messrs. Nelson for a complete and undated report of compulsory arbitration in Belgium, together with the Report of the English Committee of Inquiry, but the extracts bear repetition.

All this prosperity, this happy state of being let us now consider the enemy (Belgium and Germany ; Texts and Documents, illustrated with photographs). This contains examples of every kind of German atrocity in Belgium, from the Louvain massacre to the shooting of hostages to the expropriation of industries and the deportation of the civilian population into a state of slavery. Much of this book is based on the Report of the English Committee of Inquiry, but it goes far beyond it. The conclusion with regard to Louvain:

We are driven to the conclusion that the burning of the villages in the district, the burning of a large part of Louvain, the massacres there, the marching out of the prisoners, and the transport of hostages, is without excuse as to whether the particular persons seized or killed had committed any wrongful act were due to a calculated policy carried out scientifically and deliberately, not merely with the sanction, but under the direction of, the higher military authorities, and were not due to any provocation or resistance by the civilian population (p. 26).

Or, again, to show how the enemy had come prepared to violate international law by wholesale incendiary:

On September 30, 1914, a company was directed, at Vermee, to carry out the destruction of the houses. This company kept central reservoirs where each man carrying a pneumatic belt went to replenish himself with an incendiary liquid with which he sprinkled a glove especially provided for the purpose. After the burning of the houses, another man wearing a glove especially provided with a preparation of phosphorous passed in front of the houses which had been sprinkled and rubbed his glove on the wood. This set fire to the houses, and permitted a whole street to be burnt out in a quarter of an hour. In order to expedite still further the burning of the houses, the men threw inside inflammable material.

I quote these now well-established facts to remind the public of the people with whom we have to deal. During a period of peace when the thoughts of many intellectuals were directed towards forming higher concepts of the social and political world, when European wars on a grand scale were regarded as things of the past, the German Empire was systematically preparing, not merely for a vast war, but for a war waged "to break a treaty if such a document stood in the way of its interests." It takes its stand in an order of ideas foreign to us, with whom we have to deal. During a period of peace when the thoughts of many intellectuals were directed towards forming higher concepts of the social and political world, when European wars on a grand scale were regarded as things of the past, the German Empire was systematically preparing, not merely for a vast war, but for a war waged "to break a treaty if such a document stood in the way of its interests." It takes its stand in an order of ideas foreign to us.
The Present Position and Power of the Press.

By H. Belloc.

XXII.

Much more important than this clearly applicable test of vocabulary is the more general and less measurable test of programmes and news. The programme of the National "Front" is, for instance, followed everywhere, and is everywhere considered. Men use the idea for all it is worth, and they use it more and more, although it is as much their place as ever to worth to mention the New Age in connection with it—as yet. And it is the same, I think, with all the efforts the Free Press has made in the past. The propaganda of Socialism (which, as an idea, was so enormously successful a few years ago) was, in its journalistic side, almost entirely conducted by Free papers, most of them of small circulation, and all of them boycotted, even as to their names, by the Official Press. The same is true of my own effort and Mr. Chesterton's on the "New Witness." The paper was rigidly boycotted and never quoted. But everyone who talks as I have just said, of the Secre State, of the professional politician, of the secret party funds, of the Aliases under which men hide.

More than this: one gets to hear of astonishingly specific facts, passed secretly, of course, but showing vividly what the weight and effect of the Free Press can be. One hears of orders given by a politician in his own defence, which prove his concern: of approaches made by this or that Capitalist to obtain control; sometimes of a policy initiated, an official document drawn up, a memorandum filed which proceeded directly from the advice, suggestion, or argument of a Free paper which no one but its own readers is allowed to hear of, and of whose very existence the suburbs would be sceptical.

Next consider this very powerful isolated factor in the whole business. The truth confirms itself.

Half a million people read of a professional politician, for instance, that his oratory has an "electric effect," or that he is "full of personal magnetism," or that he is tired out; flogging up sham enthusiasm is allowed to hear of, and of whose very existence the suburbs would be sceptical.

But sooner or later a certain small proportion of the events are normal in each case, and he is not taken away saying to those people. The simple fact is that, long before the war, the House of Commons had become a fraud; that its debates did not turn upon matters which really divided opinion, and that even so, the pretense of a true opposition was a falsehood.

This salutary truth had been arrived at, of course, by many channels. The scandalous arrangement between the Front Benches which forced the Insurance Act down the neck of the people was an eye-opener for great masses of the people. So was the cynical action of politicians in the matter of Chinese Labour after the Election of 1906. So was the puerile stage play indulged in over things like the Welsh Disestablishment Bill and the Education Bills.

But among the forces which opened people's eyes, the Free Press played a very great part, though it was never mentioned in the big Official papers, and though not one man in many hundreds of the public ever heard of it. The few who read it were startled into acceptance by the exact correspondence between its statement and observed fact.

The man who tells the truth when his colleagues around him are lying, always enjoys a certain restricted power of prophecy. If there was a general conspiracy to maintain the falsehood that all peers were over six foot high, a man desiring to correct this falsehood would be perfectly safe if he were to say: "I do not know whether the next peer you meet will be over six foot or not, but I am pretty safe in prophecying that if you ask the name of the next few dozen men you come across, and note which are peers, you will find among them three or four peers less than six foot high." If there were a general conspiracy to pretend that people with incomes above the income-tax level never cheated one in a bargain, one could not say "on such-and-such a person, whose income will be above the income-tax level," but one could say: "Note the people who swindle you in the next five years, and I will prophesy that not less than a certain proportion of the number will be people whom you will find to be paying income-tax."

This power of prophecy, which is an adjunct of truth telling, I have noticed to affect people very profoundly. A worthy provincial might be shocked, for instance, to hear that places in the Upper House of Parliament were bought and sold. He might indignantly deny it. The Free Press says to him: "In some short while you will have a glaring instance of a man who is incompetent and obscure, appearing as a legislator with permanent hereditary power, transferable to his son after his death."

The man who reads that prophecy, and who might, but for it, not have kept his eyes open, sees first a great soldier, then a well-advertised politician, not a notoriously rich man, widely talked about, made peers. The events are normal in each case, and he is not moved. But sooner or later, there comes a case in which he says to himself: "Who on earth is So-and-so? Why, in the name of goodness, is this unknown, and I presume incompetent, man, suddenly put into such a position?" Then he remembers what he was told, begins to ask questions, and finds out, of course, that money passed.
Mr. Shaw's Advent in Lombard Street.

Now, as always, basing his opinions upon his personal experiences (you can almost read his life by his plays), Mr. Shaw, having joined the fraternity of super-tax-payers, is concerned for the fate that threatens in the conscription of their capital. He has accordingly rushed to the support of his menaced brethren and, in good round terms, has flatly denied that you can tax capital. He argues it, in a column of leaded type in the "Times." He is distressed that a previous communication of his should have led other correspondents to think that he regards a levy upon capital as reasonable. "I do not even regard it as possible." A reactionary Oxford don, Mr. J. A. R. Marriott, has said that if you tax capital it disappears by mere depreciation. "Mr. Marriott is quite right; he is just a Fabian. " he asks. His answer would delight a Times. He is distressed that a previous round terms, has flatly denied that you can tax capital. That may or may not be true of the "Times" readers or a Fabian audience (Mr. Shaw, of course, knows best), but, fortunately, it is not true of everybody. Not that we should object to the absorption of private capital by the State or preferably the Guilds at such a rapid rate. We have no compassion in that regard, and, unlike Mr. Shaw, our withers would be unwrung. All we can say is that we had not contemplated such a raid on the rich man's henroost. No, no we are moderate. All we thought of, at the moment, was sixpence or a shilling in the pound.

Bear in mind that the underlying idea was the conscription of capital to carry on the war to a victorious issue. And a shilling or so per pound would meet our financial commitment. Nor would it be necessary to take it in cash. An equivalent share in the business, with prices reduced to the extent of our dividend, might suffice. It might, or it might not. All we need is the pleasant assurance that, Mr. Shaw and Mr. Shawkey notwithstanding, the capital is there to be impounded.

Mr. Shaw is too shrewd to build much on his definitions and assumptions. The foundation of his argument is that, in practice, wealth simply cannot be conscripted. That three hundred thousand odd cannot be collected, because it is not in the conventional shape for collection. Mr. Shaw apparently thinks that currency is the only thing the Treasury can deal with. So he sets up a dummy "practical business man," who is supposed to say: "You haven't got it; but you can get it. All you have to do is to instruct your stockbroker, to sell your income [still the false premiss, observe]" to a false assumption. He assumes that any levy on capital and not qua income, Mr. Shaw apparently assumes that the moment this capital passes to the State ceases to be capital. If, for example, the State drew back, abashed of supererogation to point out to Mr. Shaw that the conscription of capital is its capital and not qua income, Mr. Shaw apparently assumes that the moment this capital passes to the State ceases to be capital. If, for example, the State conscripts a quarter of some private munition factory (which probably it has already enriched by great additions of new machinery) and the value of the factory is reduced to zero. Mr. Shaw and the capitalists concerned wash their hands of the business and pass out. Nevertheless, strange though it may appear, it is quite on the cards that the factory will continue to produce as before, quite submerging their conscious sentence of extinction. If the State drew back, abashed at the loss of Mr. Shaw's super-tax fraternity, National
capitalists, instantly formed, would do the work better than it was done under the previous régime. So long as the labour is available, we can shake the departing capitalists by the hand and wish them both voyage on their way to a warmer climate. We hope, however, that Mr. Shaw will stay behind. C'est son métier!

Mr. Shaw might, however, try to avoid fiction when writing on finance. For example, he puts our national income at £2,000,000,000. On a basis of 5 per cent, he calculates our capital value, therefore, at £400,000,000. As at least £750,000,000 of the national income goes in wages (another big slice going in salaries and other services), Mr. Shaw, therefore, assumes that a wage-earner with £4 a week has £4,000 capital tucked away somewhere. In this instance we think that Mr. Shaw is generous before he is just. The masses of wage-earners who read the "Times" must feel very grateful to Mr. Shaw. It is true that they don't know where their capital lies hidden—the stock ADventure must have got lost in the chimney—but the sense of riches subtly inculcated by Mr. Shaw is grateful and comforting. No doubt the local grocer, baker and butcher, impressed with the hitherto undreamt-of resources of their proletarian customers, will advance unlimited credit, and life will be one long joyful adventure. It is only to be feared that these capitalists wake up to find their capital a mere figment of Mr. Shaw's imagination, there will be riots and tumults, and Mr. Shaw will be in the midst of them.

An unpleasant play! Meantime, he had better review his estimates. He will find that the capital amount is only some ten or twelve thousand millions less than he asserts—enough to carry on the war for five or six years.

We do not grant, however, that a levy in cash on capital, apart from its theoretical aspects, is either impossible or undesirable. Mr. Shaw, of course, will not accept our word for it. But what has he to say to a practical city banker whose opinion carries weight in London? It is only a few weeks ago that it was proposed from this "responsible quarter" that—we must quote—"the new Government should suspend further borrowing altogether, substituting a tax on capital so that every able purse should be compelled to contribute to war funds even as every able body is compelled to contribute to the fighting force." This banker put our capital value at £24,000,000,000, a conservative estimate, of which he assures us 6 per cent. on this capital amount, which would yield £1,440,000,000. He does not propose to go at it like a bull at a gate-post. He knows a great deal more about affairs than Mr. Shaw. All that is required is a monthly impost, which he assures us would cause little or no monetary disturbance, as Government disbursements would balance the tax payments. Our banker goes further; he carries the war into Mr. Shaw's camp: "Just as former borrowings have caused inflation and a consequent rise in the price of commodities, so would taxation have a contrary effect. It would enforce economy of consumption, bring about a fall in prices, restrict imports, and so help the exchange. To meet this taxation of capital people would be less anxious to borrow from their banks." Which, incidentally, would be a good thing for the banks. We are not convinced that the advantages cited would actually accrue; but we are satisfied that this responsible banker knows his subject.

The truth is that the Fabian leaders have stopped thinking. Nor will the currency system cease developing when Mr. Shaw has gone peacefully to sleep. In the case here cited, it would appear that the Government authority the banks can meet the war demands made upon them. If, however, they failed us, the war could still proceed and we should learn some valuable lessons on the application of national credit to a critical situation. The mere monopoly of the coinage is one thing; the means of production and distribution is quite another. One or two cardinal facts are gradually forcing themselves upon the consideration of thinkers. One is that the forms of credit have been moulded by the banks without regard to larger economic factors. For example, short-term loans, on the purely commercial ground that the shorter the term the greater is the security of the loan. But Germany has built up its present economic structure very largely on long-term loans, the banks in consequence being compelled to associate themselves with industrial undertakings. And when the war broke out, it was confidently predicted that the German banks would crack. They have not done so. The difference lies in the fact that the British banks have systematically retained control of the currency; the German banks had to finance each new industrial development. They could not afford to stand aside and dominate the trade. The British banker quoted, however much he protest, really creates a new policy of long-term loans, if the British banks were to lend up to 6 per cent on capital value—say, £6,000,000,000—it is certain that this sum could not be repaid in a short period. We must remember that the bank customers would require the usual accommodation over and above this special loan. Another cardinal fact is that the gold coinage, now prevailing is a token of distrust. It means that a piece of paper certifying a claim for so much work done is a suspicious document and not to be trusted. So the banks say that we must obtain possession of a piece of gold, or its equivalent, to the amount of the commodities earned by our honest labour before we can proceed to visit our tradesmen. Granting that the system is effective, it is, nevertheless, obvious that it confers a monopoly which may be both oppressive and restrictive. In counting the cost of the industrial system, ninetenths of the gold industry is a dead-weight on the cost of production, certainly theoretically and probably in practice. All that is required of a true currency is that it should sensitively respond to valid wealth production. But this is only possible in connection with every act of labour. Fundamentally, therefore, the correlation between wealth production and currency depends upon the skill and honesty of the proletariat. But as labour is treated as a commodity pure and simple, any such ethical responsibility must be disregarded. It is for this reason that, financially considered, the employer cannot secure a loan upon his labour, even though the bank honours his wages cheque.

Whilst the banks readily advance money on raw materials, they cannot advance money on the labour commodity, because it cannot be put into bond or other custody such as the usual terms of security require. But we are now rapidly moving into a new phase, when the commodity Labour ceases and Labour enters into partnership. A new banking problem is here presented, and upon its right solution the future banking system depends. If and when Labour obtains partnership, with the State or with the employers, it will enter the category of "services," and, in so doing, come into practical touch with the banks, whether joint-stock, national or Guild, in respect of the socialised production and a diverted current of distribution. When this day comes, a piece of paper certifying the value of £1, backed by the credit of a Guild or the Government, will be quite as acceptable as a piece of paper certifying a like amount, backed by gold.
The Plague of ex-Lord Chancellors.

By W. Durran.

A day was named for the sacrifice. . . . The pathos of the procession was enhanced by the presence of no fewer than five ex-Lord Chancellors.—"The Dragon," "Times," September 13, 1916.

The Dragon dissembled his love and appeared in a fearsome guise. Vomiting forth flames, he devastated a whole district in the Midlands. Then someone, greatly daring, got speech of the monster. We are not told whether he was invited to turn his terrific powers against the Hussars; but we do know that he entertained other views equally helpful for our side.

On one condition only would be cease to ravage the land. It was that he should be given one hundred dollars a year to devour, beginning at the top. The whole country was in a paroxysm of grief. One monthly review brought out "an edition printed entirely in white on a black ground." Sighs and lamentations rent the air.

The monster was inexcusable. His terms were accepted in national mourning. But, to the astonishment of the world, and in a new vigour, an unequaled energy made itself felt in every phase of our activity after the first dread ceremony; and, after the second contribution to the gruesome feast, the war was brought to a victorious conclusion.

There is solid comfort in the reflection that if our Patron Saint and his namesake should, unhappily, fail—the high gods forfend!—to save our much menaced State, then the advent of the Dragon will be a blessing in disguise, a harbinger of victory. Only the growing lack of the Empire could have brought these three to forget ancient quarrels and work on parallel lines.

If our high mandarins do succeed in attracting the attention of the Dragon in the allegory, they will render—alw unwittingly—a disinterested, not to say a self-victorious conclusion.

The election of a Lord Chancellor is a striking ex-

The proposition on which it is based is a hardy annual which has flourished in the fostering soil of the Inns of Court; but, as regards real ground, we shall show that it has as little as the mango tree of the Indian conquerer.

The mystification is worked by artfully ignoring the essential distinction between salary and pension. A simple illustration will make this clear. Suppose we go back to the time when there was no pension for a retiring Lord Chancellor. Let us suppose, further, that there is a vacancy in the House of Lords sitting as a supreme tribunal. Our retiring Chancellor, childlike and bland, says to the Prime Minister: "Why pay £6,000? I will do the work for £5,000. You can announce an economy of £1,000 a year." The Prime Minister agrees. "Thank you," says the knowing one, picking up hat and gloves, "it will be understood, I take it, that as I have retired, my remuneration will be accordingly described as pension, not salary." Again the Prime Minister agrees.

What is his defence when the pensioner is incapacitated after a brief period of service? Where is the vaunted economy? It is really a net loss to the country of £4,000 a year; because a Law Lord's salary, had he been incapacitated, would have been a very large sum; his pension, say, a third (or £1,000 a year) would have been paid him; whereas the pension of £1,000 in the other case is for life. This is an obvious misappropriation of public money; a financial gamble in which the chances are all against the public.

It is true that the pensioner may serve for many years. But, we must remember that actuarial calculations are not based on exceptional but on average lives. Observe, further, that the chances of life are incomparably better than those of the continuance of that degree of robust health, mental activity and level-headedness, which are indispensable for the adequate discharge of judicial functions. At this point we find one abuse supporting another. It is notorious that our judges are often gravely handicapped by bodily or mental defects, chiefly infirmities of age.

Nor is this surprising, when there is no limit of age for retirement. "I refer," wrote a barrister in the "Times," November, 1909, "to the extreme age of some occupiers of the Bench, which when I went circuit in the 'seventies, I followed three judges whose continuance on the Bench was a scandal. The first had almost entirely lost his voice . . . . The second was taciturn, to an intolerable extent . . . . The third was exceedingly deaf . . . ."
It is true that these judges were not ex-Chancellors; but the same rule applies to all judges of the Superior Courts of this country; there is no limit of age for retirement, unlike the rules which apply to our judges in India, and the officers of all other public Services in the world.

An age limit fixed on somewhat similar lines to that observed in India would remove the last shade of plausibility in the defence of ex-Lord Chancellors' pensions. Consequently, the fixing of such a limit is most strenuously resisted; and with complete success up to the present hour. The last attempt was opposed by Lord Reading, then Sir Rufus Isaacs, when Attorney-General. He made himself responsible for the astounding statement that "some of the most vigilant judges are the oldest men!"

Despite this flattering pronouncement, there is evidence that the efficiency of our highest tribunals is impaired by the ravages of senile decay. In an interview published in the "Review of Reviews" for June, 1900, Sir Robert Stout, ex-Premier of New Zealand, said: "We, in New Zealand, are, as far as the Privy Council is concerned, in an unfortunate position. It has shown that it does not know our statutes, conveying terms, or history."

Thus, we perceive that the pensions of ex-Chancellors, like the elections of Chancellors, are not a fair gamble for the public. It is a gamble in which the dice are heavily loaded against the public: a gamble which requires the perpetuation of conditions signally unfavourable to the satisfactory administration of Justice.

It must be accounted to the recently appointed Lord Chancellor for righteousness that he does not shelter himself behind sophistical argumentation and financial expedients which would be designated by a harsher name in the City. He signifies his intention of waiving the claim for pension.

But the most significant fact connected with the Lord Chancellor's Office has yet to be mentioned. He was not, originally, a lawyer at all. On the contrary, he represented the Throne as a corrective for injustice wrought by abuse of legal forms, when "Justice," according to an ancient writer, describing conditions existing in the year 1289, "was perpetually entangled in a net of technical jargon." Then the Office of the Lord Chancellor "was the refuge of the poor and the afflicted, the altar and sanctuary for such as, against the might-of rich men and the countenance of great men, cannot maintain the goodness of their cause." Up to the time he was not a lawyer.

Then the Office, which had long been an eyesore to the Bar, was captured by the Bar, utterly perverted from its purpose, and a wild orgy of extortion began. The outcome was a series of grave scandals culminating in the dismissal of a Lord Chancellor for taking bribes in the reign of George I.

The following passages are from the Report of the Select Committee of the House of Commons appointed to review the position and emoluments of the Lord Chancellor in the year 1846:

"A considerable part of the emoluments of the Office of the Lord Chancellor is derived from fees nominally paid to the Secretary of Bankrupts who accounts for them, and is allowed a certain salary." The amount thus received in 1810 was £15,532, exclusive of the emoluments accruing to the Lord Chancellor as Speaker of the House of Lords.

The Committee recommended an increase of salary for the Lord Chancellor and abolition of fees "which can be considered in no other light than as a tax on distress and insolvency.

"Corruptio optimi pessima. We perceive that the real Dragon is not the monster of the allegory, but the insatiable capacity of the Bar; while the veritable culprits are the laity, who, possessing the power to sweep away flamboyant extortion, meekly tolerate it. We have the ex-Lord Chancellors whom we deserve.

The British Consular Service.

I.

Already a recrudescence of public interest in the consular service has come as a hint of the importance which must attach to it when the work of national reconstruction begins. Commissions have periodically "inquired into" the consular service, and more frequently the spokesmen of commerce bring forward characteristic suggestions for its improvement. But they all come and go, whereas the Foreign Office goes on for ever. Certain changes, it is true, have resulted from these stirrings of very stagnant waters. In 1904, for example, a great branch of the service was rescued from the demoralisations incident on the appointment of committing consular officers by limited competition was introduced. The aim of the Foreign Office was defined on that occasion as being "to attract young men of good position who have devoted some time to commercial life, and thus obtained an insight into business transactions which could be of service in the position of consul." This ambition has not been realised, for reasons which will be explained in the course of these articles, but the intention was obviously good, and should be recorded as a sign of grace but too infrequent.

The branch of the service thus brought under the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Commissioners is known as the General Consular Service, there being two others, the Levant and Far Eastern Services. The last two were recruited by open competition, but since the reconstitution of the General Service all three are filled by limited competition amongst candidates nominated by the Secretary of State. The examination is entirely different for each branch, and men are rarely, if ever, transferred from the one to the other. The Levant officials are conditioned to the Ottoman Dominions, Persia, Greece, Egypt and Morocco, while those in the Far East are appointed to posts in China, Japan and Siam.

With few unimportant exceptions, all other consulates throughout the world are staffed by the General Consular Service, and this is the branch of the service usually discussed by critics. It is the most important and the most familiar.

This arbitrary classification is peculiar to England, for no other country would think of shutting up its consular officials into water-tight compartments and emphasising the system by giving one branch of the service a special training, while ignoring the equally great necessities of the others. Thus, candidates for the Levant Service are sent to Cambridge for two years in order to study Oriental languages and law, after which they proceed to Constantinople as Student Interpreters, and it is not until two years more have elapsed that they are appointed vice-consuls. No such training is provided for the Far East or the General Service, except that in the former men are not made vice-consuls until they have served as Student Interpreters. In the General Service, three branches are distinguished between the Commercial Intelligence Branch of the Board of Trade and the Foreign Office is deemed to enable candidates to go abroad and take up their duties as vice-consuls. It was not until 1914 that a step was taken in the right direction, when successful candidates were obliged to go to some large consular administrations, before actually receiving an appointment on full salary. Prior to that date an utterly inexperienced youth might find himself on arrival in a foreign port called upon to take entire charge of a Consulate-General, in the case of illness or leave of absence on the part of the senior officer.

It may be asked if the divisions of the consular service do not correspond to real differences in the nature of the functions fulfilled by the three classes of officials. To some extent this is true, but the diversity of a consul's duties are such that it would be absurd to pretend that the posts in any one branch offer more homoge-
neous employment than do the branches amongst themselves. Havana falls into the Far East category, though San Domingo, Hayti, Tahiti and Portuguese Brazil are usually held with the same posts as Paris, Berlin, New York and Rio de Janeiro. The Levant Service covers Bulgaria and Servia, but not Roumania. If a Student Interpreter must be equipped at Cambridge with a knowledge of Turkish before he can enter upon his career, how is a vice-consul in the General Service prepared for the discharge of his functions in Brazil or Roumania by having passed an examination in French and German—as does the Student Interpreter—and then spending three months in London at the Foreign Office or Board of Trade? Obviously, the differentiation in question bears only a vague relation to the diverse needs of the consular profession in Boston or Mexico City.

The first change, therefore, which suggests itself is the abolition of this unreasonable and inadequate classification of the service according to the supposed diversification of function. As it is impossible to make divisions which would correspond precisely to the large, numerous, classes of consular work, the simplest plan is to treat the consular service as one department, and to train officials in accordance with the specific needs of the country in which they are going to serve. The present system of appointing men to countries of whose language they are ignorant is incompatible with efficiency, and seems strange when we consider the elaborate precautions implied by the divisions into which the service has been brought. While Student Interpreters are sent for two years to Cambridge in order that they may study the languages most likely to be of use to them, and that, moreover, after they have passed an examination in French, German, Italian and Spanish, candidates for the General Consular Service are not even tested in these four languages. Until 1915, the only obligatory language was French, with a choice of either German or Spanish, but now an easy test in Russian has been added to the compulsory subjects of examination. Russia is one of the countries to which officers in the General Service have always been sent, yet the authorities have supposed that a knowledge of Russian was of vastly more importance than the "cramping" of "commercial geography" and mercantile law, upon which they insist. As it is, candidates are received without being obliged to know both German and Spanish, the two most important commercial languages in the world, after English.

The variety of countries in which officials of the General Service are liable to be appointed is quite as great as in the Levant or Far East branches, but French and either German or Spanish were until the other day considered sufficient for the proper discharge of their duties. One may imagine how far such qualifications can assist men who are sent to Roumania, Holland, Denmark, Sweden, Italy, Portugal, Brazil and the Portuguese colonies. To this may be added the alarming fact that even such meagre linguistic qualifications as the candidates possess are never considered when selecting their posts. Those who have a thorough knowledge of German (and, presumably, are not wholly ignorant of German) will wander in many strange places, but the country where they might be of real service will not see them. A glance at some examination papers, and the subsequent appointment of the candidates will illustrate the system.

Spanish, being the easiest language to " cram," is more popular than German, which demands years of study. In 1903, strange to say, four out of the five men appointed spoke German. The one who knew Spanish was sent to Roumania, a German speaker being chosen for Caracas, the only Spanish post vacant, while the remaining three went to Odessa, New Orleans and Baltimore. In 1907, two German and two Spanish speakers presented themselves, the former going to Guatemala and Zanzibar, and the latter to Rio de Janeiro and United States. In 1908, the candidate who knew German was sent to Odessa, and the others to Marseilles and Philadelphia. The following year there were again four men who knew German; one was appointed to Rio de Janeiro, the other to cities in the United States. In 1912 the vacancies in Spanish-speaking countries were, with one exception, allotted to those who had passed the examination in German. If it be replied that vice-consuls are purposely appointed to posts which will enable them to add another language to their qualifications, a sceptical retort is fully justified. The preponderance of appointments in the United States is calculated to allow officials to forget more than they ever knew. Further, it is not an uncommon experience to find an official quite incompetent to discharge any importance in the language he is initiated into. It has been pointed out, without having brought out with him some knowledge acquired by previous study. Consuls-general, drawing salaries of £1,000 and more per annum, with innumerable and dubious perquisites, may be discovered with a rudimentary knowledge of Russian, though they have passed ten years or more in sole command of a consulate in Russia.

Vice-consuls, however, do not often incur this reproach, for the simple reason that their terms of residence in each country are so brief and irregular as to constitute ignorance and inexperience a chronic condition. Instead of acquitting them of not profiting by their opportunities, as in the case of the older officials, we should rather marvel at their learning anything at all. They are so frequently transferred from one country to another that it is impossible to believe the authorities can have the need of experience as a motive in sending new men to posts involving linguistic qualifications not possessed by the candidates in the first instance. If the latter, having proved their knowledge of the languages required by the Civil Service Commissioners, were appointed for a substantial period to a place which would enable them to acquire another language, then the system would be intelligible, if not justified. But vice-consuls are transferred on the same peremptory and arbitrary principle as governs the movements of candidates on passing their examinations. They are appointed without any reference to their proven qualifications, so the former are transferred without a thought for the efficiency of the individual, or the service, as a whole. It is apparently as undesirable that a vice-consul should remain at work which he is just beginning to understand as it is that he should obtain a vacancy in a country whose language he speaks.

During the first years of their service few vice-consuls ever remain more than eighteen months or two years at the same post. As they go out in complete ignorance of the language before they arrive, it becomes precisely at the period when a transfer takes place, or is imminent, the result may be imagined. In cases of appointment to countries where a new language must be learned simultaneously, the officer proceeds to his second post a sadder, but not a wiser, man. After two years in a large port, such as Hamburg, Marseilles, or Philadelphia, the neophyte is only just qualified to take charge of the consulate, in cases of necessity, and has acquired a certain grasp of the affairs with which he has to assist in dealing. This presupposes, moreover, that he has had previous grade with an unfamiliar language. Yet the Foreign Office would have no hesitation in taking a man from Rio de Janeiro, after a doubly inadequate period of initiation, and sending him to Bogota or the Congo, where he is expected to cope with wholly different work, with the addition, perhaps, of another language.

It must also be remembered that the period referred
to, from eighteen to twenty-four months, is by no means an extreme example of a system which is seriously affecting the efficiency of the consular service. Anyone who cares to turn over the pages of the "Foreign Office List" will meet with paragraphs in the "statement of services" which reveal depths of consular mutability exceeding the worst fancies of the narrators of feminine fickleness. Here, for instance, is an officer appointed to a consulate in Italy; six months later he begins his interval he begins to move again, going to a German port for six months, thence to the Faroe Islands for two months, then to Casa Blanca for one month, and, finally, to Norway, where he again settles for some years. In 1914, however, his peregrination is resumed, and he proceeds to Portuguese East Africa, whence he is transferred, after three months, to East Prussia, remaining there until the outbreak of war. It might be expected that such an event would necessitate his being uninterruptedly employed for the duration of the war, but, no: early in 1915 he was sent to the Argentine for three months, after which he was transferred to Brazil. Each of these journeys is paid for out of public funds, and may have been undertaken by the officer's wife and family, if, as is not unlikely, he is married. In that case, his wife's full fare was paid, and a portion of the other fares. To this must be added an allowance for luggage. Such are the expenses sanctioned by a department which refuses to pay for a deck chair on ocean journeys, and does not allow for sleeping cars on a European journey involving two days in the train! The legitimate transfer system, excites no comment. We have been undertaken by the officer's wife and family, later he is in Algiers. After an interval he begins to countries and continents. His career reads like the diary of an American tripper rather than a "statement of services" in a semi-official publication.

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?

3. What in your opinion is the best policy to be pursued by the men's Unions, although the obtaining of the working conditions aforementioned has cost the men many millions of pounds and untold privation and suffering. But they have stood loyally to their agreement, and some will regret the sacrifice, provided justice is done to the men and the cause from which the nation demanded the concession.

The problem, therefore, briefly put, is as follows:-

1. What shall be meant by a return to pre-war wages?

2. Shall the millions of men returning to civil life return, also, to the situations they left?

3. How will you deal with the females occupying the men's places in the works?

4. In what way would you deal with unskilled men brought into the works?

5. How will you deal with juniors employed on munitions, provided they remain in the works?

6. How would you deal with the unemployed after the War?

It will be readily seen from the above that the problem is many-sided. It bristles with difficulties and
touched many interests. It is, therefore, difficult in a single study to get the current. Let it be our aim to consider the matter as I view it, in as brief a form as possible, at the same time striving earnestly to make myself understood.

PRE-WAR RATES OF WAGES.

1. Wages shall equal in value those paid in the summer of 1914.

2. Every man is justly entitled to the situation he gave up when volunteering for service.

3. Speaking generally, the women must vacate the places previously by the men, and the machinery their remaining at certain employment in connection with the work must be one to be determined or arranged between the men and the employers.

4. There is a greater danger to abstain from industry than for untrained men to be allowed to meddle with skilled work, unless undergoing a course of training under well-defined conditions.

If these men, therefore, are allowed to remain, it must be to do such work as they did before the War, otherwise you introduce an element of competition in wages. It is much better business to seek to establish proper training, both in school and workshop, where attendance at school during the apprenticeship period should be made compulsory.

Unemployment after the War is, perhaps, the most difficult problem of all. The clients are so varied, and their condition so uncertain. We must leave, therefore, the sick and wounded to the agencies already appointed for the work, and deal with those sound in body and mind. The men from the rural districts will generally find employment on the land. But, to make this doubly sure, land should be acquired by the State, and dealt with on a properly staffing and simple lines in their particular vicinities. It should be devoted mainly to growing garden stuffs, and should gradually develop according to the needs of the neighbourhood and the possibilities of the land. This would absorb considerable unemployment. It should ever be kept in mind that few things pay better than land scientifically treated. Hence the need for special treatment, under the guidance of men of the school.

Dealing with unemployment in towns, and specially in centres devoted to the production of munitions, a considerable body of skilled workmen will be needed. For example, many thousands of men and women will gravitate to their former employment, which was left empty by the men, and the machinery and the best skilled workmen are ready at hand. The chief things to be avoided are night work after a usual day's work is done, and removal from the atmosphere of the workshop perhaps to a remote part of a large city, where the school element dominates. The best men from both is essential to success.

It is as much to the interest of Capital as to that of Labour that the suggested standard of skill should be reached by all engaged in the trade. The best results will not be gained if the said training be controlled by a committee of employers and of workmen's representatives. I have here, perhaps, indicated that hostility to Germany in the form of a boycott of her manufactures and a cloter industrial alliance with our Colonies, giving the latter preferential treatment, would ensure to Great Britain industrial supremacy. To my way of thinking, such a policy would in the end be found to be morally wrong, hence would never be financially right. I would certainly prefer a "live and let live" policy. A nation is its own enemy that puts a prohibitive tax on imported goods, as by such means home-produced goods are the deader, and foreign-made goods also, which means that the consumer is the victim in every case. Retaliation is no remedy. Like every other form of physical warfare, it engenders bad blood and intensifies unfriendliness. It is much better business to seek to establish proper business relations, good countries for full development. If it be found that certain countries possess natural advantages, or even acquired—say, a higher standard of education or a more stalwart manhood—then concede them the right and opportunity to prosper, for be assured that in the end no number of artificial barriers will suffice to hold them back.

The chief difficulty with regard to Germany is that it will not pursue a straight line of conduct. Here an example might be helpful. Solingen (Germany) is among the oldest centres for cutlery-making. For two centuries preceding 1750, some of the best cutlery was produced in this district. But from the latter date, down to 1870, the trade so degenerated that nothing but the vilest rubbish was produced there. The cutlery last named, although vile and worthless, was well finished, and the eye at sight, a customer was only to be caught once. Therefore, ruin to the German cutlery industry was inevitable, unless the buyer could be impressed that beyond the bare face appearance there was "real grit." There followed a universal practice of putting marks on goods indicating that they were made of steel of the best quality, were made also by the best methods (that is, by hand laboring) and, further, that they were made in Sheffield (England) and by the best Sheffield manufacturers. As proof of all this, the cutlery bore the name and corporate mark of the firm, with the word SHEFFIELD all in English characters.

These practices continued for many years, with the result that the reputation of Germany suffered to such an extent as to make her name a byword in all industrial centres and in all countries. Only after the Government passed a measure dealing with the false marking of merchandise, the effect of which has been practically to stop the practices complained of, with a further result of bettering the class of manufactures made in Germany.

The object in view in giving the above instance is to suggest that, if a similar course were adopted with regard to our own industries, no one could be guilty, perhaps similar results might follow. For example, some time ago, there was an exhibition of cutlery made in Germany, at the Cutlers' Hall, Sheffield.
the object being to show the quality of German production and the prices at which they were sold wholesale. From the point of view of utility and true beauty, they were in every sense a nearer cut to the object sought to be attained by the British Merchandise Marks Act, 1887, the authorities of the two countries, and I am confident that the III

Big possibilities present themselves if a policy of this kind is pursued, in view of the fact that the present Minister of Labour is personally intimate with and in the Joint Trade Union organisation of Great Britain and the Trade Unions, and is officially associated with the men of influence in the working-class movement. And I am sanguine, provided the case is well put, and conferences are held, that opportunity for the objects and intent of Great Britain to be well understood, that a friendly alliance of the character indicated can be brought about.

If the War is over, the Trade Unions will begin to arrange to readjust many grievances, inflicting and patiently borne, consequent on the arrangement come to with the Government, and as soon as possible will formulate their demands. In this case it will be well if both the Trade Unions and the employers keep well before them the fact that both organised Labour and organised Capital are practically impregnable, and that true wisdom is evidenced in dealing with points in dispute if economy in studying and good business methods are adopted. Speaking generally, the Trade Union leader is against compulsory arbitration only because of the work the boards in the past. In most cases the workman makes a good guess as to the award, believing that such is arrived at more in consideration of the parties concerned as employer and workman than as a result of an impartial judgment on the merits of the case. Capital and Labour must be prepared to come together with greater mutuality than ever before, recognising that, under existing conditions, each is necessary to the other, and that opportunity for the objects and intent of Great Britain to be well understood, that a friendly alliance of the character indicated can be brought about.

If the War is over, the Trade Unions will begin to arrange to readjust many grievances, inflicting and patiently borne, consequent on the arrangement come to with the Government, and as soon as possible will formulate their demands. In this case it will be well if both the Trade Unions and the employers keep well before them the fact that both organised Labour and organised Capital are practically impregnable, and that true wisdom is evidenced in dealing with points in dispute if economy in studying and good business methods are adopted. Speaking generally, the Trade Union leader is against compulsory arbitration only because of the work the boards in the past. In most cases the workman makes a good guess as to the award, believing that such is arrived at more in consideration of the parties concerned as employer and workman than as a result of an impartial judgment on the merits of the case. Capital and Labour must be prepared to come together with greater mutuality than ever before, recognising that, under existing conditions, each is necessary to the other, and that opportunity for the objects and intent of Great Britain to be well understood, that a friendly alliance of the character indicated can be brought about.

Great possibilities present themselves if a policy of this kind is pursued, in view of the fact that the present Minister of Labour is personally intimate with and in the Joint Trade Union organisation of Great Britain and Germany, and is officially associated with the men of influence in the working-class movement. And I am sanguine, provided the case is well put, and conferences are held, that opportunity for the objects and intent of Great Britain to be well understood, that a friendly alliance of the character indicated can be brought about.

It is well to remember that a man can do more work and of a higher quality as a result of his intelligence forbids that he should be content with an income below efficiency. "Put yourself to work, and you will have the workman inside the factory. The

the interests of the Empire; and they acted, as a rule, without termination of the War, we shall be called upon to meet striking false descriptions on their federation, with organised labour in Great Britain, members were representative samples, and were agreed that the prices at which they engaged in prosecuting and punishing German manufacturers for the British Merchandise Marks Act, 1887, the authorities in Germany have joined hands with the Board of Trade would be a nearer cut to the object sought to be attained by the British Merchandise Marks Act, 1887, the authorities in Germany have joined hands with the Board of Trade

A point, therefore, is, if, as has been the case under the British Merchandise Marks Act, 1887, the authorities in Germany have joined hands with the Board of Trade in prosecuting and punishing German manufacturers for

The best experts in the cutlery trade costed the samples, and were agreed that the prices at which they engaged in prosecuting and punishing German manufacturers for the British Merchandise Marks Act, 1887, the authorities in Germany have joined hands with the Board of Trade

The best experts in the cutlery trade costed the samples, and were agreed that the prices at which they engaged in prosecuting and punishing German manufacturers for the British Merchandise Marks Act, 1887, the authorities in Germany have joined hands with the Board of Trade

Minister he quotes was much more on the alert. Listen to Mr. de Maeztu's authority, and mark the irony of it: "Then one of them, which was a lawyer, asked Jesus a question, tempting Him and saying"—well, we know not only what he said, but what the trap was that ingeniously little lawyer was laying for Jesus both in cross-examining the Master in the hope of discovering Him tripping in the Law. If only he could have drawn an admission of ignorance or, still better, a criticism, of the Law from the new Teacher, he would have felt the satisfaction of his kind in the triumph of it. Jesus, however, gave the correct answer to the pedant in words the careful objectivism of which Mr. de Maeztu ought at once to recognise. Expressing neither approval nor dissent, and conveying no criticism, whether constructive or destructive, Jesus replied, like a child repeating a catechism, that "on these two commandments hang all the Law and the Prophets." But that was to say that the doctrine of Jesus therefore hung upon them? We know, on the contrary, that the commandment of Jesus and His unique contribution to ethics was the injunction, often repeated, "that ye love one another, as I have loved you." Doubtless, the love of God was implied in it, but only, I think, as a secondary consideration. In fact, I make bold to say that if the Law and the Prophets can be said to have relegated mutual human love to a second place in the order of values, the distinction of Jesus lay in reversing the order, and in making fellowship primary over the love of God. To what else, indeed, does the Law and Mr. de Maeztu? "Yea, the time cometh," said Jesus to His disciples (said Jesus to His disciples) that whosoever killeth you in His own commandment as the better way? Mr. de Maeztu, I am sure, will have some difficulty in escaping this conclusion, especially now that I have the foundation-quotations of his article a prisoner in irons in my hands.
I am reminded of a reflection I made many months ago upon the strange company the modern doctrine of Objectivism appears to like to keep. You will note that the conception of Christianity upon which Mr. de Maestu and his school prefer to rest is Old Testament Christianity—in short, Judaism. And they are wise in their generation, for relatively to Christianity, Judaism is a typical instance of objectivist ethics; and the New Testament in relation to the Old is the gospel of subjective ethics. What, in fact, is more evident than the contrast between them? In the Old Testament everything is objective, real and independent of man, from God Himself to Heaven and Righteousness; in the New Testament, on the contrary, everything is subjective, ideal, and "within you," from the Kingdom of Heaven to the Creator Himself. In the Old Testament God is the God of Power; in the New, He is the God of Love. In the Old Testament God's in His heaven and all therefor is right with the world; but in the New Testament God is within every one of us, and therefore all is right with all of us. In the Old Testament God is omnipotent, that He should be mindful of Him. In the New Testament man is everything that God should send His only-begotten Son to die for him. Is not all this undeniable, is it not, in fact, the commonplace of thought upon the subject? And may we not, therefore, fortifying themselves behind the Old, instead of within the New, Testament, the modern objectivists, possibly without intending it, are really relapsing from Christianity to Judaism? But that is perhaps an irrelevant question.

* * *

A good deal of play has been made by Mr. de Maestu (and by Mr. T. E. Hulme, as well) with the notion that in a very precise sense the error of Humanism, or the doctrine particularly associated with the Renaissance, was the error of subjectivism. We are, therefore, hidden to the under the Renaissance and to return in thought to the more objective theories in which it displaced. I am prepared, as I have many times said, to compromise with Objectivism, and to admit it to a fellowship with Subjectivism—an inferior fellowship, it is true, but a fellowship, nevertheless. I am prepared to count Things, as well as Persons, real, and only to maintain that the eternal Things are for the sake of the immortal Person. But what I am unable to do is to dismiss Subjectivism as of no account in comparison with Objectivism. There, I am, in fact, the commonplace of thought upon the subject. And may we not, therefore, fortifying themselves behind the Old, instead of within the New Testament, the modern objectivists, possibly without intending it, are really relapsing from Christianity to Judaism? But that is perhaps an irrelevant question.

* * *

For frequenting the company of sailors. Sailors are not what they were in Greek days, slaves for the most part. Nor can I prove that mutual love—Mr. de Maestu is so emphatic, that he includes "the most perfect mutual love"—is incompatible with the intellectual, physical, sentimental and moral degeneration of the human race." Nobody, in fact, by mere reasoning, can prove that a perfect Christian fellowship—a society obeying the single commandment of Jesus—may not become, from that very cause, all that Mr. de Maestu fears. But I think we can say that it seems highly improbable; and, for myself, I would add that if it implies "degeneration," I would we were all degenerate! But enough of skirmishing. I shall bring up my guns upon another occasion.

R. H. C.
but are they, therefore, not potentially tyrannical? The only effective answer that might be made would be a demonstration that tyranny is incompatible with the Irish character. But this, I fear, would be a difficult task.

My object in accusing Ireland of the crimes which, but for the grace of God, she might well have committed, is to suggest a truce in the everlasting controversy about the political affairs of many years ago. When we take into count the political circumstances of those times, and, especially, the economic conditions, we see that the Englishman of to-day need have no reason to reproach himself for the deeds and misdeeds of his ancestors. It is really high time now that the Irish abdicated all of its leadership to the Chinese.

In the near future of Ireland, we need not look for National Guilds. They are a development far beyond the range of the present embryonic economic organisations. Irish Trade Unionism is still a babe in arms, in power of imagination as much as in standing. The most promising economic development in Ireland is the co-operative movement. And this is as far as we can expect most Irishmen to look for a long while yet.

In the first place, it is only recently that, after centuries of conflict, the Irish farmers have wrested the ownership of their lands from the landlords. As we ask a hungry dog to surrender a bone as to expect Irish farmers of to-day to consider an extension of co-operative ownership from ploughs and dairies to the land is little more than asking the state that they employ wage-labourers, so that their social elevation will come more and more to be based on the existence of an inferior and service class. But, within its limits and as a means of checking Ireland's impoverisation, the co-operative movement is all for the best. In some way or other, Ireland will learn that to rehabilitate herself as a nation she must abandon the pretence of being the fairy queen of the United Kingdom, and become its fairy damsel.

The internal political future of Ireland may, I think, be foreshadowed. It is quite certain that any plan which will appeal both to the Nationalists and to Ulster will be agreeable to England. But all attempts of either party to obtain a one-sided solution are certain to fail, and the usual partisan proposals, so popular hitherto, may as well be thrown overboard now for ever. If my memory is not at fault, the Ulster Covenant binds its signatories not to eat or drink in the event of Ireland's receiving Home Rule. Well, I see that the Covenant will be broken. Ireland will have Home Rule, but not a Carson will starve.

A successful plan of Home Rule must conciliate both parties, or else the whole trouble will start again. The first difficulty is evident when we realise that the Nationalists are split into three bodies. First, there are the Sinn Fein irreconcilables, who desire complete separation and independence. But they are a small and uninfluential body, and may safely be left out of account. The largest Nationalist party consists of the orthodox Home Rulers, who desire a united and self-governing Ireland within the Empire. But they look upon Ulster as just one of four more or less equal provinces, and are prepared to grant it representation proportionate to its geographical and numerical status. In case of conflict, Ulster would find three-fourths of the Government ranged against her. The third and right wing of the Nationalists is prepared to offer large concessions to Ulster for the sake of uniting the country in peace.

On the Ulster side there are the die-hards and the moderate men. The die-hards may be allowed to disappear in the track of the Sinn Feiners. We are concerned now with the Ulstermen who would welcome Home Rule if they saw Ulster safe from Nationalist oppression. A. E.'s plan is designed to conciliate the moderate men on both sides. He would have a lower house elected in the ordinary proportions, but he would place an Ulster majority in the upper house, as if an Ulster government had just gone out of office. Vacancies in this upper house would be filled by the government in power. Meanwhile, like Caedidile, the peasant proprietors will cultivate each other's gardens.

**Write is Might.**

I look forward to the war when men of letters will be ranged on opposing sides with all the poetry of artillery.... "R. H. C." in The New Age of December 28, 1916.

Throughout the winter of 1917 all the universities in Veritia rang with the sound of the sharpening of pencils, the bubbling of fountain-pens, the overhauling of typewriters, and the mobilisation of printing presses. The flower of the country's vocabulary was called to the national banner, and a measure for the general compulsion of pens passed through Parliament at a sitting.

Not less active was the double-tongued enemy who had collected copious companies of clap-trap with which he hoped to overwhelm the invading force of arguments. His cavalry boasted the fleetest scribblers in the world; his factories were filled to overflowing with the newest pattern pens, and every seaport rang with the echo of the triple-expansive adjectives at which playwrights worked day and night.

Never before in history had two such armies met in conflict. In Veritia men spoke with admiration of Professor Probity, who, in the last May manoeuvres, had put down a rising of pedantry by sheer force of common sense; while in Fallacia no less brilliant was the record of Professor Perfidy, who, in a recent debate, had inflicted a crushing adjective on a rival professor. It was early spring before the fighting began, a reason for the delay being the severity of the March winds which went to the heads of the professors, making it impossible for their ideas to advance to the March winds which swept away the cobwebs.

At last, however, just before dawn on April 23, the anniversary of the discovery of italics, Professor Probity opened fire with an attack upon the enemy's front-page, to which Professor Perfidy replied with a quibbling counter-stroke of his pen, defending his equivocal position with volleys of abuse, supported by columns of calumny amounting to about fifteen thousand bad words, and armed with ingenious repeating paradoxes. By the combined fire of these, the Fallacians hoped to inflict fatal wounds upon the enemy's feelings, and completely to destroy his reputation wherever it had gained a foothold in neutral headlines. Then refreshing himself with a draught of mixed metaphors Professor Perfidy threw the whole weight of his argument at the weakest points in the opposition, and as his printing presses began pouring out broadside after broadside, thousands of Veritian verbs turned passive and in a subjective mood surrendered their persons. Notwithstanding this reverse, which greatly heartened the enemy, the Veritians wrote hard all that day, facing charge after charge with mere handfuls of facts. When night came the Fallacians had fortified their premises, having with one of their indiarubber pieces wiped out a whole regiment of Professor Probity's footnotes. So heavy, however,
were the losses they had suffered in neutral respect, and with such dignity had the Veritians replied to the most insulting of their base operations, that no decisive article of victory could be claimed.

The next morning, resolving to cross the enemy's purposes before he should have time to seize the situation, Professor Perfidy mounted a battery of type-writers to discharge a curtain lecture into the Veritians' first column. But the trick failed; for after advancing in self-confidence the Fallacians proceeded on false assumptions, and were reduced to an absurdity by the well-directed home-thrusts of their opponents' leader. Professor Perfidy was now compelled to withdraw the front line of his charge; but, lying at full length, he contrived to keep up the offensive in a series of anonymous attacks, completely destroying the subsidiary supports of the enemy's main positions. At last, bestride with a dash, black hypens, Professor Probity discovered a dry spot in the Fallacians' ink, safely crossed the stream of abuse, and, with an army increased thirty per cent, dropped seventy cm. epigrams right over the enemy, in waylaying the enemy's out-going post before it had time to be delivered. The struggle here was fierce and badly smudged. Heavy clouds of rhetoric enfolded both armies, and volleys of blank verse were interchanged with such amazing originality and vigour that an ambush concealing a terrible rumour was stripped of all its verbiage. Or the Veritian side the professors fought fluently, inserting bold aphorisms wherever the lines began to waver and infusing fresh meaning into every sally, while, safely entrenched behind a wall of ink, Professor Perfidy made record shots at the enemy's figures of speech. It was now long past noon, and though the Fallacians had been forced to take refuge in bathe, they continued throwing mud and casting the most foul aspersions. Professor Probity determined, therefore, to try a new plan. Reading between the enemy's lines he discovered a convicted cliché in the guise of a jeu d'esprit, while further on he came across a battery of evil intentions. These discoveries filled his pen with indignation, and, soaring in funny chimes, he dropped sixty cm. epigrams right on the heads of the Fallacians, the flash of wit being visible for many miles around. Then, advancing on his chief capital, the Veritians pursued Professor Perfidy, till he fell into a contradiction. At the same time, a paragraph of picked sentences was detached to assail the fallacy of the undistributed middle, the destruction of which was effected by simple force of style. Column after column of the Fallacians now stormed the Parnassian heights which Professor Probity still occupied, and by opposing a superior number of false quantities they succeeded in capturing a metre. For one moment it looked as though the Veritians would be compelled to fall back into their armchairs, but rallying their headlines they sent the enemy plagiarising in all directions, while sixty fires from their ruthless maxims told with terrible effect even on the denser mass of the Fallacian people. Nearly the whole of Professor Perfidy's men were now put to shame. But in another part of the field of debate fortune favoured his philosophy, and here the body of Professor Perfidy's argument was almost completely destroyed. Large detachments of dictionaries were now brought into action; lumbering platitude were heard coming over the wires, and waggons bringing up quotations appeared on both sides. At last, carefully scanning the enemy's lines, the Veritians succeeded in capturing a foot of light verse, and advancing in hexameters, Professor Probity swept a complete ode off its feet, at the same time inflicting a serious minor poet on his dismayed antagonists. New drafts of the Fallacians' plans, however, were seen rushing into print, and, presently, fresh proofs of their cunning appeared true to bourgeois type. Their design was to catch the enemy in the abstract, and thwarting his aim by cutting off his supplies of information, to proceed by false reasoning upon his unsupported hypotheses. For this purpose, volumes of gas were discharged at the Veritians' main episode: formidable adjectives mounted on solid substantives kept up an incessant shower of abuse, and high expletives burst in upon Professor Probity's brown study. It was obvious that the enemy was preparing a new oragnx, and, when night came falling in, the Veritians were forced to abandon their case. Words had failed them, and many parts of their speech were missing. In fact, so desperate was their plight that, overwhelming their scruples, some of the professors were in favour of doubling their meaning. Let us fight the enemy with his own weapon, they cried. Let us turn the point of his jokes! Let us penetrate him with puns! An i for an i! We also can gas! Let us also be frightful! But Professor Probity only grasped his open tighter. Better be blasted out, said he, than take up a false position; and, with a swift turn of a phrase, he rounded a period, causing many msprints in the enemy files.

Amid the clash of symbols the battle continued in the light of a scintillating young epigram, and when dawn came, the Veritians had extended their lines, and then a split was visible in the enemy's infinitives. Ascending his high horse, Professor Perfidy had ridden off on a verbal technicality, leaving his men up to the neck in half-truths. In vain they shifted their ground. Professor Probity cut off their straggling sentences, and, for striking his lines with appendices, took up a preposition at the end of an advancitory column. But the battle was not yet won. The Fallacians had still some magazines in reserve, and, for a whole day and night, volley after volley of bombast swept the field of inquiry. The Veritians replied in iambics. Whereupon, wheeling his literary hack, Professor Perfidy headed a raw levy of witticisms, and with these ill-trained bon-mots succeeded by sheer force of numbers in making a circular attack. Then, concentrating his fire on the crescent, he advanced in a cloud of obscurity which the Veritians only penetrated by putting their men in large caps. Reinforcements of ink now came pouring in on both sides, and trains of reasoning brought fresh inspiration to the galling Veritians. New issues were obviously at hand. Blowing his own trumpet, Professor Perfidy opened fire with a super-blue pencil, and relying on his adjectives dealt a left-handed compliment between the enemy's eyes. Then, disguised as a peace note, he sent a bad notice offering the Veritians convertible terms. Professor Probity replied in iambics, and his pen, coming up to the scratch, drove its spike between the enemy's eyes, pressing home a hitherto unheeded point. But even now it was unsafe for the Veritians to think of putting the paper to bed. A few worn-out truths retired into damp sheets, but the others just rested on their laurels, their only refreshment being a draught of the red ink of the country; while the Fallacians fared even worse, being obliged to a handful of Latin roots eked out with combustibles. It was an hour before sunrise when the Veritians heard an ugly rumour coming from the enemy files; but misdirecting his ambitions, Professor Perfidy made a false step, exposing himself to a bellicose return. Over all the paper he fell under him, and he was forced to seek a hasty conclusion, leaving the enemy in possession of his celebrated ink-wells. Later in the same day a threadbare excuse, carrying a white lie in its mouth, arrived, begging the Veritians to fully understand. Professor Probity, this is a fight to a full-stop. Then your ink be upon your own fingers, shouted the Fallacians, and, distributing raging posters, they wrote off at a tangent, scattering insinuations all around. Fling-
Views and Reviews.

LET ME PERISH!

The war has been the occasion of a revival of interest in spiritism; police and public vie in their attempts to know the truth of it. But it must be admitted that spiritism itself is not so interesting as it was during the fifty years after the Rochester rappings were first heard; a blight of dreariness has fallen upon it, "and common is the commonplace, and vacant chaff well-meant for praise." In the attempt to become scientific, spiritism has lost what poetry it had; it does not speak of the immortality of the soul, but of the survival of human personality, and, with most tedious iteration, it repeats that the dead have only passed over. What comfort there can be in this doctrine, I do not pretend to know; all the mediocrity revelations that I have read reveal so similar a state of existence, so identical a state of thought, that I feel sorry that these spirits have not gone a little higher. What shall it profit a man if, when he throws off "the body of this death," he still retains the cliches not only of spiritism, but of politics? Surely, if a journalist has to lie daily, a spirit should die daily to the lies of journalism. Yet with the utmost confidence, they repeat through "Recorder" all the cant of patriotism that, from the "Morning Post" to the "Referee," and "John Bull," has degraded the war to a slanging match; and, in addition, tell us that the war on earth is a mere reflection of the war in spirit-land. Apparently, the teaching is that all bodies have souls, that all motions have a spiritual counterpart, that in the other world, there are spiritual soldiers, spiritual guns, spiritual shells, spiritual "tanks;" spiritual rations, and, let us hope, spiritual generals. It is true that these correspondents do not describe these battles; they only mention the fact that there is "a war on somewhere," but that their duties are confined to receiving the spirits released from the body, and making them aware of the change.

There is, in this conception, a lack of dramatic fitness; for, if a personality survives with all its memories, its interests, and its aptitudes, if the conditions of life on earth are reproduced in spiritual equivalents, obviously the gallant young soldiers who have been working "Recorder's" arm (or pulling her leg) ought to be firing spiritual bullets from spiritual rifles, throwing spiritual bombs in spiritual dug-outs, and killing spiritual Germans with spiritual bayonets. Surely both spiritism and patriotism should combine to raise new armies from our total casualties, armies of soldiers trained in the methods of modern European warfare, and perpetuating them in a metaphysical Nifelheim. It is true that there would be no military advantage in continuing the war on the other side, in mere fairness to material soldiers, the spiritual War Office should spiritually "comb out" these spiritual "slackers" who are skulking at the "receiving station," and put them in the spiritual firing line. Surely, their work can be done by women or C3 men, or other disembodied non-combatants.

I have pressed this pretended parallelism to an absurd conclusion because its inherent absurdity does

* "Do Thoughts Perish? Or, The Survival after Death of Human Personalities." By "Recorder." (Kegan Paul. 2s. 6d. net.)
not seem to be observed either by "Observer" or "Recorder." Although these letters assert a parallelism of the two states, they also assert that the spirit-world is indescribable. This is fundamentally false; for apocalyptic literature itself, though frequently bewildering, is not unintelligible. From St. John to Swedenborg and Blake, the invisible has been capable of description; and those who assert that the human personality survives just as it was, but freed from the limitations of sense-perception, overrate the necessity of writing apocalyptic literature by pleading that we "in the body pent" cannot understand it. There is no evidence whatever to support the assumption that human personality is limited to sense-perception; nor one pretends, for example, than an algebraic equation is intelligible only to a disembodied spirit, and certainly the spirit-world, as experienced by these correspondents, is not more abstract than an algebraic equation.

On the contrary, when spirits get a "pass" to other planets (we are not told whether they had to pay a go or come fee in fairs), when they speak of other spirits as being "not the only pebbles on the beach," we begin to suspect that spirit-land is as far from the "stuff" of the bodies of this sphere is in your actual earth, as is radium or what we function. Of course it is made up entirely of the bodies of this existence of Grub Street, not of spirit-land; and if one pretends, for example, than an algebraic equation. On the contrary, when spirits get a "pass" to other planets (we are not told whether they had to pay a go or come fee in fairs), when they speak of other spirits as being "not the only pebbles on the beach," we begin to suspect that spirit-land is as far from the "stuff" of the bodies of this sphere is in your actual earth, as is radium or electricity. When we think of the precision of physics, of the subtlety of metaphysics (with both of which, it may be presumed, a Fellow of the Royal Society would be acquainted), we can only marvel that one intelligent person should be willing to accept such insanities as I have quoted as evidence either of the survival of her friend, or of the nature of that unknown country. The personality of a R. S. should at least remember to define his meaning, should at least be capable of developing a conception with some show of logic; but he seems to drop as easily into the cliches of spiritism as do the little black boys for whom media have such affection. These Fellows of the Royal Society seem to img their thought in a fog though part of the plan. The profundity, the bathos, of it! Yet this is the rubbish that is offered to us "because of the urgent need in these terrible days for some knowledge, and much comfort." If the Fellows of the Royal Society can do no better than this, they were "better dead"; we know more of the spirit than they can tell us, and beg them to "come in any shape but this."

A. E. R.

---

To the German Nation.

By Yakov P. Polonsky.

(Written during the Siege of Paris.)

An ordered strength not vainly hast thou bared,
And courage in thyself engendered;
Thy foe, in captive-wise, his sword surrendered,
The emperor his sceptre forfeited.

All-armed didst thou arise and shed
Calm on the nation blindly war-impassioned,
And thou didst pacify thy dread;
Thus, all that time e'er prompted, thou hast fashioned.

Enough! From further ills of war forbear.
And if renown thou art to share,
Strong sovereignty thou wilt obtain in earnest,
If thou barbarian glory spurnest,
O'er ruined towns with bloodstreamed bodies there.

"Enough!"—this cry did we upraise,
We, nurtured by thy lore from childhood days,
We, feeble-looked neighbours;
Powder and steel and copper, end these labours,
This iron and lead, their thunder, smoke, and roar
Torrents of tears 'mid victory's triumph pour;
Thy trophies, emblems of mourning,
Of woes and fears. "Enough!"—this cry did we upraise.

From all who this ideal have made;
Liberty, justice, human moderation,
Which in thy strata of splendour were arrayed
Superbly when thine age succeeded.
Went forth from Schiller's lips to every nation.

Now all is blown out!
These youths of thine
For universal love no longer pine;
The art they love, it is the art of fighting.
(Their science fervidly the cannon moulds.
And only him thy race a patriot holds
Who, with a spirit full of light,
For other nations, too,
That God himself bids thee arise,
The East and West to Germanise!

With honour 'neath thy roof thou didst acclaim
Him who once could, and durst, thy strength dissemble,
Who thought to raise his tyranny for ever,
And taught through this, his tyranny, became.
With honour welcoming, didst thou partake
Of course it is made up entirely of these material.
I use this word for lack of any other—say "stuff," if you will. The stuff of the bodies of this sphere is in your actual earth, as is radium or electricity. When we think of the precision of physics, of the subtlety of metaphysics (with both of which, it may be presumed, a Fellow of the Royal Society would be acquainted), we can only marvel that one intelligent person should be willing to accept such insanities as I have quoted as evidence either of the survival of her friend, or of the nature of that unknown country. The personality of a R. S. should at least remember to define his meaning, should at least be capable of developing a conception with some show of logic; but he seems to drop as easily into the cliches of spiritism as do the little black boys for whom media have such affection. These Fellows of the Royal Society seem toimg their thought in a fog though part of the plan. The profundity, the bathos, of it! Yet this is the rubbish that is offered to us "because of the urgent need in these terrible days for some knowledge, and much comfort." If the Fellows of the Royal Society can do no better than this, they were "better dead"; we know more of the spirit than they can tell us, and beg them to "come in any shape but this."

A. E. R.

---

Translated from the Russian by P. Silver.
Towards National Guilds.

An antithesis is very often made between Quality and Quantity. It is commonly assumed that when the standards of Quality are abandoned, the standards of Quantity are substituted in their place. Thus, we assume that the present system of production is Quantitative as contrasted with the Qualitative production the Guilds would bring in. But are we quite sure that this is the right pair of opposites? Is Quality, as distinct from Quantity, the actual aim of capitalist production? It may seem, perhaps, to be so; and, as a practical working hypothesis, the assumption that capitalist production tends to Quantity, and Guild-production to Quality, may safely be made. But a more exact psychology, and, therefore, economics, would never suggest Quantity as the true alternative to Quality but

Mr. G. D. H. Cole are wrongly given, and the title of the third pamphlet of the N.G.L. is announced as "Towards a United Guild" instead of "Towards a Miners' Guild" (t.d. of the Secretary, N.G.L., 17, Acaica Road, St. John's Wood, N.W.). At any rate, this is a sufficient explanation.

The appearance of a magazine devoted to the propaganda of National Guilds is, after all, a matter for congratulation to readers of The New Age. The writer of this paragraph remembers the remark of a well-known Socialist when he heard—how many years ago is it now?—that the I.L.P. then in its cradle, was setting up a journal for itself: "Ah, that means the I.L.P. has come to stay!" We may, therefore, hope that the appearance of the "Guildsman" is a sign that the League and all it stands for have come to stay—and, indeed, we believe it.

We should like to point out for the encouragement of the tasting that the progress of National Guilds, when once it begins, will be productive from the outset. In the case of the I.L.P., the goal—namely, the conquest of political power—was, in the first place, a very long way off, for it assumed the attainment of a Parliamentary majority of Labour M.P.'s; in the second place, it was, even at that, only a means to an end: since political power had afterwards to be converted into economic power; and, in the third place, there could be no question of a reward consistent with the political progress—in other words, the increment of Labour representation by no means involved, as a necessity, any increment in the well-being of Labour. On the whole, indeed, it must be said that the pioneers of the political movement of Labour must not only have had great faith themselves, but power to inspire faith in others. For otherwise, who can conceive a movement setting off for so distant an object as a Parliamentary majority, and contenting themselves with no fruit by the wayside? The Guild movement, on the other hand, being economic in its inception and application, and, hence, direct in its effects, will produce changes concurrently with every step it takes. Is it today that, let us say, the idea of partnership in workshop control becomes acceptable? Well, tomorrow it is in operation. Is it next year that partnership of the Unions with the State in the control of mines and railways is conceded? At once the fruit is ripe, and the Guild idea is by that degree advanced both in practice and in theory. The distinction, in fact, between the I.L.P. and the N.G.L. is that the former was mainly theoretical, while the latter is practical. The former aimed at acquiring the means; the latter aims at the end itself. The former was always liable to slip between the cup and the lip; the latter leaves no interval between precept and practice. The former hopes to find the way to industrial control through the windings of Parliament. The latter goes straight to industry, leaving Parliament to time the pigeon.

In the January "Guildsman," V.H.R., writing on the vexed question of Workshop Control, comes to the conclusion already reached by The New Age: that "better is it that workshop control should be repudiated than that any Trade Union right should be given up in exchange for it." That workshop control—however advantageous to employers—will be given to Labour on any other terms than as a concession, is improbable. And, as a concession, it will obviously expect to be reciprocated. Now, what is it that Capitalists require, above anything else, of Labour? Think what you would wish of Labour if you were in the position of Capital? In the political, economic, and social respect, the right to strike? The right to strike is the only weapon left in Labour's hands: it is Labour's last pebble against Goliath Capital; and Capital is aware of it. Is it not, then, probable that, in return for the concession, so much that is prized, a shift in workshop control, Capital will require of Labour the dropping of its pebble? "V. H. R." concludes that "for Labour to renounce its right to strike for anything less than the abolition of the wage-system is to deliver itself bound hand and foot to Capital," We agreed.

NATIONAL GUILDSMEN.
As an Englishman he is undoubtedly in a position magnanimously to welcome whatever pleases him in the English tongue as an addition to the literature of the Empire. "It is a matter of no concern to me, whatever a writer in English be Irish or Welsh, or Canadian or American, and, as such, have political, national, or even racial prejudices and curiosities. It matters a great deal to us, for we cannot identify ourselves with Canada or America, whose language and literary traditions are English, whereas ours are Irish. Were Ireland just a settlement of English colonists, "R. H. C." would be justified in ignoring our "racial prejudices and possessions." But, it so happens, he is trying to ignore a national culture which, in spite of difficulties, has persisted and has kept its imprint upon us.

Whether by accident, force, or by our own consent, we share a common language—namely, English—the standards, qualities, and potentials of which we ought in common to appreciate, respect, and develop. It ought not to be necessary to remind "R. H. C." that the process by which a people comes by a language is of vastly more importance than this quotation would imply. In the case of Ireland, the acquisition of English has been a very different process from that which has resulted in the great English-speaking countries of the world. The consciousness of this fact is precisely the impulse from which the literature of the Irish Renaissance has sprung. Prior to that, Irishmen were writing as English colonists write, conscious of the fact that they are as part of England's literary evolution. As the word Renaissance indicates, we are now discussing the re-birth of a tradition in letters which had lain dormant since the decline of Gaelic literature. The spirit of the race has crystallised once more, not in mere "notes" and vague intimations of national identity, but as the literature of a bilingual people, fundamentally English.

Wales, having escaped with her linguistic and literary heritage intact, has not had the same need of moulding the English language to her own use. But, had she always been driven out of literature as Gaelic was, there would doubtless have been a literary revival in Wales as in Ireland. Canada and America, knowing only one instrument and tradition of culture, English, do not present any analogy with countries more fortunate in the possession of a native literature and a civilisation independent of England. It is probable that, when American civilisation is as old as Celtic, it will express itself characteristically in all the arts. The perceptible, if gradual, elimination of the English influence justifies the supposition that the American English, when it exists, will be other than a "localised" English community. Then, no doubt, historians will regard Whitman, "Mark Twain," and Theodore Dreiser as writers of the transition, in whom the first faint suggestion of literary independence was noticeable.

"R. H. C." misrepresents the Anglo-Irish writers, when he identifies them with those who think "it is derogatory to them and to Irish nationalists to wish to write in perfect English." Experience will prove that all but the minority, who are silent because they cannot write Irish, are satisfied with English as a substitute for the language of which they have been deprived.

A. E., Yeats, John Eglinton, O'Grady, Synge, and the rest are filled with no political dislike of English, whose "standards, qualities, and potentialities" they keenly appreciate. The more logical, if hopeless, idealists, taking their cue from the imperialists of late England, profess the greatest contempt for the Irishman who claims to be Irish in English. This domestic controversy is of little importance here, except as indicating how extremes meet. Such Gaelic-speaking Britishers as have entered the world of letters through their Oxford accent that, whereas Irishmen may be bilingual, few Englishmen can be. And that is the claim of almost every educated native Irish speaker. Ireland is doubly flattered by the remembrance of her contributions to England's literary history, just as some of us take pride—as does Mr. Bernard Shaw—in the fact that Wellington was an Irishman. Paris also congratulates herself on Lafayette's rôle in the story of America, but she will probably be more satisfied with her Napoleons and Joffres. National pride, like charity, begins at home, and Ireland will give Yeats and Synge

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

"IRELAND'S LITERARY RENAISSANCE."

"Sir,—It now remains for "R. H. C." to brand "Ireland's Literary Renaissance" as a Sinn Fein document, since the writer's objection to the annexation of Anglo-Irish literature is "politically-minded." "He is thinking of England," says "R. H. C.," with a bland determination to ignore the possibilities of an Irishman's thinking only of Ireland. Whenever we dare to take any interest in our country as such, these unpleasant suggestions of unwavowed alliances are attributed to us. The "Pall Mall Gazette" has already denounced "Ireland's Literary Renaissance" as a reasonable manifesto, and, although "R. H. C." has conjured up the spectre of a positive alliance against England, he hints that the "curse of politics" is blighting the pages of literary history.

The New Age

After Andre Ferdinand Herold.

Beloved, all the dust has turned to flower, The frolic Centaurs like spurred cavalry Charge on; the ships sail sunward, quit the quay Where windsmeet and the soul of the sea's power. Now are the temple columns made a tower Of trailing roses and convolvuli, And Dryads from each happy forest tree Hold smooth white hands out in the glad green bower.

Come! for the ways with flowers are a-flame. The lily's white, the poppy's hue of shame, Above the drowsy avenues and drear. Now are the temple columns made a tower Of trailing roses and convolvuli, And Dryads from each happy forest tree Hold smooth white hands out in the glad green bower.

Where winter through they shrank from the sea's power. Hold smooth white hands out in the glad green bower. About their toil with heartless singing Sere leaves and unconsoled murmur 'Lo! To forest boughs made voluble with woe.

You laugh, poor simple churls, that have no mind The lily's white, the poppy's hue of shame, Above the drowsy avenues and drear. Now are the temple columns made a tower Of trailing roses and convolvuli, And Dryads from each happy forest tree Hold smooth white hands out in the glad green bower.

The slayer of the leaves. Poor fools that sing, And happy songs rise to the welkin's height Sound the glad carols of the forest boughs made voluble with woe.

And happy songs rise to the welkin's height Sound the glad carols above the drowsy avenues and drear.

Autumn on branch and tree-bole like a blight, From vine-dressers whose gladness seems slight To forest boughs made voluble with woe.
precedence over Swift, in considering the literary history of Ireland, as distinct from the English-speaking world. We regret, not our share in English literature, but the cost at which the contribution. The Jews would probably agree that the domination of Western civilisation by Hebrew philosophy has been an expensive one. It is, however, only a seeming paradox. But, when all is said and done, we recognise with " R. H. C." that these were Irishmen writing English who could not disguise the fact of their nationality. Indeed, his "play-boy" theory describes the situation cleverly, though not so accurately as an Irishman would like.

There is a "play-boy" in most Irish writers, but there is more, and it is their unfortunate insistence upon the former element which makes us distrust English criticism. The "play-boy" is probably the most obviously Irish quality in the earlier Anglo-Irish writers, and so little did this repugnate them as we could produce a literature which expressed us more profoundly and more generally. Taege is little of the "play-boy" in Synge, for all his marvellous genius in the enactment of the heroines of Wilde and Shaw, on the other hand, are true to the old type; they exaggerate the quality in Irish writing which has so long done service with English critics. The Renaissance has given us a group of writers whose part is in precise proportion to the degree of their success in keeping the "play-boy" in their place. As " R. H. C." says, "We know how true it his "play-boy" the first duty of the Irish writer.

By cultivating the deepest, and not the most superficial, impulses of national being, the Renaissance writers have displaced the conventional ideas of their predecessors. They have had no encouragement from English criticism in doing so, and, remembering what was developed with the approval of England, they may well disregard the "play-boy" in their place. As " R. H. C." says, "We know how true it is that the Russian stage has lately stood in a similar relation to theatrical modes as the women of Paris have stood to Poiret's sumptuous modes. It has undergone itself through intimacy. Knowing this, it turns to the Russian stage and the drama are not two things, but one only; the idea of " the theatre of unity " is capable of "re-dramatising the theatre. Ihis further aim is to say something of his own a "courageous" character. Here is a sample of Mr. Bakshy. He observes it is a common belief that there can be one "ideal theatre," All theatrical reformers have been working towards its realisation. But the outcomes have, assumed varied forms. Mr. Bakshy concludes, therefore, that there is no standardised form of "ideal theatre." Whereupon he stands upon a little hill of his own and "courageously" declares that his "contention that theatrical evolution has revealed no unifying principle remains unimpaired." Which, when one comes to think of it, is pretty sorry stuff. But the amazing thing is, Mr. Hope neglects to see how sorry it is. Instead of admitting non-being on the evidence of indisputable historical and contemporary fact, he is content to take sides with Mr. Bakshy, who appears as apologia. Firda, Bakshy repeats the misstatement that reformers are "advancing in all directions," and then he is kind enough to direct us to the various by-ways which they are taking under the guidance of Mr. Bakshy's book. It is very singular that Mr. Hope should err in this fashion, for of recent years there has been a very large output indeed of reliable books on the history, theory, and practice of the theatre and the drama, which have told us as plainly as they could that the wise men of the theatre are and ever have been actuated by one great, motive—namely, the application of a universal principle to the theatre. From the dawn to the present they have upheld one ideal. Like the men of the church, they are temple-builders who exalt the ideal of unity in unity. The intimate theses that have been propounded, the advance. Even Mr. Bakshy's book cannot deny it. On the contrary, it is brimful of evidence of a united search for and discovery of the environment and of the learning. To take but one example. Mr. Bakshy is describing the idea of "the theatre of a single will" and "congregate action" as it occurred to the poets Poes Sologub and Vlachlavl. He says, "The theatre, it was argued, is capable of revealing the inner mysteries of life and of arousing religious sentiment. These, however, can never attain unity so long as the audience remains merely a passive observer. The example of the early Greek theatre and the medieval mystery-plays provide the form in which the audience not merely is present in the performance, but itself takes an active part in the performance. The
theatre, united into one whole, thus becomes a temple, with the stage as a sacrificial altar, serving as a medium of religious purification. Here in a few words is a description of a common or standard form of ideal theatrical temple, that is, with a stage for altar, and a general air of confession and conversion—which theatrical reformers in the best sense are in the habit of realising. This Mr. Bakshy proceeds to show, as he has written in a very nicely illustrated one, let it be said, obviously designed flatly to contradict his own views on the theories of the Russian stage. In order not to appear unfair to Mr. Bakshy, I ought to say that the fault is not his altogether, but is partly due to his nationality. He is careful to inform his moderns that he is humbled by what he terms his "pronounced Russian accent," but which I should term his inability to think in English. Let him, however, take heart, for rational thinking is a very common defect. Many persons born in England are utterly incapable of thinking in Irish.

HUNTY CARVER.

* * *

"WE MODERNS."

Sir,—Mr. Edward Moore is a good snuper, but superiors do not win battles. He is also an amusing snuper—amusing for he takes the characteristic modern and agnostic delight in setting up Aunt Sallys—Christian Aunt Sallys—and neatly knocking them over, and then regarding their fall with an innocent grin of delight. In the course of his amusing notes in this week's New Age I counted the mere bodies of six Aunt Sallys—that is to say, what I recognise as Mr. Moore's Aunt Sallys. Doubtless he himself regards them as vital Christian doctrines which he has ridiculed beyond hope of repair. The first Aunt Sally was his idea that Christianity conciles life as an ever-present battle, in which victory is impossible and defeat ever imminent. It gives life as an ever-present battle, in which the stalwart and persevering fighter will win his salvation if he avoids evil and does good. The second Aunt Sally is his idea that Original Sin involves the levelling down of humanity to its lowest common factor—the sinful man. It does not; it helps man in his struggle towards perfection—i.e., towards salvation—by reminding him of his limitations. Otherwise he is apt, as moderns do, to attempt "advance in all directions." The third Aunt Sally is Mr. Moore's idea that Original Sin was invented to blast the great man utterly, in the centre of his being; which he makes an original sin that great men cannot co-exist, which means that no great men have believed in Original Sin! The fourth Aunt Sally is the idea that Christianity is the universal conscience of the common sinfulness of humanity. This is an ingenious Aunt Sally, for it is dressed up in a half-truth. The other half is the common Christian consciousness that men are equal in being the "sons of God." Mr. Moore tries to discount this half by dressing a fifth Aunt Sally, for it is dressed up in a half-truth. This Aunt Sally, for it is dressed up in "affirmation throughout his notes. What does he build to "advance in all directions." The third Aunt Sally is Mr. Moore's idea that Original Sin was invented to blast the great man utterly, in the centre of his being; which he makes an original sin that great men cannot co-exist, which means that no great men have believed in Original Sin! The fourth Aunt Sally is the idea that Christianity is the universal conscience of the common sinfulness of humanity. This is an ingenious Aunt Sally, for it is dressed up in a half-truth. The other half is the common Christian consciousness that men are equal in being the "sons of God." Mr. Moore tries to discount this half by dressing a fifth Aunt Sally, for it is dressed up in a half-truth. This Aunt Sally, for it is dressed up in a.......

NEW AGE.

Sir,—Mr. Hope admits to "an anti-feminine bias in criticism"—in other words, he admits to sexual selection in his judgment; and then he wonders that I find unconvincing his conclusion that the woman in the case of "London Pride" is responsible for all the faults of the play. I do not deny and I have never denied that he may be right. What I contend is that, right or wrong, Mr. Hope would have come to the same conclusion from which, in fact, he now admits he started—namely, that the woman is to blame. And other women, no doubt, will agree with him. M. G. S.

Memoranda.

(From last week's New Age.)

To be able to examine oneself objectively and one's neighbour subjectively is the only sufficient foundation that reason is ready to take the place of force. The duty of giving your life for the nation without hope of return has nowhere been preached with more fervour than in circles where the duty of giving your capital and income is not so much as dreamed of.

The future is not bright for private enterprise in farming, subject, as this industry must more and more be, to State considerations.

Unemployment is quite as necessary to capitalism as employment—"Notes of the Week."

The willingness on the part of Labor to sell itself as a commodity is the essence of wagery.

Wagery to-day is as morally devastating and so socially degrading as was slavery in the first half of last century.—The New Age.

The modern police system is such that a man can be decoyed into cases for prosecution at the will of those who govern.

There was never a time in European history when the mass of people thought so little for themselves, and depended so much for the forms of society upon the conclusions and vocabulary of a restricted leisure class.

There have been many great artists who cherished false ideas regarding the essence of art.

The works of men differ infinitely more in value than men themselves.—RAMIRO DE MAEZTU.

Labour is a social status which can only be "improved" by its disappearance.

If Labour directs its action with a view to securing that, whatever be the industrial arrangements after the War, they shall not be such as to involve anything of the nature of a property right in the labour of employees, shall not involve, in respect to "agreements," the declaration of contracts where there is no proper contract, shall not be such as they can only be carried out through a disintegration of family life, it will have done as much as it could towards its own emancipation, and at the same time "deserved well of the State."—W. ANDERSON.

No work more quickly becomes old-fashioned than the work of youth.

If we are ever again to have "style" as well as "character" in acting, we shall have to establish a classical as well as a "natural" theatre.—JOHN FRANCIS HOP.

To know how to treat his "play-boy" is the first duty of the Irish writer.—E. H. C.

In Mr. Chesterton's philosophy the original thing is the Original Sin.

Must not things be forever before they can be accomplished?

Dorgua is religion for the irreligious.

Mr. Chesterton is always saying what a fine future mankind has behind it.—EDWARD MOORE.

The absence of the Prussian menace may enable us to reduce the Estimates by, say, a hundred pounds.—A. E. R.
PRESS CUTTINGS.

SLEEPING AT THEIR POSTS.—At the Hull Munitions Court three local electrical workers were charged with being asleep when they should have been at work. They were engaged on a 24-hour shift on a ship. It was stated that owing to the fact that the electrical department did not work diligently, the ship was delayed for three days. The Electrical Union desired a heavy penalty to be imposed for this slackness. Two of the defendants, aged 17, said that this was the first time they had done a 24-hours' shift, and was fined £1. "Electrical Review."

I trust that Mr. Bonar Law, who will soon have to think about his budget, will make his compulsory contributions as big as he can. We have paid about 500 millions in taxation during the past year, and if there is still enough ready money in the country to produce a loan of that amount or more,—everybody expects that it will be very much more,—the inference is that we could have paid a thousand millions without difficulty if the taxes had been levied in the right way. It is the business of a Chancellor of the Exchequer to find out where the money is made and who gets it, and then annex it by taxation. I do not suppose the matter will be popular; I am not yearning for more taxation myself, and do not know anybody who is. But I trust that many others besides me will recognise that, after calling for time he had done a 24-hours' shift, was fined — "Electrical Review."

"Truth."

An officer, he contends, so selected would certainly possess such a comparative merit of, from the point of view of national efficiency, no mistake could possibly be made in nominating him for promotion. The result would be threefold—an ever-present personal stimulus for professional efficiency on the part of every individual officer throughout his career; utilisation of every officer who is physically competent to perform any of the various duties required of naval officers so long as they remain competent to discharge them; and the utilisation of officers specially adapted for command and flag ranks when they are in the prime of their vitality and ability, and with sufficient years yet ahead to enable them to perfect themselves in the vastly responsible duties that go with those grades.—"Glasgow Evening News."

An officer, he contends, so selected would certainly possess such a comparative merit of, from the point of view of national efficiency, no mistake could possibly be made in nominating him for promotion. The result would be threefold—an ever-present personal stimulus for professional efficiency on the part of every individual officer throughout his career; utilisation of every officer who is physically competent to perform any of the various duties required of naval officers so long as they remain competent to discharge them; and the utilisation of officers specially adapted for command and flag ranks when they are in the prime of their vitality and ability, and with sufficient years yet ahead to enable them to perfect themselves in the vastly responsible duties that go with those grades.—"Glasgow Evening News."

Certainly every man of moderate means should take the Fours instead of the Fives. I say this because I understand that when Mr. Lloyd George came to terms with the Labour Party he agreed to conscript capital as a matter of war. It would be a stupendous task and lead to innumerable squabbles. Therefore, he can only conscript capital by raising the income tax to, say, 10s. in the £. This is quite likely to do. Indeed, I look upon it as one of the certainties of the War. Having the conscription of capital in view, it was very necessary to debar the rich from subscribing to the 4 per cent. tax free issue.—MR. RAYMOND RADCLIFFE in "The New Witness."

The quickest and the fairest way to release productive capacity for munitions and the essentials of civilian consumption is to restrict people's means to purchase non-essentials. Our tax system bears some relation to inflation of the currency, impose hardships haphazard with a tendency to concentrate them on the weakest shoulders. Taxation presses universally, and compels economy automatically. If the Government will only deprive its subjects of the means to divert the country's economic resources into non-essential channels, our economic organisation will become elastic and adaptable enough to apply itself to the country's real needs; there will be no need of officials and committees to attempt the impossible task of deciding in detail what work is "essential" and what not; nor would there be further need for the regimentation of industry and dragooning of workers. The same time, by checking inflation, increased taxation would reduce the money cost of the War and lessen the need for loans; thus the capital charges, which already threaten to hamper social reform for a generation, would be reduced.—"The Athenaeum."

Associated with this view is that which is opposed to the segregation of Labour and to "class legislation" and treatment. It is held that the conception of a Ministry of Labour rests upon a false view of society and of the functions of Government. There is no more reason why there should be a Ministry devoted to class interests, such as Labour, than that there should be a ministry of capitalists, or of landlords, or of vegetarians. The State is primarily concerned with the workman as citizen. This criticism is of considerable importance as it goes to the root of the matter and contains the germ of a suggestion as to the lines on which the Ministry should develop.—"The Athenaeum."
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