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### NOTES OF THE WEEK.

We have more than once been taken to task for advocating the Compulsion of Wealth while the voluntary system of Loans is still said to be on trial. But have we not, in fact, precedent on our side? The very people who are now alleging the dangers of our advocacy of Compulsion were not so long ago themselves recommending the Compulsion of Men, and at a time when the voluntary recruiting of men was in a better state than is at this moment the voluntary recruiting of money. Still more strangely, it appears that it is only as regards sacred money that any breath of the proposal to apply Compulsion to it is pernicious and illegitimate. For not only, as we know, was it regarded as almost the criterion of patriotism to be found advocating the Compulsion of Men while the voluntary system was still in operation; but it is now nowhere suggested that the threats of Compulsory Labour, which Mr. Neville Chamberlain and others have freely uttered, are anything more than the outcome of far-sighted patriotic zeal. But what is sauce for the goose is, in our humble opinion, sauce even more suitably for the gander. And there is not, indeed, a single argument that was adduced for the conscription of men that does not apply with tenfold force to the conscription of money. Substitute money for men in the thousand and one articles that were written in favour of compulsion about a couple of years ago, and the same articles can be used over again to-day without any other change. The equality of sacrifice thereby brought about, the democratic uniformity of compulsion, the discovery of the “shirker,” the removal of the injustice done to the volunteer, the elimination of the job-stealer—all these well-advertised benefits of compulsion in the case of men will be found to inhere in an even greater degree in the Compulsion of Money.

However, we are no longer alone in our proposals for the conscription of money. The passages we have been able to quote elsewhere from speeches and articles recently published are evidence that the subject is not only being generally discussed, but that the conclusions of the best minds upon it are similar to our own. It will be remembered that Mr. Bonar Law was the first Cabinet Minister openly to announce that Compulsion would be employed if the Voluntary Loan should show any sign of failure; and he has now been followed by Mr. Hayes Fisher, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Local Government Board, who, in a speech at Ealing last week, told his hearers that the present Loan was the last chance they would have of lending money to the Government at five per cent., or at any per cent. at all. “We must have a forced contribution,” he said, “and that contribution may be either in the form of a contribution from income or from capital.” That there is at this moment any immediate prospect of applying Compulsion to money we are not, of course, sanguine. Heaven and earth will first be moved to save from the fate that befell men the far more precious commodity of money. But that, if the war continues over another year, the compulsion of wealth will become inevitable we are as certain as of the fact that if the war ends without the compulsion of wealth, our wealthy classes will have something to be eternally ashamed of. What! it will be said by a posterity groaning under mountains of debt, our heroic forefathers in the Great War freely laid down their lives however, we are no longer alone in our proposals for the conscription of money. The passages we have been able to quote elsewhere from speeches and articles recently published are evidence that the subject is not only being generally discussed, but that the conclusions of the best minds upon it are similar to our own. It will
lent landowner," the present taxation of two-thirds of his income-leaves little to be conscripted, in the event of compulsion. But is that really the case? Might not the taxation of capital begin where the taxation of income leaves off? The alternative, in fact, is rather amusing. Let it be supposed—and it is by no means an altogether imaginary case—that a man has acquired a considerable estate of land from which, on account of his taste for privacy, he derives no income in the form of rent or profit. Is he to be exempted from contributions to the needs of the State because, while potentially a wealthy man, he chooses actually to remain, in the matter of income, a poor man? An example we know of is of a man in one of the southern counties who bought out of the proceeds of his business in the City agricultural and woodland of a total area of nearly eight square miles, from the whole of which, when we last heard of him, he was drawing in profit and rent no more than a few hundred pounds a year—the estate being mainly devoted to his private pleasure. Is such a man, like the "Times" Laird, to plead the exiguousness of his actual income as an excuse for exemption from any other kind of contribution to the State's needs? Is it impossible to say to a man in such a case that either he must realize his estate in the way of income or be called a part to the State as a capital tax? We see from the present activity of the estate-market that there is, in fact, little difficulty in realizing landed property in comparatively large amounts. Considerable estates of this kind are changing hands daily. But if for their own convenience the owners of this form of capital can realize it in the current medium, it is certainly not impossible that the same operation may be performed for the convenience of the State. "A Laird," in short, should have it put to him by the Government that his duty does not end in the surrender of a share of his annual income. A share of his estate is still open to be taken by the taxation of his capital.

The "Times," like other unconscious bullies, is very bold, however, when the victim of its justice is already an object of public disapproval. In a leader last week the "Times" had the temerity to call for the "conscription of the capital" of the private money-lenders whose circulars are now being carried through the post to the expropriation of the individuals. The "conscription of capital," says the "Times," has been hitherto a vague doctrine of highly disputable economic advantage, but in the light of these uninvested thousands it at once assumes a simple and definite meaning. Why should not these "idle sums of money..." be put to the use of the State? The conscription of capital, if...
gency service after having refused to give them it for services rendered since the days of the Creation! Our own attitude, we may say, remains what it was before this speculation. We have never dreamed that women were incapable, was ever rendered. While men and women are different, it cannot be justice or generosity to treat them as if they were the same. And until they become indistinguishable not equality of treatment is justice, but equity of treatment.
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The latest German Note to America must be taken in conjunction with the Chancellor's speech; and the combination exhibits the discrepancies which we have come to expect in German diplomatic activities. The main point of the Note is that it definitely withdraws all the pledges given to the United States in previous communications. The most explicit pledge was that given after the torpedoing of the "Sussex" in April, 1916. In answer to President Wilson's Note of protest the German Government stated in its reply of May 4 that the German naval forces had received the following order: "In accordance with the general principles of visit and search and the destruction of merchantmen recognised by international law, such vessels, both within and without the area declared a naval war zone, shall not be sunk without warning, and without the savings of human life and without the injury of neutral property in the service of commerce."

This undertaking was not always literally obeyed, and instances are on record of German naval commanders interpreting the conditional clause "in accordance with the general principles of visit and search and the destruction of merchantmen recognised by international law," literally. Still, the pledge was a paper pledge, and could always be argued about. It has now been withdrawn entirely without the slightest attempt at parley.

An excuse is given in the German Note. After a violent criticism of the Peace proposals of the Entente, the German Government explains that it "must abandon the limitations which it has hitherto imposed upon itself in the employment of its fighting weapons at sea," and its excuse for doing so is the fact that the Allies have refused to consider the question of submarine warfare.

Unfortunately for the German contention, the Chancellor made a speech on the very day the Note was delivered, and his version of the grounds for assuming "intensified submarine warfare" was entirely different. He reminded the Reichstag that the subject of stronger forms of submarine warfare had already occupied official attention three times, in March, May, and September of last year. In March and May the Chancellor opposed "recklessness" at sea on the ground that it was not advisable in consideration of the military and diplomatic situation at the time; and in September, "according to the unanimous judgment of political and military authorities, the question was not considered ripe for decision. Last autumn, he continued, the time was most ripe for dealing with the question of this new means of injuring our enemies most grievously, it must be begun when with the greatest prospect of success we can undertake this enterprise." His further explanations deserve to be quoted:

Where has there been a change? In the first place, the most important fact of all is that the number of our submarines has very considerably increased as compared with last spring, and thereby a firm basis has been created for success. The second deciding reason is the fact that it is no longer possible to consider the submarine war as a means of weakening the United States as a power. This fact was already confronting England, France, and Italy with serious difficulties. We firmly hope to bring these difficulties to a head when we can show that our submarines are operating in the widest sense, and of timber for coal-mines. Our supplies of coal have been increased, and the coal question, too, is a vital one in the war. Already it is critical, as you know, in Italy and France. Our submarines will render it still more critical. To this must be added, especially as regards the situation already confronting England, the supply of ore for the production of munitions in the widest sense, and of timber for coal-mines. Our submarines' activities are rendered still further acute by the increased lack of enemy cargo ships. In this respect time and U-boat and cruiser warfare have prepared the ground for a decisive blow.

In other words, submarine warfare, which would not have "paid" before, promises to "pay" now. And when dealing with the Chancellor's speech let me direct attention to the remarkable statement which he quoted as having been made to him by Field-Marshal Hindenburg:

"Our front stands firm on all sides. We have everywhere the requisite reserves. The spirit of the troops is good and confident. The military situation as a whole permits us to accept all the consequences of an unrestricted U-boat war, and as the U-boat war in all the circumstances is the means to injure our enemies most grievously, it must be begun."

It is only in Germany that such language could be used by a soldier to a statesman, but it should not be overlooked that Hindenburg is now in control of the German navy as well as of the army. He assumed command of the fleet on November 25 last; and his reference to the "most grievous" methods of injuring Germany's enemies may be taken as definite proof that Germany no longer looks for her military victory on land. It became evident after the initiation of our blockade policy that the German authorities were devoting close attention to the sea, and their methods of using our war-ships. But the tireless experiments made with larger craft showed the Berlin Government how it might be found possible to adopt a wholly new means of "injuring" England, and this new means was chosen without hesitation. Large submarines, layers, cargo-boats, and attacking craft were carefully brought out to the high seas. Their capacity, so far as one can judge from the accounts given of them in the German papers, enables them to travel for at least a week without fresh fuel or stores, and their potential power of doing damage is as yet barely calculable. It is officially stated that 415,000 tons of shipping, both British and neutral, was sunk during December, and German enthusiasts expect that the "unrestricted" warfare will raise this figure to a million tons a month. The British shipping sunk so far represents fifteen per cent. of our pre-war tonnage.

The effect of the Note on America is what might have been expected. The people, the press, and the politicians all fall back from their deep dream of peace to find themselves confronted with the most troublesome problem of their whole history, a problem to which the civil war issues were trifles. For the United States, hitherto merely interested in the European affair for the sake of guaranteeing peace at the end of the war, finds herself involved in the struggle willy-nilly. There is no longer any mistake about that; and so far as I have seen reports of the utterances of American speakers, and quotations from American papers, the only man in the country who wishes to go on believing that America "is not concerned" is Mr. William Jennings Bryan, who no longer counts in any party. Even the pro-German Hearst papers have come out strongly in support of the President, and express themselves as ready for war if no other solution can be found. (A moral revolution, this! it is as if Northcliffe had suddenly decided to support Asquith.) Steamship sailings to Europe have been cancelled, and two thousand stranded Americans in France are cabling to Washington to know how they are to return home. Even the Western and Middle Western States have realised, at last, the danger of Germany in her present condition. Three courses were open to President Wilson: to send a Note to Germany demanding the withdrawal of what amounts to her ultimatum; to await a concrete case of a violation of Germany's undertaking of last May; or to hand Count Bernstorff his passport without further ado. If there is another solution I cannot think of it; and it now appears that President Wilson and the American nation are in favour of the third. History will be written this week.
The British Consular Service.

III.

When it was decided in 1904 to recruit candidates for the General Consular Service by limited competition, the intention was “to attract young men of good position who have devoted some time to commercial or other business experience.” At first, the age limit was from twenty-two to thirty years; the older candidates with commercial or other “cramming” years which he has spent in some department of commercial life. A glance at any of the papers devoted to Civil Service examination work will show that during the past ten years ninety-eight per cent. of the successful candidates for the General Consular Service were coached at one particular institution in London. Obviously, few of these can have corresponded to the intention of the Commission at whose instigation the examination system was introduced. Applicants for nomination are informed that it is a recommendation to have been called to the Bar, or enrolled as a solicitor, in the presence of any commercial training. In recent years it is doubtful if any of these qualifications have been shown. Large numbers are nominated to compete for each appointment, and the class of candidates selected is very different from what might be expected from the statement of conditions. They strike one, in the main, as being composed of the failures at other examinations, who, having passed the usual Civil Service maximum of age limit—twenty-four—find they have still a chance of getting a job with a pension. On the one hand are those just old enough to compete; on the other, those who are too old for any other Civil Service examination. Needless to say, the former invariably obtain the first places.

The reason for this failure of the Service to attract, if not suitable men, at least, such candidates as were expressly desired in the original programme of examination, will be evident when we consider the terms and nature of the appointments offered. The scale of salary for vice-consuls begins at £300, a supplementary allowance of £200, £350 being granted, free of income tax, to bring the amount up to the equivalent level in North and South America. During their probationary period they are in receipt of half-pay, and do not draw their full salary until they are definitely appointed. On appointment an allowance is made for outfit, including uniform, sword, etc., and travelling expenses are paid, with certain reservations. For example, consular officers are not supposed to require deck chairs on ocean journeys, nor are they supposed to sleep when travelling all night. They are allowed to charge for hotel expenses, but not for meals consumed while actually travelling. Consequently, if an official arrives in a city at 6 a.m., and leaves the same day at midnight, his expenses are not recognized as legitimate. He must spend a night there, if he wishes to be reimbursed.

On transfer to a new post similar allowances are made, but not until arrival. The result is that a vice-consul must always be prepared to advance large sums of money when transferred, and as all transfers are sudden, unforeseen, and unexpected, great hardship ensues. A vice-consul never knows, for example, how long he will be left undisturbed. If he is living in San Francisco, Valparaiso, or any other port, he is seriously inconvenienced by the system of transferring without warning. He may have leased a house and furnished it, when, one morning, a cablegram informs him he is to proceed at once to the Faroe Islands or the Congo. Thereupon he is expected to disburse all the money required for such journeys, to settle immediately all his local financial obligations, and to wait, perhaps for months, until, after innumerable queries and reductions, his travelling expenses and transfer allowance are paid him. To add to his embarrassment, from the moment the cablegram reaches him until he arrives at his new post a fourth of his salary is deducted, so that the allowance on transfer is given with one hand and withdrawn by the other. As a rule, borrowing is the preliminary to obeying these unwelcome mandates, whose frequency is only equalled by their unexpectedness.

These conditions alone would suffice to explain the coyness of our hypothetical “young men of good position.” If they have had any business training they are well aware of how and of the trouble and anxiety with which they, when travelling, or residing abroad, on behalf of their employers. They know that it is customary for good business houses to advance to their representatives sufficient funds for journeys undertaken in the furtherance of their interests. They also know that, if not suitable for appointment abroad, they will receive a definite contract, setting forth the duration of the appointment, and the conditions attending to it. They will not abandon a good career, whether barristers, solicitors, or young business men, in order to enter upon an irregular, ill-paid, onerous existence, where nothing is certain but the caprice of bureaucracy.

It is not an attractive prospect to be called upon to live with a certain dignity in a community where you are prominent but poor, and where you must become a borrower in order to raise money to leave, when called upon to continue the same face elsewhere. It is not agreeable to arrive in a town at the other end of the earth, not knowing whether you will remain there a week, a month, or a decade, but painfully conscious that you will certainly be transferred just when you have settled down, and have entered into obligations involving monetary loss if not fulfilled. It is humiliating to find yourself a traveller amongst people of a certain class, who, aware only of your official position, are at a loss to understand money on a scale commensurate with your supposed rank, but actually deprive yourself of certain elementary necessities. It is absurd to see one of His Majesty’s consular officers standing during a six-day voyage to New York, because his Government will not sanction the 4s. at which the other passengers have hired their deck-chairs. It is unjust to make a servant of the Crown of a portion of his salary for the time occupied by him in travelling on the public service. He cannot be held responsible for the fact that it takes him more than a day to get from Odessa to Bogotá. In these days of regular railway and steamboat services, it ought to be a simple matter to determine the legitimate duration of any journey, and impose fines only where delays are voluntary. As it is, a geographical accident is regarded as a punishable offence.

Lest it be imagined that long holidays and easy hours provide compensation for the irregularities and pecuniary hardships attendant upon consular disorganisation, let the facts be stated. The annual leave is one month, the same as for officials on the same scale of pay in the Home Service. While Colonial and India Office officials enjoy leave based upon recognition of the climatic and other differences which make their service more strenuous than that of their colleagues at home, Consular officers are treated as if they enjoyed the calm regularity of the seven-hour day in London, Edinburgh,
and Dublin. As a great privilege, no doubt, they are allowed to accumulate their holidays, instead of taking them annually, in which case thirty months' service counts as three years, and entitles them to ninety days' leave. But they cannot break the continuity of this accumulated leave by taking a short holiday when required. If one takes a fortnight's leave after working abroad for, say, twenty-eight months, all the balance of leave is forfeited. Leave must be either accumulated or taken annually. In certain tropical posts the same period of leave can be accumulated in a shorter time, but these posts are relatively few, and their existence does not console those who have worked through the torrid months of summer heat in the United States, Southern Europe, and South America. A cheerful contempt for geography again distinguishes the Foreign Office in their schedule of "unhealthy posts," as they know who have suffered from malaria and intense heat in posts not officially recognised as unhealthy, though known to be so by the natives of the countries in which they are situated.

A further disadvantage inflicted upon the Consular, as distinct from other foreign services, is the absence of any system of substitutes to discharge the duties of men on leave. In the large consulates the unskilled vice-consul simply takes upon his shoulders a slightly larger burden. But in independent consulates, where the salaried officer is alone, he has nobody to replace him when he goes on leave, and must, at his own expense, hire somebody locally to look after the office. In many cases—for such consulates are usually in tropical and remote places—there is nobody really competent and reliable, and if the officer, making the best of a bad selection, hits on a dishonest or disreputable person, he is responsible for everything done during this substitute's tenure of office. Should money be stolen, he must refund it; should errors be made in his by no means simple accounts, he is expected to make good the losses. There is on record the case of one consul, in a very unhealthy African post, who appealed in vain to the Foreign Office to send someone to relieve him, as ill health made his departure imperative. There was nobody at hand to whom he could entrust the consulate, and, finally, in desperation, he closed the office, and was taken on board the steamer too ill to walk. He was in more than this respect an exceptional man.

Inadequate pay, uncertainty of movement, unsatisfactory financial arrangements, and meagre holidays are quite sufficient to frighten off those "young men of good position." But irregular hours and unpleasant work, aggravated by a disorganisation which we shall have occasion to describe, must be added to the count. Green striplings, fresh from the Civil Service "college," may be lured by the prospect of £500 a year as a starting point; but disproportionate as the amount is to the expenses of a consul's life, it is yet such as our profiteering governing classes grant only as a bribe to get unpleasant work done. The appointed candidate, who imagines he is about to enjoy the undignified ease of the domestic bureaucrat, will be greatly shocked when he is called out of his bed at dawn to journey down to some cuttying wharf, where a tram steamer is moored, with a mutinous, intoxicated, or otherwise unruly crew on board, whose quarrels he must settle. He will be still more shocked when he finds that, after being on duty from that time until he can return for breakfast, he is expected to attend at the consulate as usual during the day. It will not take him long to discover that if the bribe seemed large it was only because he was ignorant, both of the calls upon his purse and the wearisome and often disgusting nature of his duties. In short, when too late, he will understand that it is not for nothing that the General Consular Service does not attract men of good calibre. When his friends refer to enter the consulate to see him, he will then fully realise the dignity of his profession.

George Berkeley.
The Great Charter of advocacy was promulgated by the Master in general terms. The details are filled in, with camel-like precision, by another hierophant almost equally distinguished. "My scheme," he writes, "was to throw all my strength into an exordium which might make the jury feel that such an accusation made against a man of stainless reputation was really incredible. Then, when I came to deal discreetly, and not in too great detail, with the serious evidence against him, to the Twelve Minds which it was my duty to influence would be predisposed, and even eager, to reject, explain away, or wholly ignore facts which were inconsistent with the conclusion at which it had already arrived. The peroration was intended to sweep away any lingering doubts by the confidence of its rhetorical appeal for acquittal."

We invite our readers to ponder over this authoritative pronouncement on the whole duty of an advocate "for the defence." At every point it is in sharpest contrast to a scientific inquiry, or, indeed, to any investigation for the purpose of arriving at truth; and what is Justice but Truth in action? It is true that Justice may be, and occasionally is, a by-product of such exhibitions of the art of persuasion; but their result, calculated and contrived, under the highest legal patronage, is the glorification of advocacy in the altruistic guise of duty to clients.

Our readers must not overlook one aspect of this Charter, which has a piquant interest for us in the present connection. We hear an outburst of merriment in the female camp; advocacy has delivered itself into their hands. Observe then the methods in which it places absolute confidence for winning verdicts; or, losing Empires, are purely feminine in the sense that women's detractors are continually emphasising. Male advocacy throws its whole weight into the production of an atmosphere in which feeling is supreme. In that psychological climate, facts count for little or nothing. Brilliant histrionic efforts are devised to humble the jury into conclusions utterly inconsistent with the facts; then the peroration sweeps the last lingering trace of their influence away! Is it not highly probable that the Bar's refutation of the argument for the consciousness that they are men's equals, if not their superiors, in those arts of persuasion which have been exploited to secure for advocate fame, filthy lucre, coronets, great rewards for advocacy.

The incursion of the prescribed methods of advocacy into politics assumed the proportions of a crusade in the female camp; advocacy has delivered itself into the female camp; it places absolute confidence for winning verdicts, or losing Empires, are purely feminine in the sense that women's detractors are continually emphasising. Male advocacy throws its whole weight into the production of an atmosphere in which feeling is supreme. In that psychological climate, facts count for little or nothing. Brilliant histrionic efforts are devised to humble the jury into conclusions utterly inconsistent with the facts; then the peroration sweeps the last lingering trace of their influence away! Is it not highly probable that the Bar's refutation of the argument for the consciousness that they are men's equals, if not their superiors, in those arts of persuasion which have been exploited to secure for advocate fame, filthy lucre, coronets, great rewards for advocacy.
Geography and Empire.
By Andrew R. Cowan.

For many years I have held the opinion that the cosmic law of attraction and repulsion applies in history, as well as in nature—that is, it be more carefully handled than by Sheriff Alison, whose nominal jargon was that God definitely favoured the Tory side of things. Dualism, indeed, is apparent at every turn in life. "Polarity" is a characteristic alike of villages, towns, cities, countries and empires. I have in my time taken part in village ructions, in which the only discernible motive was that the combatants lived at different ends of the village street. But our internal feuds were stilled if the neighbouring village came into the question. Then party strife was quenched, and we became as united in our repulsion as all the belligerent nations at the present moment. Thus, our village was "but a model of the mighty world." But fundamental and universal as repulsion may be, it cannot quite have equated with attraction since man emerged as a distinct species. The case that the constructive forces of life have tended to gain upon the destructive, otherwise the race could not have increased in numbers, and in "that wealth, knowledge and civic amenity which we agree to call civilisation." But Ormuzd has not yet got the better of Ahriman. The areas of cooperation have certainly largely increased, but so have the areas of strife—a fact which the纯粹 Norman-Angellists are rather apt to blink. The sphere of cooperation might go on enlarging until there were only "two incensed and mighty opposite" left in the world. But the damage done might still be tremendous, and the demon of discord might remain unexorcised. Yet this Syndicalism might lead ultimately to a grand renunciation of hatred followed by the millennium. Pending that, we have to try to rationalise Imperialism in terms of our fundamental law. All communities, then, whatever the bond of union, retain aggressiveness as a primum mobile of their existence. No community is too small to be devoid of the trait. The wood-Veddish shrinking in the darkness of his jungles, whose warm rains spray his nakedness, thinks himself the finest fellow in the world, and would not be averse to dominating it, if only he knew how. And the feeling may exist despite ages of oppression. The Balkan nations, for instance, so far from learning the lesson of toleration under their affliction, seem to have had their imperial appetites sharpened as if by punishment. Free of the Turk they set about imperialising on their own account with a zest which is apt to shake one's faith in the Janus-doctrine as someone has called it, which looks in the direction of liberty and tyranny from the same base. The problem of the future is to rob nationalism (to which we are irrevocably committed) of its essential intolerance. Empire, then—the domination of one people by another—has been at work over the whole surface of the earth. But, in the general conflict, only a few great systems have risen to world-historical importance. Why they rose and how they fell are the constant themes of historians. A very favourite "explanation" is to assert that the race attaining to hegemony had a "natural genius" in that direction. I am not going to say that there is nothing in the theory of "race," but I think it has been vastly overrated. And my point—that geography is a much better clue, though hardly resorted to by comparison. Take a few concrete cases. Ancient Egypt once included many small States. Imperialism in the Nile valley then took the form of centralising round conflicting strategic points up and down stream—the apex of the delta proving by far the strongest centre. Unified Egypt then began imperialising outside. But, though she subjected lesser peoples, she could not conquer the Hittites of Pentapolis, Armenia and Sardis, and collapsed absolutely before the Persians. Egypt has never been really independent since the time of Cyrus. The reasons are mainly geographical. The civilisation "had length without breadth." It could easily be cut across, while the river gave a unifying power to any conqueror able to launch on the stream. The dependence of the people, too, upon intensive cultivation (a result of "geography") weakened their natural stamina and sagacity against their aggressiveness. Thus, the people were helpless against more massive and diversified cultures. Persia was such a civilisation. Hunters, shepherds, artisans and merchants, these combined to make up a highly effective independent mass. From the point of view of the combatants, Persia lay in the centre of the ancient world. Touching upon the "five seas" of antiquity, she formed a concentration point in the general human movement, and could thus give striking expression to the universal appetite of conquest. This is why not only became the first real "world-empire," but again and again rose from her political ashes in a fashion unparalleled in history. She held up her head even against Rome, and, through avatar after avatar, asserted herself down to the nineteenth century, having also literary renascences ages after ages. It became the conventional falsehood that Persia had been the steamer and the railway that have caught Persia in the Russo-British vice, the geographical differentiation telling now against Persia instead of for her. So Rome's greatness was due essentially to the city's central position in the peninsula, and the peninsula's centrality in the Mediterranean. Skipping a thousand years or so, let us take a case where the theory of "race" would be farcical as an explanation. Of all the anarchy peoples of Europe the Poles were the worst—their liberation veto having become a byword to all time. And yet this land of aristocratic "bounders" and hapless serfs actually once dominated from the Baltic to the Black Sea. In point of fact, the far-famed "corridor" of German construction was anticipated by the Polish empire—for such it really was. The explanation is essentially geographic. Poland lay in the eastern centre of Europe, and commanded many of the important rivers running northwards and southwards. It was to this she owed her political power so long as the surrounding nations (Russia especially) had not developed their geographical resources. Then collapse was inevitable, perhaps, even had there been constitutional purgation. The whole of Austrian history can be rationalised on similar lines, as can the weakness and strength of Germany since the time of Tacitus. But it would take a book as full of facts as this to tell in detail. Enormous, however, has been said to throw some light upon Germany's bid for world-power in the present war. I not only believe that Germany's aim was "Weltmacht," as her own prophets have declared, but I also hold that her scheme had greater inherent chances of success than anything since the days of Cyrus. If the reader looks at a map of the world, he will see that the shortest cut from ocean to ocean in the Western Hemisphere is across the isthmus of Panama. But the "corridor" is too small for world-power. Over and above the tropical jungle and latitude there was not sufficient land basis for population and production in Central America. At best, it could only be a ganglion of empire, such as the United States have made it. It was quite different with the main short cut in the old world. I am not referring to Suez, which is a British ganglion, as Panama is a Yankee one. The more easterly short cut is formed by the strip of lands from the Baltic and North Sea to the Red Sea and Persian Gulf. Here we have a great development of versatile soils, temperate in the north, and bracing enough, because dry, where tropical conditions prevail. Then points up and down stream—a concentration point in the general human movement. Having secured hegemony throughout these regions, then she would have described what may be called a "parallelogram of power" of unequalled effectiveness. She would then have commanded the whole central drainage system of the old world with the Rhine and Danube—the great "Teutonic" rivers—linked up with the
power of Saga divinities. And think, too, of the maritime possibilities. Germany then would have had open-ings on the Baltic, the North Sea, the Black Sea, the Aegaeon Sea, as well as the Adriatic, the Red Sea, and the Pacific; and she would have had by far the strongest continental position, with every advantage of "interior lines," and a potentiality of naval development on all the chief seas of the globe, with radiation into all the oceans, since the Indian Ocean, for which she was heading, is but a branch of the Pacific. With her African Colonies, her island possessions, and her Chinese base as coaling stations, she could have girdled the globe in such might as the world had never seen before. Universal dominion would have been hers in virtue of sheer "geographical predestination," and the moral is that, if the "corridor" is not effectively blocked by the creation of real independent States in South-Eastern Europe, Germany, though she loses the war in a military sense, may still win politically. For, in the course of a few years, she might indignantly retain the greatest geographical lever on the face of the planet. It is for that reason I imitate old Cato, and wind up on all occasions with the statement, "And it is my opinion, fathers, that the corridor must be blocked!"

An Industrial Symposium.

Conducted by Hunty 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:--

(2) 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?

(40) Hon. Sir John Cockburn, E.C.M.G.

There is every probability that the enmity which so often exists between Capital and Labour will be lessened by the War. The vast majority of men and women in all classes are right-minded and well-disposed. They readily arrive at a mutual understanding when brought into contact with one another. It is ignorance of the conditions under which our fellow-mortals live which is the most frequent cause of estrangement, for, as the French proverb puts it, "To know all is to pardon everything." To prevent duelling, industrial strife, and every form of industrial revolution after the war. At present we have made no provision for these difficulties that are certain to come.

There are two aspects of the problem. There is the domestic and the external. According to their political predilections, we shall find the people regarding the immediate problem on one or on the other, but I venture to think that we have to keep both clearly in view. As regards external problems this is certain, that without our external trade we could not maintain in this little island a very small population in very great discomfort. If Englishmen had been content to live by taking in one another's washing, there would never have been a British Empire. The extension of our external trade is one of the principal objects we have to keep in view, it is important not only from the economic point of view, but also from the political point of view. Personally, I think the greatest danger we have experienced from German trade is due to the manner in which Germans have used their trade connections to build up political connections in remote parts of both the British Empire and in neutral countries. At this very moment it is known that German trade agencies are acting as spies for the German Government in various portions of the Empire.

Many people who recognise the importance of our
external trade confine their action to demanding in
strident tones that the Government should do something.

Our present experience of Government action does not seem to me to look out much hope from Government action in the future.

Let me turn to the equally important but much more difficult problem—industrial development—the domestic side. The most urgent problem we have to deal with is the position of the men when they return from the war. If that problem is not dealt with, we shall certainly choke, and, as some people think, perhaps revolution.

Our people have become accustomed, and rightly accustomed, to a higher standard of wage, due to the increased demand for labour, and we have got to consider in looking at the problem broadly as a whole, the workmen are eager for shorter hours—for the same pay, of course—the employer wants longer hours, because the longer hours mean a greater output from his machines, and the machine is becoming more and more the important factor in production. Therefore you have the further argument for the shift system that the same owner of the machine and the organisers of the business are entitled to a portion of the product as well as the men who work the machinery. Fortunately, we still find that workmen in many places look upon improvements in machinery with very much the same suspicion as in the beginning of the nineteenth century, when they used to break the power-looms. It is very curious, because, if you come to think of it, the very first instinct of man, however uncivilised he may be, is to make a tool to help him in his work. Indeed, man might almost be defined as a tool-using animal, and only a tool and an elaborate tool.

I venture to lay down this proposition, that, so far as material comfort is concerned, the progress of mankind is dependent upon the progress of machinery.

There is the further unfortunate fact that normally—no, that is to say, in peace-time—our people have not even making full use of the machines we have got—very much less the owners of the machine and the organisers of the business. The problem is insoluble, like most economic problems, by economic forces alone. It must be solved, if at all, by political action. The wages problem really amounts to a higher standard of living for themselves, their own demands for comforts and luxuries, either of home manufacture or foreign importation, will create employment for themselves either in home or export industries. Reciprocally, if we utilise for the purpose of peace the tremendous productive power which the war has shown to us, we can secure for our whole population a richer, a fuller, and a happier life.

How are we to effect this combination? The difficulties in the way are very serious. On the one hand, we know, the workman restricts his output. He does it because he is suspicious of his employer. On the other hand, the employer pays low wages to his workman, and he does it because he knows that the workman produces very little work. You get to a deadlock. There has been a partial suspension during the war, due to patriotic pressure—not, perhaps, so universal as might be imagined—but after the war that suspension will cease. Indeed, curiously enough, our politicians, with that ephemeral view which seems to be the necessary counterpart of politics, have actually been promising the workmen that after the war the old conditions are to be restored—that is to say, that after the war a man's pride shall be not in doing as much work as he honestly can, but in doing as little as the foreman will allow him to do. I can imagine nothing more extraordinary than that politicians should deliberately hold that up as an ideal to the manual workers of this country.

In view of the mutual suspicions that exist, it is extremely difficult to get rid of the present deadlock. The problem is insoluble, like most economic problems, by economic forces alone. It must be solved, if at all, by moral and political action. The wages problem really amounts to the need of a great reform, the three-shift system. Then you can get shorter hours for the men, and longer hours for the machines, and a greater proportion for the establishment charges.

I venture to say that the solution of the problem is not very recondite. It merely means the addition of the shift system. Then you can get shorter hours for the men and longer hours for the machines. We have done it in war; we can travel a long distance every day to his work and find no provision for food in the middle of the day. Yet in a great many works that is still the case. Since the war broke out, people have come to demand in a large part of our population, and we have had canteens established for munition workers. I have seen some of the reports of these canteens, and they are uniformly successful. We have now schemes that have been well dealt with the matter. Mid-feeding, as everybody knows, means inefficiency. It also means discontent, and discontent means bad work. There are very few employers who do not take care of their machines. I hope in the future there will be no employer who does not make it part of his business to take care of his men.

But, after all, the question of wages is the fundamental question. And the long and the short of it is, you long must you have low wages. The workman cannot receive more than the product of his work is worth. That is an axiom which I am afraid a good many men never seem to understand. More than that, the workman cannot receive so much as the product of his work. I know the Socialists profess that the workman ought to receive the whole product. But surely the solution of the problem is not getting that a large part of that product is due to the machine which the workman does not own and did not make. In this audience it is unnecessary to elaborate the theory of the matter of the ownership of the machine. The owners of the business are entitled to a portion of the product as well as the men who work the machinery. Unfortunately, we still find that workmen in many places look upon improvements in machinery with very much the same suspicion as in the beginning of the nineteenth century, when they used to break the power-looms. It is very curious, because, if you come to think of it, the very first instinct of man, however uncivilised he may be, is to make a tool to help him in his work. Indeed, man might almost be defined as a tool-using animal, and only a tool and an elaborate tool.

I venture to lay down this proposition, that, so far as material comfort is concerned, the progress of mankind is dependent upon the progress of machinery.

There is the further unfortunate fact that normally—that is to say, in peace-time—we are not even making full use of the machines we have got—very much less the important factor in production. Therefore you have the further argument for the shift system that the same owner of the machine and the organisers of the business are entitled to a portion of the product as well as the men who work the machinery. Fortunately, we still find that workmen in many places look upon improvements in machinery with very much the same suspicion as in the beginning of the nineteenth century, when they used to break the power-looms. It is very curious, because, if you come to think of it, the very first instinct of man, however uncivilised he may be, is to make a tool to help him in his work. Indeed, man might almost be defined as a tool-using animal, and only a tool and an elaborate tool.

I venture to lay down this proposition, that, so far as material comfort is concerned, the progress of mankind is dependent upon the progress of machinery.
results, equally beneficial to employer and employed universally successful, because in many cases the resulting in class warfare. I ask you to consider whether instead of securing their acquiescence.

much more familiar than I am. Probably of you certain that you could develop the individual capacity

scientific use of human muscles, we can secure on the present their realisation is obstructed by class suspicion, of profit-making, and has neglected the human side, it is necessary to maintain this class suspicion

death. It is for us to plan and prepare so that after the War Office does not trust to the instinct

victory is, assumed; agreement becomes even more possible of an arrangement, with its aftermath of disaster abroad; and it may easily happen that, while Capital and Labour are haggling over terms of employment, other nations will be working the ground and taking the orders. And one of those other nations will be Germany.

Industrial peace after the war will be worth a great deal to Capital in its future development. Is it possible, for this essential foundation of its own prosperity? Upon the answer to that question depends the ultimate success of British enterprise abroad.

It would be a profound mistake for Capital to ignore the Trade Union movement, an attempt to crush them, or even to try to outwit them, for be it remembered that Trade Unionism is one of the few institutions in this country that will emerge from the war stronger and more powerful than they were before. Capital must be prepared to negotiate.

It is here that the State will step in to assist in a settlement, for some of the demands that Labour will put forward will entail legislation. The operations are by no means confined to the industrial field. The aid of Parliament will have to be invoked to enforce the minimum wage and the maximum working hours in those sections of industry that will be re-established by the aid of State credit.

The State must assist in providing guarantees to Labour, in the shape of Acts of Parliament, for a larger share of health, wealth, and happiness in the good times that are coming when the war is over.

to ensure. I hope this will not be regarded as a threat: I am, not writing as a trade-union official but as a contributor to a symposium. Nothing will be lost by plain speaking, and we can very reasonably make all reasonable demands, or there will be mutiny aboard.

Capital is in a much more favourable position, however the war may end. But the most promising developments will be jeopardised if Capital is not at peace with Labour. Hence Capital must spare no effort to come to terms. The markets of the world will be the centres of commercial conflict between nation and nation, and will be beside the mark to speak of this situation as being partly to be avoided back by industrial troubles at home. In the latter contingency, Capital will lose heavily, and the more the better it will become and the more acute will be the difference.

Now, if it were possible to convert the nation into a single commercial entity, the danger referred to would be averted. Obviously this desirable consummation can only be achieved by composing the differences between Labour and Capital. Unless this be done, the nation cannot be made a single commercial entity. A permanent settlement of those differences cannot be expected in this generation, but, their temporary adjustment over an admittedly difficult period of economic recovery and development is comparatively easy, and ought to be attempted.

There is no other country in which Labour is so well organised as the United Kingdom, and for that reason the possibilities of an arrangement are greater. At the same time, for want of an agreement, the superior organisation of Labour forces in some other countries may be in the way.

We are all familiar nowadays with the spectacle of a large army of men marching to war, to carry victory into the field. Again I say, Labour must be satisfied in all reasonable demands, or there will be mutiny aboard.

Capital must be prepared to make an enormous sacrifice to the workman or workwoman by a system of scientific labour. The time has come for the workman or workwoman by a system of scientific

The very opposite is the case. At the moment, comparative calm reigns in the industrial world. It has not been disturbed by the outbreak of the war; it has not been disturbed by the outbreak of the war. The time is come for us to plan and prepare so that after the War Office does not trust to the instinct

It is for us to plan and prepare so that after the war the very same spirit of co-operation may bind us all together to work for the triumphs of peace.

The actual relationship between Labour is fixed on carrying out its duty, the men at the front.

Organised Labour, confident of its strength and of its capacity to meet all possible contingencies after the war, and realising how much depends upon the victory of the Allies, is content to wait until that issue is decided before entering into any discussion of other matters. For instance, there is the question of an arrangement, for some of the demands that Labour will set out, for some, agreement becomes even more difficult when it is appreciated, however, that Capital has placed aside all its old aspirations and beliefs. Nor must it be assumed that Labour has been given an opportunity to carry out its duty.

The industrial situation after the war, from the economic point of view, depends largely upon the terms of settlement when peace is declared. There would be an enormous difference between the conditions set up by an incapable nation for peace and those that will be agreed to by a powerful nation. It is for us to plan and prepare so that after the war the very same spirit of co-operation may bind us all together to work for the triumphs of peace.

This preliminary statement is necessary because so many have formed the conclusion that the present in-
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Towards National Guilds.

While it certainly appears that the State (meaning by that the Bureaucracy) has become more powerful during the war, the reality is different. The bureaucracy has lost ground during the war. Why do we say this? Because the power of an institution or class is not alone what it can exercise at a given moment, but what it can reserve it possesses. And, from this point of view, it may safely be said that the bureaucracy has used up all its reserve during the war, and that after the war it will find itself shrunken and discredited. Power in administration is much like Credit in finance. It is largely composed of belief or prestige, in the confidence inspired by its subject. When, therefore, it is stretched beyond its real basis—which is actual ability—it tends, like credit similarly stretched, to disappear. But it is a fact that during the war the bureaucracy has demonstrated to most people who have been brought into contact with it that its prestige or credit was largely undeserved. While, therefore, it will be allowed to run its length during the war, its activity after the war will be considerably curtailed. This will be expressed by a general feeling that we have had enough of bureaucracy. It will be put into the place of organisation, to refrain from at least offering their composed of belief or prestige, in the confidence instinctive perception by Capitalists that the Bureaucracy reserve during the war, and that after the war it will find itself shrunken and discredited. Power in administration it possesses: and, from this point of view, it may safely be said that the bureaucracy has used up all its reserve during the war, and that after the war it will find itself shrunken and discredited. Power in administration, to refrain from at least offering their composed of belief or prestige, in the confidence instinctive perception by Capitalists that the Bureaucracy reserve during the war, and that after the war it will find itself shrunken and discredited. Power in administration.

In the meanwhile, and until the bureaucracy has realised its weakness, and its weakness has become patent to Capitalism, Capitalism will itself make use of Labour. The recent joint conferences of Capital and Labour, initiated by Capital, are the result of an instinctive perception by Capital that the bureaucracy is discredited, and is open to be superseded. But Capital will kick Labour downstairs when once it feels itself securely seated on the vacated throne.

"Socialism has no longer any need to concern itself with the organisation of industry, since capitalism does that." So says Sorel, and so, after him, may we. It is a strain upon men, however, and especially upon men who feel themselves possessed of a gift for practical organisation, to refrain from, at least, offering their advice to the capitalists who are at present running industry. They feel that the silly people do not know even their own silly business; and that, if they were only so minded, they (the Socialists) could run it so. And Mr. John Hodge, the first Minister to be appointed (salary £3,000 a year), could actually complain, with a show of reason, that a Labour man who refused to support him "was not playing the game." It is useless to argue that the demand was going to be satisfied, other older demands not so utopian as to deny the right to exist of property or to affirm the right in theory and then to empty it of value by refusing to recognise it in practice. But we must distinguish between Property legitimate, and therefore carrying rights with it; and Property illegitimate, which, however, may be turned to this purpose the element of wage-labour is decisive for us. Such property as can be used without the help of wage-labour—which does not depend upon wage-labour for its utilisation—is plainly from our point of view legitimate; and all its rights, within the compass of the general welfare, we would maintain. But such forms of property, on the other hand, as cannot be utilised by their owner either by himself or by the co-operation of his economic equals, but require the services of wage-labourers—we regarded as illegitimate. It will be seen that to the latter category belongs most of modern Capital. Let us go further and say that all modern Capital is in this category; for the definition of modern Capital is Property requiring wage-labour to use it. Under National Guilds nobody need own what he cannot use without the help of wage-labour. But he may own all he can use by himself.

One of the dangers of consenting to associate the National Guilds League with a demand for anything less than National Guilds has been illustrated by the recent appointment of a Minister of Labour. For twenty years, as Mr. Lloyd George observed (surely with his tongue in his Welsh cheek) the Labour movement had asked for a Ministry of Labour; and now, by the neck, they should have it. And Mr. John Hodge, the first Minister to be appointed (salary £3,000 a year), could ask, with a show of reason, that a Labour man who refused to support him "was not playing the game." It is useless to argue that the demand for a Ministry of Labour was only one of the demands of the Labour movement—and a very minor demand at that; or to ask why, if this twenty-year-old demand was to be satisfied, other older demands should not be satisfied as well, if not before it. The fact is undeniable that it was on the Labour petition, and hence that its concession could only appear as a favour. But what a favour! What irony in selecting the smallest and most dubious of a long list of demands, and in making its concession cover the whole programme! Beware, we say again, lest we fall into the same error. Let us never demand or even appear to consent to anything less than some thing vital, something that contains the germ of all we are seeking.
Readers and Writers.

A considerable work on "Hindu Mind Training" has just been published by Messrs. Longmans, with a long and interesting introduction by Mr. S. M. Mitra. It has sent me back to another of those cheap little books which I have made myself nuisance with recommending. No, it is not this time the incomparable "Patanjali for Western Readers," by Daniel Stephens, M.A. (Theosophical Publishing Society, 6d. net). My reason for repeatedly mentioning one or other of these works is that there is any virtue in me, I owe it to such as them. And there is another reason and yet another. Mr. Belloc—the Generous, I think I may call him—has lately been explaining his method of discovering what is really thought in any country: it is, as you now know, to read the unofficial Press of the place. Similarly, I would say that in order to know what the world really thinks, it is useful to read the unofficial and, so to say, unauthorised works that are seldom to be found in the library or publicly recommended and advertised. My other reason is even more recondite, though, as I think, overwhelmingly final; it is that these little classics contain, as no others do, the germ of the European Renaissance of which everybody else is talking through his hat. For what on earth is the use of inculcating a revolution of ideas when all the ideas to make it with are already fatiguingly familiar? An educated man of to-day knows everything practically that the Western world has to teach him. He can, it is true, shuffle the pack of ideas from Plato to Moore and deal with a fresh hand for himself; but what he cannot hope to do with the Western cards is to make a revolutionary change by means of them. But it is no less certain that without some such change a revolution or renaissance is impossible. The more we change the more we shall remain the same. But where, I think, the difference between Shakespeare and Bacon comes to be designed, the theory of the real existence of mental powers is cast away, and the practice the assumption we make is of the need to create rather than to exercise faculty. What direct lessons, for instance, are given in our schools in the art of judgment? Or in the art of imagination? Or in the art of generalisation? Or in the art of thought itself? What exercises of a particular nature are provided for the nobler faculty of man, namely, moral judgment or the activity of the spirit of Justice? You may look over all the curricula of the schools and interrogate all the practical educationists of our day and civilisation, and find no better answer than that these faculties of the mind are assumed to be exercised in the ordinary course of school-instruction, and that, in fact, their direct exercise is impossible, since no curriculum could be devised to deal with them immediately. But is that really the case? And is it by mere luck that such faculties become active in some and remain passive and inarticulate in others? Must we depend for our renaissance-types (in whom, of course, the faculties above-mentioned are active) upon the chance by-products of common education? Is there no direct and certain method of training the mind in these excellences and of thus ensuring a race of really educated persons? Well, I believe that there is, and that Mr. Mitra in the present work has sketched the outline of a school-curriculum in which such methods are made practical. Where, for example, he has introduced a single new idea—into education, let us say—and the renaissance is begun and the world will take a leap forward if only into the dark.

For the reason that the renaissance must begin in the children's schools, and that, as far as I know, no signs of it are yet to be seen (and I have read a good many educational works in my time!), the book to which I have referred is well worth consideration. The plan recommended for the education of the young is to instruct the mind to using its inner faculty directly, and not merely mediately through the chance by-products of the acts of others. But is that really the case? And is it by mere luck that such faculties become active in some and remain passive and inarticulate in others? Must we depend for our renaissance-types (in whom, of course, the faculties above-mentioned are active) upon the chance by-products of common education? Is there no direct and certain method of training the mind in these excellences and of thus ensuring a race of really educated persons? Well, I believe that there is, and that Mr. Mitra in the present work has sketched the outline of a school-curriculum in which such methods are made practical. Where, for example, he has introduced a single new idea—into education, let us say—and the renaissance is begun and the world will take a leap forward if only into the dark.
by no means beyond our ability to construct; and I have no doubt whatever that their effect is to deepen and to sharpen ordinary perception almost miraculously. What, in fine, I have been suggesting is the practicability of a new kind of education, based, if you please, on the dog, and another kept a cat, but not one of them had heard of anyone but a fool keeping a notebook. But even this did not satisfy these busybodies. They inquired where the library was, and when I said that they would find nothing in it, they as good as said it was what they expected, but they would see for themselves. Really some people have strange ideas of a library, said Mr. Scribbler, with a curl of his handsome but now quivering lip. Where was the last volume of The New Age? we were asked. We appeared to have no copy of "National Guilds", and why were the leaves of de Maizel's book on Compulsory Truth—or some such nonsense—still uncut? We explained as best we could that it was a custom of the trade never to review any book written by anyone connected with The New Age, or, for that matter, to refer to any article in it. And we said that there were excellent reasons for the rule in the tone in which The New Age commented on the Press. And I, I said, had additional reasons of my own for ignoring that particular rag, since ten years ago it had published an anonymous review of my wife's hundred and first novel that she had been an invalid ever since. Was the criticism true? asked one of the officials. That isn't the question, I said gently but firmly; no decent paper should print the truth about a book unless the truth is the eternal verity! Indeed! added Mr. Scribbler contemptuously. Then in another part of the building they took possession of a number of letters to the Editor which we had declined to publish owing to the criticisms they contained of some of our leading articles. But the letters we were actually told should have been published at once! Space ought to have been found for them. Of course, Mr. Scribbler explained to the "Critic" representative, we often do print letters containing criticisms—considerations, in fact, offered in a footnote. It gives a paper tone and the appearance of impartiality. But these suppressed criticisms were regular knock-outs; they were simply unanswerable, and would have done the reputation of the paper no end of harm. Next a number of articles were discovered which we had also decided not to print as they contained new ideas. But the ideas appeared excellent, said one of the officials. Why were they not published? I had to explain that we never printed articles exposing new and untried ideas. The responsibility was too great. They might cause offence to some influential reader. It was not by ideas that a paper lived, but by sensations. So it seems, said an official, rudely seizing our next day's leader—a really clever piece of work. Why didn't you publish it? he wasn't sure which way the cat was going to jump. Among other papers seized, if you please, as incriminating evidence against us, were manuscripts which had been sent in and had remained in our possession for more than a month. Did we not know, we were asked, that according to Clause 10 b. of the Prevention of Cruelty to Young Authors Act, it was no offence for Editors and Publishers to keep manuscripts for more than one calendar month? Think of that! Finally, said Mr. Scribbler, his whole face now turned red, we were charged with prejudice. It seems that we had justified a well-known politician in an offence for which we had written of another man—a mere nobody—that he was an unpatriotic and infamous ruffian. Of course I tried to explain, said Mr. Scribbler savagely, that the cases were totally different, and came under different rules of the office. The politician in question was not only an old family friend, but a very influential person; whereas the other fellow lived somewhere in Brixton. Another case against us was more trifling still. Whenever there was a strike for higher wages, just because prices and profits have gone up, we naturally draw attention to the scandal in the largest type we have on the premises. But why, asked the officials, did we not give similar prominence to the occasions when the workers...
agreed to take lower wages because prices were lower? Did you ever hear such rubbish? said Mr. Scribbler, now foaming at the mouth. But there—the visit was altogether unfair, he repeated. Even an hour's notice, he said, would have given the "Sage" time to get the current issue of The New Age and to bring the staff up to date in ideas. Moreover, certain unpleasant contretemps could easily have been avoided. But to take us unaware like that—a disgraceful business—a most disgraceful affair, concluded Mr. Scribbler heatedly.

Further inquiries by the "Critic" representative elicited the fact that even the Editor of the "Daily Sage" was run to earth in his own room, and that among the questions put to him was one concerning Heatingly.

'Sage'' office under suspicion of illiteracy were a series of articles by the Editor himself. Naturally the proprietors are highly indignant, and it is understood that action will be taken immediately. Interesting developments are hourly expected. J. R. MacLeod.

The Other John Bull.

A MODERN MORALITY.

By William Margrie.

Scene: The Coroner's Court.

(The Jury, the Clerk, and other functionaries are present and ready for business. The Coroner rises, has a drink of water, and commences his address.)

The Coroner: Well, Gentlemen of the Jury, we meet on a somewhat melancholy occasion. (Loud applause.) Our business is to discover, if possible, the true, direct and indirect causes of the death of the late well-known gentleman, Mr. John Bull, merchant, manufacturer and financier. For many years he was known to me personally. I confess his death came as a painful shock to me. The last time I saw him was about six months ago, when he appeared to be enjoying his usual health, though he was, perhaps, a little less sprightly and optimistic than he had been in the past. But I never dreamed that that would be the last time we should meet. For after all, he was a comparatively young man, not much over fifty, I believe. He appeared to me to be in his prime, and I would have given him another twenty-five years at least. But it was not to be. I understand he dropped down dead while leaving a picture palace.

Well, now, gentlemen, as the case is one of more than average importance, we must do our best to arrive at the indirect and fundamental causes of Mr. Bull's death as well as the more immediate one. (Cheers.) So therefore, gentlemen, I shall conduct the investigation with too much pedantry or red tape. (Loud applause.) We can't bring Mr. John Bull back to life, but if we discover the true cause of his death, we may be able to prevent others from being cut off in their prime. Let's see, Mr. Clerk, who is the first witness?

Clerk: The attendant at the picture palace, sir.

Coro.: Then call him, please.

Clerk: John Wilkes. (He appears.)

Wilkes: Quite right, sir.

Coro.: You are an attendant at the Flapper Picture Palace?

Wilks: Well, I ain't exactly an attendant, sir, because I'm the attendant.

Coro.: What are your duties?

Wilks: Well, sir, from about seven till ten I'm cleaning up. Then I go out bill-sticking for a couple of hours. Then I come home and have a bit of dinner and then get myself ready. From two till eleven I stand outside the doors and then, see that nobody gets inside without paying. After they're all cleared out I lock up and go home.

Coro.: Is that all you have to do?

Wilks: That's all, sir.

Coro.: But you have Sunday to yourself, I suppose?

Wilks: Oh, no, sir. We open on Saturday for charity.

Coro.: How do you work it?

Wilks: Well, the boss reckons how much he'd make if we didn't work for charity, and he puts that down as "services rendered," and charity has what's left.

Coro.: Did you witness the tragedy of John Bull's death?

Wilks: Yes, sir. I was on duty as usual outside the show at the time. I saw Mr. John Bull come out and look to the right and then to the left, and then, before you could say Jack Robinson, the poor fellow dropped down as dead as a door nail. I called out to a chap that was standing at the corner, and also to Bill Wiggins who keeps the wheel still just outside the show, and the three of us took the unfortunate gentleman across to Dr. Boney's.

Coro.: Do you know if the deceased had been laughing excessively during the performance?

Wilks: Well, I expect he had, because most of 'em were splitting their sides.

The Foreman of the Jury: Can you give us a rough idea of the type of pictures that were being shown?

Wilks: Oh, yes, easy. There were Charlie Chaplin; The Cowboys' Revenge; A Cabinet Minister Eating Oysters; The Flapper's Honeymoon; The Burglar's Triumph; Bathing at Margate; How Little Willie Stole the Jam; What Happened to Little Willie Afterwards; The Rat Hunt; and the Adventures of Jack Sheppard, Dick Turpin and Sweeney Todd.

Foreman: Good heavens!

A Juryman: No wonder John Bull dropped dead!

The Clerk: Dr. Walter Boney!

Coro.: You were the first medical man to see the deceased after his death, I believe?

Boney: That is so.

Coro.: What was the immediate cause of his death in your opinion?

Boney: Heart failure.

Juryman: I take it, doctor, that when you medical gentlemen say a man died of heart failure, you really mean that you don't know what he died of?

Boney: I am quite certain that the deceased died of heart failure.

Foreman: You mean that his heart stopped beating at the time of his death?

Boney: It certainly did.

A Juryman: Did it stop before or after?

Boney: At the same time.

A Juryman: Did it heart failure cause the death, or did the heart cause the heart failure?

Coro.: I'm afraid that is getting too technical for us.

Foreman: At any rate, Dr. Boney, I take it that you
BONEY: He must have taken a boot five sizes larger.

FOREMAN: What do you mean by a hospital match, sir?

CORO: Then, that is one fact established: the deceased's heart had stopped beating. Apart from his heart, doctor, did you find anything abnormal about deceased's body?

BONEY: Yes, Mr. Coroner, and not only about his body but also about his clothes.

CORO: Kindly describe your discoveries.

BONEY: Well, to start with, Mr. John Bull's feet were an enormous size.

CORO: What size boots do you think he took?

BONEY: He must have taken a boot five sizes larger than the average at least. And his toes were greatly damaged.

CORO: What do you conclude from this?

BONEY: That he played football.

CORO: That's true. I know he went in for that sport a great deal when he was a young man. In fact, he often neglected his business to play in a hospital Rugby match.

FOREMAN: What do you mean by a hospital match, sir?

CORO: Well, in my time, medical students were the most enthusiastic Rugby players.

BONEY: You're quite right, Mr. Coroner. They did it for practice and experience. I'm sorry to say that while Mr. Bull's feet were over-developed his brain was undeveloped. It was in an unhealthy, anaemic condition, and it gave me the impression that it hadn't been used much recently.

On the other hand, his liver had had too much work. I analysed the contents of his stomach, and I was surprised to find a large quantity of margarine there, as well as about a dozen samples of patent foods and tinned meats. His muscles generally were flabby and weak. You see, gentlemen, the foods that I have mentioned don't contain much nourishment, and, owing to his unhealthy liver, Mr. Bull wasn't able to extract the maximum amount of nourishment from the second-rate foods that he ate.

JURYMAN: But, doctor, doesn't Science say that margarine's as good as butter?

BONEY: Yes, I reckon so.

CLERK: Is Mr. Sam Bull here?

SAM: Aye, aye. But I was British-born. I emigrated when I was fifteen. And I can't say I've ever regretted it. America's the place to make money in, and England's the place to spend it. I've always kept my eye on the Old Country. And I generally manage to spend a month or six weeks over here every two or three years.

CLERK: By profession you are?

SAM: A manufacturer and exporter of human necessities and luxuries.

CORO: When did you see your cousin last?

SAM: On the day of his death.

CORO: Were you with him at the actual moment of his death?

SAM: No, sir. I was with him at the picture show, but he came out before me.

CORO: Did you notice anything peculiar about him just before he died?

SAM: No, I can't say I did. Though now I come to think of it, he did wear a sort of worried look, so to speak, between the smiles.

CORO: Did he appear to enjoy the pictures?

SAM: Yes, I reckon so. He laughed pretty heartily, especially at the juvenile films. He split his sides over How Little Willie Stole the Jam, and A Cabinet Minister Eating Oysters.

YET, somehow, I guess he had something on his mind all the time. I reckon it was business worry.
Coro.: Do you know anything about his business affairs?
Sam.: Well, yes, a little. There's no doubt that John's business had been going down for some time. But, if his ghost will forgive me, I reckon it was his own fault.

The Foreman: In what way?
Sam.: I'll tell you. But, first of all, let me mention what I saw in the picture show. I noticed, Mr. Coroner, that all the blessed chairs, all the blessed mats, all the blessed fittings, and all the blessed pictures themselves came from the States. I said to myself, at the time, "Now, this is mighty rum, might'n run, indeed. Surely, an old established firm like John Bull and Co. ought not to have to depend on Uncle Sam for all its furniture and luxuries like this."

But as to my poor old cousin. Well, gentleman of the jury, as I remarked, his business had been going the wrong way for some time. But, in my humble opinion, it was John's own fault. He wasn't enterprising enough, wasn't adaptable enough. He didn't go with the times. He didn't manufacture enough things. He was becoming a mere agent, a sort of clearing-house for imports and exports. His office was too big, and his factory wasn't big enough. He employed too many clerks and not enough mechanics. And most of his machinery was out-of-date and wanted scrapping.

And his clerks weren't up to snuff. None of 'em knew a foreign language, and they were a bit weak at the higher arithmetic, and few of 'em could describe a new article in an attractive way so that everybody would be obliged to sample it. And they weren't over-polite to strangers either. Although I was John's own cousin, these gentlemanly young clerks would never show me round the works, if they could help it. Why, bless you, Mr. Coroner, in my works on the other side, I keep three University men to do nothing but show strangers over the place and explain things. They can all speak, and, if necessary, swear, in six languages.

And then I noticed that poor old John didn't encourage young men with ideas. One evening I was standing in his office, when a bright-looking youngster came in, and asked him if he'd finance a patent for him. He had the drawing and specification with him, and he was just beginning to explain 'em when John cut him short with: "Here, that's enough, young man, I can't waste my time in listening to cranks." The young fellow was just about to leave, looking like a dying duck in a thunderstorm, when I took pity on him. I said: "One minute, lad. Let's have a look at your drawing." He handed it to me like a shot. I took a sort of bird's-eye view of it, and guessed there was something in it. I offered him twenty pounds for the idea, just out of charity. He accepted at once. And, now, gentlemen, if you'll believe me, that twenty pounds has already brought me in 5,000 dollars!

The Jury: Bravo!
Coro.: And do you think that John Bull's business worries had anything to do with his death?
Sam.: I do, Mr. Coroner. They shortened his life undoubtedly.
Coro.: Thank you, sir.

Mrs. Bull: Yes, sir.
Clerk: Your name is Mary Bull?
Mary: Yes, sir.
Clerk: You are the late John Bull's widow?
GERTIE: Righto. I'm here. What do you want me for?

CLERK: Miss Gertie Frivolity.

GERTIE: Oh, yes. Poor old Uncle John! Well, it was like this, you see. About three months ago uncle said to me—

"Well, Gertie, my dear, it seems to me, you're wasting your life."

"Not at all," says I. "I see far more life than you do. Last week I went to three dances; the week before I went to two plays, three revues and a West End cinema, and the week before that I was at Margate."

Poor uncle said, "Oh, yes, that's all very well in its way. But how would you like to go to evening classes and learn French and German?"

"Not at all," says I. "'I'm English, and what do I want to speak French for? No, uncle, dear, it's you who are wasting your life. You look run down and worried. So I'll tell you what I'll do. I'll take you to at least one jolly revue every week."

And I've kept my promise, Mr. Coroner. I took him to twelve different revues in three months.

A JURYMAN: No wonder he died!

CLERK: Well, miss, and what do you think it was that killed your uncle?

GERTIE: Work! I'll take good care it doesn't kill me. (Laughter.)

CLERK: Mr. Ratepayer.

RATEPAER (strident and cocksure): Yes, sir, here I am.

CLERK: You're a member of the Middle-class Ratepayers' Association, I believe?

RATE: I'm more than a member, sir. I'm a branch secretary.

CLERK: Was the deceased a friend of yours?

RATE: He was. I have known him a long time. He was a member of our branch.

CLERK: Can you throw any light on his death?

RATE: Yes, sir. It was high rates that killed John Bull. There's no doubt about that whatever. High rates and faddism.

CLERK: Can you give us any evidence relative to your statement?

RATE: Yes, sir, I can. Mr. John Bull frequently spoke to me about his high rates and his business troubles and foreign competition.

He said that while his rates were always going up his profits were always coming down.

He said that high rates and municipal Socialism would ruin the country before long. And so they will, sir. It wouldn't matter if we got value for money. But do we? Not a bit of it. Take the Education rate. That's always going up by leaps and bounds. But what's the good of that? Are your modern boys and gals any better than they were when I was a boy? Not a bit of it, sir. Look at me! I never had a day's schooling in my life, and yet I've done pretty well. I say I'm absolutely uneducated. Does anybody contradict me?

CLERK: No, sir. May I ask what you do for a living, sir?

RATE: I'm Secretary of the National Anti-Education League. 'The League is growing like a house afire, sir. We've got branches in every part of the country, except Scotland. We're stronger in London than anywhere else.

FOREMAN: But, surely, you wouldn't prevent a man giving his children a good education?

RATE: Everybody can give his children as much education as he likes, providing he pays for it himself. But we say it isn't right to make bachelors
and spinsters and other respectable people pay for the education of other people's children who are too lazy and stingy to pay for it themselves.

And what's the good of all this here education, I want to know. I say it's filling the prisons and the lunatic asylums and all other institutions of that description.

A Juryman: Rat!

Rate: If you say that again, I'll punch your bloomin' head.

Coro: Order, order!

Rate: That's all very well, Mr. Coroner, but I ain't come here to be insulted.

Coro: No, of course not. I sympathise with you.

Rate: Well, as I was assaying, what's the good of all this here education? Who's it run for? It ain't run for the benefit of the kids at all. It's run for the benefit of the teachers.

A Juryman: Hear, hear.

Rate: I'm glad you've got one sensible man on the jury, Mr. Coroner. And look at the holidays they git. And look at their pay. And what are they paid for? Nothing, Mr. Coroner. Absolutely nothing! Less than nothing. They git all this money for makin' labourers' kids a jolly sight too prad to do a honest day's work. It's a downright scandal, Mr. Coroner, and we're up agin it. And if you'd like to join our league, I shall be pleased to take yer subscription here and now.

And then there's all this here municipal Socialism. A nice bag of tricks that is. Just think how they waste the ratepayers' money on useless things like parks, libraries, bands and such like rubbish. What do they do it for? Why, to give soft jobs to the borough councillors' sons and daughters. That's what it's done for, Mr. Coroner. I know because I've bin a borough councillor meself. The workin' man don't want all this flummery. All he wants is to keep the dirty foreigner out of his fine park, and to have a bath occasionally.

For what's the public libraries used for? Why, to habour a lot of good-for-nothing layabouts and work-shies. And what's the good of the parks? No good whatever. Last Saturday I walked through Richmond Park with the missis, from Richmond Green to the Queen's Lodge. It's a beautiful place, there ain't no denyin' that. But how many people do you think we met?

Coro: Fifty?

Rate: Not a bit of it! No; all we met was two men, a tramp, a small boy, and a dog. This speaks for itself, Mr. Coroner. The ratepayers' money is wasted shamefule. Then, there's the baths and washhouses. What's the good of them? When I was a young man I used to have an all-over wash once in a blue moon, and I ain't none the worse for it.

Foreman: But, surely, sir, a man is all the better for having a bath occasionally?

Rate: What I say is, that if a man wants a bath, let him pay for his own soap. He can't be too scrupulous about it whatever, poor old John Bull was killed by high rates, over education, municipal Socialism, and foreign competition. Then I say, Down with Education and Up with Protection. What we want to do is to keep the dirty foreigner out.

Coro: Thank you.

Clerk: Dr. Malthus?

Dr. M.: Yes, sir.

Coro: I believe the late John Bull consulted you several times?

Dr. M.: That's true, sir, but unfortunately he didn't take my advice. I saw him shortly after he got married, and I said to him, "John, my boy, if you want to live to a ripe old age, if you want to be healthy, wealthy and prosperous, don't have too large a family. One's a blessing, two's tolerable, but three's purgatory." But he went and had six!

Coro: Do you think the size of his family had anything to do with his death?

Dr. M.: Undoubtedly, sir. There's no doubt that his large family, with all the trouble, worry, anxiety and expense it entailed, was the fundamental cause of poor old John's premature death.

Foreman: But, sir, if one child is good, doesn't it follow that two are doubly good?

Dr. M.: Not at all, sir, but quite the reverse. Two children are only half the blessing of one. Of course, I'm thinking and speaking chiefly of middle-class people like my old friend. A big family makes no difference to the intruder poor. They have everything done for them by the municipality, and it's people like the deceased that have to pay the piper.

Coro: But isn't it to the advantage of the race that middle-class people, who usually come of a good stock, should have large families?

Dr. M.: It may be. But when your income is limited and fixed, you can't afford to be altruistic to that extent.

Foreman: There's another question, sir. Is it not a fact that the late John Bull had extensive plantations and nurseries in Australia and Canada? Well, if that is so, wasn't it the advantage of Mr. Bull that he should have a fairly large family, so that his sons and daughters could manage these plantations?

Dr. M.: I can't say. I'm not a nurseryman. I am now only concerned with the question of John Bull's death and what caused it, and, on that point, I claim that I know what I'm talking about. John consulted me shortly before he died. He certainly looked very seedy, though he couldn't say exactly what was the matter with him. But I could see at a glance. He was suffering from the big-family complaint. He was worried, anxious, peevish and low-spirited. But, of course, I couldn't really do anything for the poor fellow; it was too late to do anything. So poor old John died in his prime because he tried to do too much for posterity.

Mrs. B.: May I say a word here, Mr. Coroner?

Coro: Certainly, Mrs. Bull.

Mary: Well, then, I feel it's my duty to contradict practically everything the last witness said. I don't mean to suggest that Dr. Malthus was consciously telling you lies. But he's a man with a fixed idea. He got the "big family" on the brain. He thinks that all human troubles are due to big families.

Dr. M.: Hear, hear.

Mary: If that's the case, Dr. Malthus ought to be the happiest man alive, because he hasn't got any children, and he never had any. Consequently, he knows all about children, and how they ought to be brought up. (Laughter.) Having had no experience of parent-hood he's an expert on the subject. Of course, in one sense the doctor is right. All our troubles are due to children. If there were no children, there'd be no trouble. There'd be nothing. But in our particular case, Dr. Malthus is all at sea. Whatever my husband died of, he certainly didn't die through having a large family, for the simple reason that we never had one. We only had four children, and they're all alive now. (Laughter. Speaking out.) And, in any case, what's it to do with the man? Practically all the responsibility, trouble and anxiety of rearing children falls on the woman.

Juryman: Hear, hear.

Mary: But the man has to find the money.

Dr. M.: Not in our case. I brought my husband a nice little round sum, and he went and invested it in
foreign rails, and lost it all. This, I admit, has very little to do with the subject. What I want to emphasise is that both John and myself were much happier in our early married days than we were later on. I know I was. Then I had plenty to occupy my mind. Of course, I had an average mother's share of trouble and anxiety, but I was never bored to death, as I have been since. (Cle- ers.) I successfully mothered two sturdy boys and two nice girls, and that gave me a sense of triumph. I'm glad to say all four are now doing well in the Colonies.

JURYMAN: Bravo, Mrs. Bull!

MARY: As for John, well, he certainly didn't seem so worried and harassed during the first ten years of our married life, as he has been lately. I think that's all I have to say.

CORO.: Would you like to say anything further, Dr. Malthus?

DR. M.: My reply to the lady is that this is a matter of pure science, and, consequently, she must allow me to know best.

FOREMAN: Do you mean to say, doctor, that if the lady says she had only four children and you say she had six, are we to accept your word before hers?

DR. M.: Precisely.

CORO.: Next witness.

CLERK: Mr. Theatre-Manager.

Me. THEATRE-MANAGER (a jovial, red-faced gentle-
mam): That's my name.

CORO.: I believe you own and control several West End theatres?

T.-M.: I own 'em, but I don't know about controlling 'em. It's the leading lady that generally controls me.

CORO.: I understand the late John Bull was a patron of your theatres?

T.-M.: Quite right. I often saw him in the stalls and sometimes in the boxes. I remember him well, because he was about the only man who ever paid for a box. All the others were dead-heads more or less.

CORO.: Can you tell us anything that will help us in this investigation?

T.-M.: I'm afraid I can't tell you much. I hope you don't suggest that my plays killed him?

CORO.: Oh, no, I don't suppose they were as bad as that.

T.-M.: Though you think they were quite bad enough. Well, and I reckon you're about right. It fairly licks me to think what trash, piffle and drivel the British public will put up with. Put up with, did I say? No, but that ain't the right way to put it. They don't only put up with it; they ask for it. And they don't thank us for givin' 'em anything better.

CORO.: Do you ever try problem plays?

T.-M.: Oh, yes.

FOREMAN: What is a problem play, sir?

T.-M.: A problem play is a play that's put on the boards to see what antediluvian rubbish the public'll stand.

CORO.: And what's your candid opinion of the matter, Mr. Theatre-Manager?

T.-M.: My candid opinion, Mr. Coroner, is that the public that wants the bush that we give 'em must have softening of the brain pretty bad. In other words, it's just about time to call in a lunacy expert

CORO.: And you say Mr. John Bull was a great theatregoer?

T.-M.: Yes.

CORO.: I hope the jury will make a note of that.

FOREMAN: The inference is that the deceased was suffering from softening of the brain. But is it not possible that going to your plays brought him to that condition?

T.-M.: It may have done. But we're business men, and we have to give the public what it wants.

FOREMAN: But how do you know what it wants if you never change the fare?

T.-M.: Oh, we change it sometimes.

CORO.: But do you ever try to make the public think?

T.-M.: No, because the dramatic censor won't let us.

CORO.: But you run a theatre for so-called legitimate drama, don't you?

T.-M.: Oh, yes.

A JURYMAN: What is a legitimate play?

T.-M.: Well, you see, a legitimate play is like a legitimate monarch. When a play's been handed down from generation to generation for a few hundred years, as far as the main plot's concerned, it's legitimate.

CORO.: Can you give us a rough idea of the type of plays that have been running at your legitimate theatre lately?

T.-M.: Yes, I'll give you a rough idea of the last hundred. It won't take long, because they were all much of a muchness.

The first was about two men and a woman. The second was about two women and a man. The third was about two men and two women. The fourth was about a case of adultery. The fifth was based on a divorce case. The sixth was based on a breach of promise case.

CORO.: There isn't much originality about those subjects?

T.-M.: Bless you, Mr. Coroner, there hasn't been any originality in plays since Aristophanes, and he's been dead over two thousand years.

CORO.: But you run other types of plays as well, don't you?

T.-M.: Oh, yes. I expect we shall have to give up the legitimate drama before long. Bad as it is, it is too much of a mental strain on our patrons. I'm now running a dozen revues in the West End.

CORO.: What sort of thing is a revue?

T.-M.: The revue, like the trade-mark of the Isle of Man, is all legs and no head. That hits it to a "'it." The three-legged figure of the Isle of Man would do very well to represent the modern revue. And I'm thinking of running a revue called "The Isle of Man." There'd be no human beings in this show at all. Their place would be taken by mechanical figures resembling the symbol of the Isle of Man, dressed up in shoes and stockings and frills and turbelows.

FOREMAN: Well, that'll be a bit of a novelty, anyhow.

T.-M.: Yes, that's the worst of it; it might ruin my reputation if it contained an idea. Our aim is to produce a show that'll be absolutely brainless, idealless and mindless. We haven't quite reached that ideal yet, but we've got pretty near to it.

CORO.: Do you think there's any hope for the British drama?

T.-M.: There's only one way of saving it.

CORO.: And that is?

T.-M.: To exclude all women from the theatre, both from the stage and the auditorium.

GERTIE: Mr. Coroner, I protest.

T.-M.: You see, in Shakespeare's time, no women were allowed on the stage, and all the plays were written by men, and see what a fine drama we had then.

CORO.: So to sum up, Mr. Theatre-Manager, you believe that the fact that the deceased was a frequent visitor to your theatres is a proof that he suffered from softening of the brain?

T.-M.: I'm afraid so.

CORO.: Thank you.

The last witness gave us some important evidence, gentlemen of the jury.

(TO BE CONCLUDED.)
LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

THE NEUTRALITY OF BELGIUM.

Sir,—Since Mr. S. Verdad has recently been discussing this question, may I recall to him two extracts from French newspapers which speak for themselves and should be more widely known? They were published in Le Figaro on August 8, 1914 (written before the Germans were involved in war): "...we could, if need be, force the Belgians to come to our assistance in turning the German attack upon France."

Extract (I) appears to postulate a right of way across Belgium being allowed to France; or, possibly, a Belgian attack on Germany. Extract (2) seems to assume a Franco-Belgian alliance, not merely for a passage across her territory, but for military assistance. The purpose of this—namely, to "turn" the German attack, involves the assumption that the Germans would have their main forces (legitimately) concentrated on the Franco-German frontier.

All this entirely confirms the German claim that the Treaty guaranteeing Belgian neutrality had become a "scrap of paper," and (b) that in attacking Belgium they were taking a precautionary step to obviate an attack on themselves by or through that country.

ARTHUR BRENTON.

Mr. S. Verdad writes: In view of the correspondence, speeches, etc., in possession of the public for two years or so, it seems to me that Mr. Brenton's first assumption is a remarkable one. I expressly made the stipulation that I was not permitting, or regarding, any regard to Cologne, for the reason that if a formal declaration of war by Germany had preceded the outbreak of hostilities, and if the neutrality of Belgium had been respected, the French would have had at least a chance of making for Cologne. As every strategist realised, their base for this purpose was to be Vernon; and, in the absence of an unprovoked attack by Germany, the Belgians would have been just as likely to resist a French invasion of their territory as a German invasion. From Vernon to the frontier the distance is a bare thirty miles, and then the Thionville-(Tréves)-Cologne main line, with its Trier-Coblenz-Bonn-Cologne branch, is only a few hours' march away. The second assumption appears to me equally unsound. As Sir Edward Grey distinctly explained in his long speech of August 9, 1914, all the Entente plans and precautions involving Belgium had been discussed on the hypothesis that Belgium's neutrality would be respected by Germany, and it was clearly understood that Belgium would do her share in resisting by force any violation of her neutrality. Why otherwise should there have been a Belgian army? And, while the German assertion that the attack on Belgium was made in order to forestall an attack on Germany through Belgium (for the suggestion that Belgium alone might have attacked a Power like Germany is too ridiculous for discussion) was put forward as an excuse after the manoeuvre had failed, and after the German Chancellor had himself publicly acknowledged the wrongfulness of forcing a war through Belgium, the French and English military authorities had very definite proof that Germany meant to begin a war by a march through Belgium. What was this proof? The fact that the strategic railways were directed to points on the Belgian frontier between Aix-la-Chapelle and Malmedy, and to points on the Luxemburg frontier towards the south, were twenty times as numerous for the amount of normal goods and passenger traffic, and were obviously intended for the speedy concentration of troops. There was no such network of railways on the Franco-Belgian frontier.

Let me remind Mr. Brenton of other facts well known to the German Government before war broke out. On July 28 the British Government invited both France and Germany to respect Belgian neutrality; France agreed immediately; the German Foreign Minister refused to make a statement on the ground that by doing so he would be disclosing the German plan of campaign, and that in any case the German Government could not bind itself. Even when the Allied Government was brought to the notice of the German Foreign Minister he still refused to give an undertaking, or rather to confirm the undertaking to which Germany had already bound herself in writing. Again, when the Germans did suddenly launch their attack, it was seen by the very disposition of the forces engaged that the French had not the slightest intention of marching through Belgium. The troops had left the Treves-Coblenz-Bois-Bertrange, and concentrated their main armies on the line from the Belgian frontier to Bilboz. The regularity of the German movements through Belgium, no less than the confession in France by the rapidity of the German offensive through the neutral country, furnishes still further proof of Germany's guilt. I should add that these points have already been fully considered in neutral countries; but even the German propagandaists have by this time dropped them. The evidence in favour of the Entente and against Germany is too convincing, both legally and historically.

T. THE BIRTH-RATE.

Sir,—Perhaps I may be allowed to add some comments to the useful discussion on "Maternity" of "C. W. E.," November 23, and Miss Gladys F. Biss, "The Birth-Rate," November 6. The temptation for women engaged in maternal service appears to me to be exaggerated. This contempt, and the habit of sneering at women which often accompanies it, are, no doubt, characteristic of a supercilious class of Englishmen. But in two of the foremost nations, France first, and some way after, America, which are both child-creating nations, men regard the maternal function with the respect it ought to have, and, indeed, show a true sympathy for its importance. There is surely much more hope that Englishmen will become less brutal and ignorant through increased contact with other nations.

On this side of the Atlantic, I have known prospective mothers moulded by a wholesome and joyous excitement and a sense of social importance which are especially valuable in the stress of first child-bearing. The social excitement involved in the desire to be a mother appears unfailingly confirmed. We owe much to this natural stimulus, and may hope that in a future happier centuries it will take channels other than the military "path of glory." Observe how people find more impulsion of causes than is usually supposed in the deferment of marriage, and the increased frequency of one-child families and no-child marriages. The sterility of either sex, and no-child marriages. The sterility of either sex, and the impossibility of conceiving a child, are as though the world were "exhausted" by the war. The social forces are not being increased by the war, but strengthened by the war. Europe will emerge from the war like unto a highly trained athlete—an athlete for whose strength and skill America, obese and untrained, will be no match. The previous perfected industrial organisation of Germany will give place to superior organisation. Triumphant or defeated, Germany will come forth from the war having obtained the most skilful and efficient group of men, while the industries of England will have become socialised to an extraordinary degree, with a commercial organisation that will rival that of Germany, and with a social system that will surpass that of Germany in the place that it gives to individual initiative. For the equipped and developed commercial collection of England and Germany, America is absolutely unprepared to cope. She
As I pointed out the possibility that "the most perfect mutual love" might be compatible with "the absolute intellectual, physical, sentimental, and moral degeneration of the human race," R. H. C. has replied that "it is highly improbable." But why? Of course, it is not only improbable but impossible if the word "perfect" implies the primacy of the love of God (the love of the good); but if we mean by perfect love that passion of the soul which wholly interests life becomes dependent on the life of another person, we might as well attribute this affection to the inhabitants of a monkey-house, or to Sappho and her maidens on Lesbos, or to the very inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah, and love, supreme and perfect love, would not cleanse their memory of its infamy. If we forget the primacy of the love of God, perfect mutual love may only mean the mutual perfect satisfaction of all that is vile in our human appetites. And yet the love of one's neighbour is an indispensable commandment. We are here in order that the will of God be done on earth as it is in Heaven, to maintain and increase the "good," the values, the good things. To realise our function, we have to build societies and institutions. And to make or keep societies we have to learn to love one another. Let us be partners in a good cause, and, then, let us love one another in the cause, for, if we abstract from our mutual love the common love of a good thing, love is no longer but a blind and senseless attachment, a drain on the nerves, a bandage on the eyes, and a dead weight on the soul.

---

"LONDON PRIDE."

Sir,—Mr. Hope appears unable to distinguish between bias and judgment. Judgment would quite fairly account for his low opinion of humour in woman, and thus for his verdict of it. But only "feminine" bias would explain his undemonstrable conclusion that all the faults and none of the good things in "London Pride" are the woman's.

As for Mr. Hope's last sentence, I must apologise for him; but we should be grateful that he did not shout: "Call yerself a gentleman!"—to which I could only have replied, "Please, sir, 'e 'tme first."

M. G. S.

---

ON LOVE AND THINGS

Sir,—I have been reflecting on the last reply of "R. H. C." and I think it may be safely divided into a question of fact and a question of possibility.

"In fact," says he, "I make bold to say that, if the Law and the Prophets can be said to have relegated mutal 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."

Nothing of the kind. To dispose of this question of fact it is enough to quote another passage in the Gospel referring to the same episode:

"And he answering said, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind; and thy neighbour as thyself."

"And He said unto him, What is written in the law? how readest thou it?"

"And he answering said, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might: this is the first and great commandment."

My proposition that love of one's neighbour is only good when there is already love of God in it, or when it can be formulated as "love of one's neighbour in God," or of a fellowship, is also implied in the Christian doctrine. Love of God ought to be unconditional: "with all thy heart, etcetera, for God is good. But love of man ought to be conditional: "thy neighbour." And one should never love the whole of one's neighbour, or the whole of oneself, but only that which may be good in each man, for man is not good. And these are not my words:

"And a certain ruler asked Him, saying, Good Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life?"

"And Jesus said unto him, Why callest thou Me good? none is good, save one, that is, God." (St. Luke, xviii, 18, 19.)
And, of course, there is no fruit-tree seed. I think this expresses Mr. Hope's attitude. It is somewhat similar to that of Aladdin when he first gazed upon the priceless gens growing upon trees in an enchanted cave. He had nothing, not even fancy, with which to relate the fruit to a first cause or unifying principle. There certainly was the fruit, and there as certainly were, I dare say, the leaves, likewise the stem and other visible fruit-tree furnishings. But where, on earth, could be the power which must exist before a single particle of these priceless gems could be attracted from the soil, so to speak? Without this power, how did the fruit get on the tree? Did it happen like Topy? Or was it stuck on piece by piece, by all sorts and conditions of wizards. This would account for the diverse shapes of the fruit. They are diversified because they are diversified, and there was no need for a seed.

Now suppose that Aladdin instead of entertaining this loose and shallow conception of the gemmed fruit-tree, were possessed of an insight into the unity of so wonderful a structure, its connectedness, the passionate growth and development of the stream of action within it towards a single, distinct, and high purpose, and, finally, its habit of throwing off multiple forms and building little labyrinthine puzzles in response to the action of soil, air, moisture, and other external influences. In this case he would, of course, be aware of a seed of unity, of an agency in the seed prepared to act by persevering and unifying power, of this agency acting in true order of operance, and, lastly, flowering in brilliants as big as balloons, if need be.

Read in this light, the drama and its means and furnishings. But where—a earth could be the power that must exist before a single particle of these priceless gems could be attracted from the soil, so to speak? Did it happen like Topy? Or was it stuck on piece by piece, by all sorts and conditions of wizards. This would account for the diverse shapes of the fruit. They are diversified because they are diversified, and there was no need for a seed.

We Americans are wondering, in the watches of the moral night of our nation, what we shall do to be saved from our wealth. Two thousand men own most of the wealth upon which one hundred million Americans depend. It is precisely as a preventive of self-government, as an instrument supremely suited to serve plutocracy, that the American constitution has been a marvellous success. The methods of our American money are a greater peril to the human race, both spiritually and materially, than the European war. H. D. HERRON.

Capital is not a happy phrase. Generally, State activities, even from the distributive point of view, are expensive; from the manufacturing point of view, they have been rather conspicuous by their failures. JOSEPH ARCHER DOWS.

Drama differs from religion by the fact that it has spectators and not participants in a sacrament. As there are many different sorts of plays, there should be many different sorts of theatres. JOHN FRANCIS HOPE.

The heart should always be in flames, but the duty of the head is to remain ice. What distinguishes wisdom from folly is the ingenious use that wisdom makes of circumstances which folly cannot employ and only fruitlessly resents. H. H. C. I.

The Irish genius is a genius for talk; and cultivated talk is the very essence of every man of letters. There are countless millions of shapes of the same nature, each different from every other by unavoidable external influences, such as the tools of the theatre, but all conforming to a single and unified vision. I will not go further with the outline.

My point is that Mr. Hope is making use of the old confusion of content with form. If the form is diversified, therefore the content of all the diversified forms must be diversified also. Moreover, if the diversity of ripened pea-pods tells of steady development, then the sap informing the pea-plant must be diversified also. Else ultimately no pea-pods. I must confess there is something very ingenious in his line of argument which capitulates a mind like my own. It makes me grateful to Mr. Hope for pointing out that in some respects we do not differ an inch.
PRESS CUTTINGS.

To the Editor of the "Times."

Sir,—I see that conscription of wealth is a favourite topic with some public men. I wonder how much there is to construe. I am an apparently opulent landowner in Scotland. My public burdens this year, income-tax, super-tax, and local rates, amount to 138. 3d. in the pound. Out of the remaining 6s. 9d. must come the upkeep of the estate, the War Loans, and war charities to which I contribute annually and freely, and lastly the insignificant item of the subsistence of the landlord. In this and similar cases conscription would not, it would seem, yield very much.

A. LARD.

Yesterday we drew attention to a typical money-lender's circular, such as the ordinary householder is accustomed to receive, and we pointed out in relation to the national appeal for subscriptions, great, and small, to the War Loan.

To-day we have received others, which are more instructive and in one case far more impudent. One of these offers an immediate loan of £100 to £25,000 "at first interview or by registered post"; and another confesses to the possession of a "large amount of uninvested capital," from which the lender is "prepared to make private cash advances from £100 to £25,000 at a reasonable rate of interest." More than this; the writer offers a "liberal commission" for introductions to "financial business," and so insults those whom he addresses, secretaries in some instances of good clubs, by inviting them to become his touts. As long as financiers of this kind can advertise their uninvested thousands the War Loan will always be by far the most attractive.

The "Times."