NOTES OF THE WEEK.

We have always deprecated optimism regarding the duration of the war if not regarding the final result; and we find no reason for changing our opinion in the interview with Sir Douglas Haig which was published last week. What private reasons the Commander-in-Chief of the British forces had for allowing himself to be interviewed and published we can only guess; but we are fairly certain that the consequences will not prove to be what he expected. In the first place, despite an appearance of conviction, his interview leaves the mind of the reader with anything but exact notions. We are to have a military victory this year, but it may not be followed by peace. There is to be decision, not conclusion, and, in the second place, the door is left open even for a complete contradiction of every forecast contained in Sir Douglas Haig's remarks; for we must be ready, he says, to continue the war as long as may be necessary. We do not profess to understand all the considerations present to Sir Douglas Haig's judgment when he accorded his interview to the representative of the French "Journal"; but we are aware of none that justify it. It was used to mislead the English to boast what they were about to do; and the disposition to boast we have, in fact, usually set down as practically certain. But so long as it is fed with lies and soothed by flattering hopes, the weaker members of the nation can only be expected to succumb to apathy, and to be found, when the truth dawns, unready to meet it.

The reason of such an interview in England is undoubtedly to persuade people that once more the war is as good as over, and that there is nothing to be done but to do nothing and to wait. Wait and see, in fact, precisely expresses the word that is inevitably produced by cock-a-hoopism of this kind. But we can only say that, in any event, the conditions of war are destined to last not only for the duration of the war itself, but for a long time afterwards; and hence, that we cannot be wrong in assuming that the war may continue indefinitely. What the objection to this attitude can be cannot very well make out. Yet it is a fact that many journals are promising their readers not only an early victory, but an early return to the conditions of peace, exactly as if the latter in their opinion necessarily followed upon the former. We, on the contrary, while naturally prepared for victory, and even for an early peace, cultivate no illusion that either of these is inevitable in the near future or that either would at once allow us to return to the conditions prevailing before the war. For a generation at least upon the most favourable estimates we can form of the future, the restoration of pre-war conditions will be impossible; and upon even moderately favourable estimates the nation in our judgment ought to be prepared to endure the conditions of war for several years after the war is over. All this soothing-syrup, therefore, appears to us to be as dangerous as we believe it to be really unnecessary. Properly informed and addressed in a manly spirit, the nation, we believe, is quite willing to face with a good heart any future that can be clearly regarded as practically certain. But so long as it is fed with lies and soothed by flattering hopes, the weaker members of the nation can only be expected to succumb to apathy, and to be found, when the truth dawns, unready to meet it.

For this reason the present Loan may be said to have been obtained largely by false pretences. What, in fact, has been the main inducement—apart, of course, from the rate of interest—held out to investors but that this is the Victory Loan, implying, of course, that it is the last of the great loans? In many of the advertisements of the Loan, and in many more of the articles written about it, you will discern the insinuation, if not the direct statement, that the present Loan is to be our final effort, the overwhelming exertion of the nation, and, in effect, the last shot in its locker. That it is, in any event, the last big Loan or subsidy that will be necessary, everybody with any intelligence knows enough to deny. Victory, with or without peace, will still require another, and, perhaps, another Loan of is great, if not greater, amount than the present. And when the occasion arises, what will be the state of mind of the millions of investors in the present Loan who have done, as they will think, their last? Will they
not turn round and charge the present managers with deception? However that may be, the fact is certain that the present is neither the last nor the most urgent of the Loans that will have to be raised before we are completely out of the wood. And we are only advising our advisers frankly to say so.

Mr. Bonar Law has now explained that when he said that we could not continue the war indefinitely he only meant that we could continue it longer than Germany. The difference is, of course, nothing but a statement of to-day; but the lightheartedness it reveals is nothing to the superficiality of Mr. Bonar Law's comparison of our present state with our state after the Napoleonic wars. Like any Adelphi associate of a spendthrift who has just come into fortune, Mr. Bonar Law pleaded with the nation to open its purse for the present Loan on the ground that no matter how much we spent we could well afford it. The national debt, he said, after the Napoleonic wars was eight hundred millions when our national income was only two hundred and fifty millions. Hence, upon a national income of ten times the amount we could well afford a debt of ten times the Napoleonic wars—a debt, namely, of eight thousand millions. But is it really necessary to adduce the evidence that this is specious reasoning, based on a comparison of dissimilar circumstances, and, therefore, worthless? In the first place, we cannot be said to have so easily afforded the cost of the Napoleonic wars that a repetition of the trouble of paying it off fills the nation with any joy. What England suffered during the period of repayment simply cannot be calculated in terms of money, but it is enough to say that it threatened to undo the work of a century. In the second place, it must be remembered that for our income we are in the habit of saving very much less today than in the period immediately preceding the Napoleonic wars; and rightly. A more widely spread civilisation demands a more generally costly standard of living; and it is by no means the case to-day that the poor are prepared, as they were in Napoleonic days, to live upon nettles and beech-leaves. Finally, our relative position as a nation in the world is very different from our position a hundred years ago. Ex-hausted, debt-ridden as we emerged from the Napoleonic wars, we were still relatively the wealthiest nation in the world. Temporarily crippled, therefore, though we may have been, we were still more than a match for our competitors in the world-market. But to-day, we are far from the position of a nation bound to compete with nations that, even before the war, were almost our equals, and that, in consequence of the war, have become our superiors. And our recovery under these circumstances will be more slow and not by any means sure. The only consolation, in fact, that we can draw from our present situation is when we avert our eyes from the past and consider our present possibilities. From the very fact that the nation, as a whole, has become accustomed to luxuries as well as to necessities, we conclude that we have a liberal margin for economy outside the text of necessity.

If, however, we turn to Mr. Bonar Law's speech for evidence that he appreciates this point, we search in vain. Not only is he ignorant of the fact that he receives on the nation's behalf their voluntary surrender. From our own and any humane point of view, the donations Mr. Bonar Law admits to having received as free gifts towards the cost of the war are every one of them honourable deeds worthy to be held up as the braveries of the war. But Mr. Bonar Law, it will be seen, like the "Times" that followed his lead, calmly classified them among the various means, all presumedly of the same value, for financing the war. Some, he said, chose to lend at over five per cent.; interest on the best security in the world; others in their wisdom chose to give. It was all the same, and both parties were entitled to the same measure of thanks. We shall not stop to comment on the unutterable vulgarity of Mr. Bonar Law's judgment since it is patent, as well as inexcusable. We shall simply remark that sooner or later the values must be reversed, and that donations, voluntary or compulsory, must take the place of Loans at the inflated market-rate. It is true that at present only a few persons in Parliament and elsewhere dare breathe the name of the Conscription of Wealth—among them, we are glad to see, being a leader in the "Times," Mr. MacDonald, Mr. Asquith, and Mr. Hogge. It is also true that men even like Mr. Shaw pretend that the Conscription of Capital is impossible, though at the very moment, as an authoritative correspondent in the Channel Islands Inform us, that form of taxation is in operation in Guernsey. Necessity, however, is full of invention, and will find better reasons for conscripting capital than Mr. Shaw can find against it; and in the end we shall have to come to it.

The assumption is made that in undertaking an unlimited submarine campaign in defiance of neutrals Germany is revealing desperation. It is a gambler's last throw, preparatory to a complete surrender. That may be so we hope and we do not deny; but the distinction ought to be made between an act of desperation such as Germany's is supposed to be, and acts of folly such as our own Government is guilty of. Desperation presumably is manifested by staking everything upon the uncalculable. But what can that be called if it is a matter of easy calculation that every food-vessel that is sunk reduces the supply of our food, and that the longer the submarine campaign continues the nearer we shall be to famine. Under these circumstances, therefore, our business, unlike Germany's, is with the calculable. We know that, in fact, for a population of our present size, an amount of food which can be easily estimated is necessary, and that if it is not imported from abroad, it must be produced at home. The simplicity of the matter is beyond dispute; and the conclusion to be drawn is that, unless we gamble with Germany in a way we must find ourselves bound to compete with nations that, even before the war, were almost our equals, and that, in consequence of the war, have become our superiors. And our recovery under these circumstances will be more slow and not by any means sure. The only consolation, in fact, that we can draw from our present situation is when we avert our eyes from the past and consider our present possibilities. From the very fact that the nation, as a whole, has become accustomed to luxuries as well as to necessities, we conclude that we have a liberal margin for economy outside the text of necessity.
unproductive than ever before, and for definite reasons perpetually being drawn off from them. Is it impossible existing organisations in the essential industries—both employers and workmen—to co-ordinate their efforts, to "comb" themselves out, and to call upon the Government only when they had failed, by their own economies, to find enough labour for their specified function. And we see that, in fact, precisely this plan has been adopted in Germany in the case of the boot and clothing industries, finding that in the industries the demand could be met (in the matter of labour) by organising the industries and pooling their resources, the German Government called upon the boot and clothing employers to arrange among themselves, by mutual compensating scheme, which factories should be suspended and which should be kept running: with this consequence, as we anticipate, that the supply of these commodities will be maintained in Germany even while labour is perpetually being drawn off from them. Is it impossible that what has been done in Germany should have been and still must be impracticable here? Everything else could have remained as it was before the war; and the only difference would have been that profits, hitherto personal, would have become public. The nation would have become a vast profit-sharing community. Suppose, on the other hand, that it had been decided to suspend Supply and Demand, and to produce (as we do for the Army) for use only, regardless of Wages and Profit. It would have been essential to be thorough about it. The Law of Supply and Demand (as Lord Devonport has discovered in the matter of potatoes) cannot be suspended here and admitted there without producing friction, and even stoppage of production. The whole nation would have had to be put on pay as the Army is, and rations would have had to be served out exactly as they are served out in the Army. The present "policy" of the Government, however, is a compromise between opposite policies. It is this to-day, it is the other tomorrow. At one moment Supply and Demand is suspended in respect of certain commodities; at another national service is introduced into a competitive system. Lord Devonport is charged with steering their boats under these directions, must often pray, as we do, that they may soon drift to harbour or sink.

The evil that men do lives after them; and Mr. Asquith is responsible for the opinion upon salaries just expressed by Mr. Bonar Law, and, again, for the opinion, still lower down the scale, of Mr. Hodge. "I think," said Mr. Bonar Law, "that in time of war any other time, a man who is doing work for the State can really be paid for. Both assumptions are, of course, absurd as they are proper only to the thoughtless. At a time when literally millions of civilians are performing work for the State without adequate payment, but without any payment whatever, it is in bad taste for a few individuals, discharging by self-selection a particular service, to claim for everybody the right to be paid, while only paying it has created. The matter, however, was simple if only some economist-statesman had been called in at the outset to advise. For what, in the main, has been only been the difficulty? It has been to make people having chosen, a transition, between the commercial economic system that prevailed before the war, and the real economic system that ought to prevail during the war. Before the war it was certain that production, distribution and exchange were governed wholly by the ordinary Laws of Supply and Demand; and the first question that should have been answered upon the outbreak of war was whether the nation should continue to depend upon Supply and Demand or adopt the system of Production for Use. Very pedantic, no doubt, these distinctions are, and are practically value. Let us suppose, for example, that it had been definitely decided, after a full view of the matter, that the Rule of Supply and Demand should continue in force. There were good reasons for the decision, and we might even have made it ourselves, but for failure against the judgment of common sense; and, above all, that they have not the flexibility of mind to change their course when they must see the error of it. It is a fact, that what has been done in Germany should have been essential to be thorough about it. The Law of Supply and Demand (as Lord Devonport has discovered in the matter of potatoes) cannot be suspended here and admitted there without producing friction, and even stoppage of production. The whole nation would have had to be put on pay as the Army is, and rations would have had to be served out exactly as they are served out in the Army. The present "policy" of the Government, however, is a compromise between opposite policies. It is this to-day, it is the other tomorrow. At one moment Supply and Demand is suspended in respect of certain commodities; at another national service is introduced into a competitive system. Lord Devonport is charged with steering their boats under these directions, must often pray, as we do, that they may soon drift to harbour or sink.

The evil that men do lives after them; and Mr. Asquith is responsible for the opinion upon salaries just expressed by Mr. Bonar Law, and, again, for the opinion, still lower down the scale, of Mr. Hodge. "I think," said Mr. Bonar Law, "that in time of war any other time, a man who is doing work for the State can really be paid for. Both assumptions are, of course, absurd as they are proper only to the thoughtless. At a time when literally millions of civilians are performing work for the State without adequate payment, but without any payment whatever, it is in bad taste for a few individuals, discharging by self-selection a particular service, to claim for everybody the right to be paid, while only paying
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Foreign Affairs.

By S. Verdad.

A WEEK or two ago Said Halim, the Grand Vizier of Turkey, resigned and his place was taken by Talaat Pasha. The new Grand Vizier made his first appearance in the Chamber on Friday last, and in the course of his speech said:

Our enemies have declared their intention of thrusting us back into the depths of Asia Minor, turning us out of Constantinople, and driving us from the Straits. To these ridiculous threats of our enemies, who took flight at the Dardanelles as a result of the defeat inflicted on them by our valiant army, we reply that we shall not relinquish Constantinople as long as there is a single Ottoman left. We shall persevere in this gigantic struggle in close fraternity of arms with our brave and victorious allies until we have compelled our enemies to recognise our right to existence.

On the 13th inst. Djavid Bey, the Finance Minister, addressed the Senate and emphasised the close relations existing between Turkey and Germany. He stated that since the outbreak of the war the advances from Germany and Austria to Turkey amounted to £79,000,000, repayable eleven years after the conclusion of peace. Apart from this item, Germany had promised to provide Turkey with funds for re-organisation after the war; and, added Djavid:

If these hopes are realised, if we succeed during the years following the war in securing for our country too of 120 million pounds, then, provided that this money is spent on agriculture, railways, and the building of roads and factories, Turkey will be able in ten years to cover her ordinary expenditure and the interest on the sinking fund, on the national debt, and on the debts contracted during the war.

After which it is not surprising to hear that the Senate forthwith adopted a bill "authorising the Government to accept from Germany advances of £74,500,000 and to issue £3,000,000 worth of banknotes." The banknotes, went on Djavid Bey, "were not paper money, but notes which would be cashed by Germany in gold, and he expressed his surprise that the value of these notes was decreasing and that the public were offering these pounds for one pound in gold. We must clearly recognise that Talaat's rhetoric was, so to speak, confirmed in anticipation by Djavid's figures; for even in peace time the Entente Powers would never have dreamt of furnishing Turkey with loans amounting to nearly eighty millions in two and a half years.

What have we ourselves done towards this? Our forces in Egypt have inflicted at least three decisive defeats on the Turkish troops drawn from bases in Palestine; and our armies on the Suez front are sufficiently strong and active to threaten the frontiers of Palestine itself. Our expedition in Mesopotamia is as a large overseas undertaking of the kind as we have ever made ourselves responsible for, with the single exception of the Boer War expedition. Despite the surrender at Kut last spring, our armies in Mesopotamia have been kept well up to strength, and the sanitary and other services connected with them have been re-organised. The result has been that large forces of Turks have been deflected from the Caucasus and the Russian front proper, and are still being held.

Generally speaking, our non-European expeditions, once they were seriously taken, have been well managed. The British Army has been organised and trained during the last century precisely for warfare of this kind.

And Russia? So far as Asia Minor is concerned, the Russian armies have been held back by the pro-German elements at home. The onlooker has the impression that the Caucasian armies lately under the command of the Grand Duke Nicholas could easily sweep the Turks and their German officers from Erzerum to the sea, and that the Turks in the field were adequately supported by the home authorities. And the onlooker's impression would be right; and it would be applicable to the Riga-Danube front as well as to the Caucasian front.
Solace from the Past

II.

Three weeks afterwards some members of the Levant Company called at the Council Board to find out what had happened, and were blandly asked if their ships were ready. Of course they were, was the answer. We are waiting for your convoy! Their Lordships replied that they had at the disposal of the merchants a squadron of six men-of-war, and for further information referred them to the Earl of Nottingham. On being approached, the Secretary of State was pleased to say that the French had lately been greatly reinforced in the Mediterranean, so that it might be worth the Company to consider whether it was prudent to risk such a vast estate with such a small expectation of a safe conduct to the Mediterranean. All considered this suggestion at a General Court, and withdrew, that the Cabinet might discuss the matter.

The pleasure of the merchants must have equalled their surprise when, on the 14th of November, the Lords of the Admiralty informed them that the escort was nearly ready, and advised that their ships should be in the Downs by the 1st of December. It looked as if the Government meant business at last, and was so much in earnest that it did not even scruple to break the Sabbath. The merchants were invited to attend a Cabinet meeting at Kensington on Sunday, the 11th of December.

To Kensington accordingly they went, and found His Majesty's Ministers deliberating under His Majesty's own presidency. The question was put to them, whether they considered a convoy of twelve English and six Dutch men-of-war a sufficient protection for their fleet. The merchants answered that, if six or seven third-rates were added, they thought it would be safer. Whereupon they were ordered to withdraw, that the Cabinet might discuss the matter.

After a while they were called in again, and once more the question was put to them, now in a definite form: whether they were content to proceed with the escort of eighteen ships already mentioned. Seeing that there was no alternative, the merchants unanimously answered that they were content, if a greater force could be granted; and seized the opportunity to press the question whether they were content to proceed with the escort of twelve English and six Dutch men-of-war a sufficient protection. The Company had been forced to meet its obligations in Turkey with money taken up at an extravagant interest. 'It is easy to imagine the sigh of relief with which the members of the Levant Company bade God-speed to the expedition, when we consider what those delays had meant for them. In the first place, they were under agreement with the ships in their service to allow them demurrage at the rate of nearly £3,000 for each month they lay in harbour. Then there was the cost of the Embassy at Constantinople which amounted to at least £10,000 a year, besides incidental charges unavoidable in a country where nothing could be done without bakshish. Normally, these expenses were defrayed by a duty levied upon trade; when trade ceased, the springs of revenue ran dry, and recourse had to be had to loans. For two years past the Company had been forced to meet its obligations in Turkey with money taken up at an extravagant interest. It had contracted a debt of over £20,000 at from 12 to 15 per cent. And the merchants had replied that they were content, if a greater force could not be granted; and seized the opportunity to press again for a speedy departure.

From that point things moved with unwonted rapidity. In reply to a question given to the Company's ships to be in the Downs by the 1st of January. They were in the Downs by the middle of that month. Thence they sailed, with the first fair wind, for the Spithhead, where they arrived about the 10th of February. Needless to say, the Levant Company's were not the only ships that had been kept in suspense all this time. During the year 1692 great fleets belonging to England and her Allies, had been gathering in our harbours, in the expectation of a safe conduct to the Mediterranean. All these vessels now looked eagerly to the English Admiralty for the long-deferred signal. The English Admiralty seemed anxious not to disappoint the hopes built upon it. On the 14th of February the Commissioners, in reply to a question from the Turkey merchants, declared that the escort had orders to set out with the first fair wind; and, what sounded more reassuring still, Vice-Admiral Rooke, who had been appointed to the command of that squadron, was sent down in great haste.

But all these pleasant appearances proved deceptive. February passed, and March, and the Mediterranean squadron was delayed.

The Levant merchants' patience was exhausted. In great bitterness of spirit, they drew up, on the 13th of April, 1693, and offered 'Your Majesty's Princely consideration' a memorial, enumerating the enormous losses which they and the nation had sustained through these unconscionable and inexplicable delays. Nothing, however, came of this cry. The English men-of-war, in spite of the official declarations to the contrary, were not yet half manned or half provisioned. The Dutch men-of-war were still at Amsterdam. Thus, week succeeded week in sickening inaction, until a month later a member of the Levant Company, being at the Earl of Nottingham's office, was asked by the Secretary of State to inform his friends that on that very day (13th of May) several Lords of the Council were going down to Portsmouth to give orders for the Admiral's ships. Whether he set out to sail forthwith, and to take the merchantmen along with it; the idea being that the merchantmen should be convoyed by the whole Navy past Brest—Louis's naval basis on the Atlantic—and then proceed on their voyage as the Admirals would determine in the light of the intelligence they received about the enemy's movements.

And, in fact, on the 30th of May, the whole armament—70 ships of the line and about 30 frigates and smaller vessels, under the supreme command of Admirals Killigrew and Sir Ralph Delaval—were in the Downs by the middle of that month. Thence they lay in harbour. Then there was the cost of the Grand Fleet of the Allies as the Grand Fleet of the Allies were in sight of the Le Havre, having sailed from the Isle of Wight, accompanied by some 400 merchantmen—English, Dutch, Danish, Swedish, German and Flemish—richly laden for the markets of Spain, Italy, and Turkey.

It is easy to imagine the sigh of relief with which the members of the Levant Company bade God-speed to the expedition, when we consider what those delays had meant for them. In the first place, they were under agreement with the ships in their service to allow them demurrage at the rate of nearly £3,000 for each month they lay in harbour. Then there was the cost of the Embassy at Constantinople which amounted to at least £10,000 a year, besides incidental charges unavoidable in a country where nothing could be done without bakshish. Normally, these expenses were defrayed by a duty levied upon trade; when trade ceased, the springs of revenue ran dry, and recourse had to be had to loans. For two years past the Company had been forced to meet its obligations in Turkey with money taken up at an extravagant interest. It had contracted a debt of over £20,000 at from 12 to 15 per cent. And the merchants had replied that they were content, if a greater force could not be granted; and seized the opportunity to press again for a speedy departure.

From that point things moved with unwonted rapidity. In reply to a question given to the Company's ships to be in the Downs by the 1st of January. They were in the Downs by the middle of that month. Thence they sailed, with the first fair wind, for the Spithhead, where they arrived about the 10th of February. Needless to say, the Levant Company's were not the only ships that had been kept in suspense all this time. During the year 1692 great fleets belonging to England and her Allies, had been gathering in our harbours, in the expectation of a safe conduct to the Mediterranean. All these vessels now looked eagerly to the English Admiralty for the long-deferred signal. The English Admiralty seemed anxious not to disappoint the hopes built upon it. On the 14th of February the Commissioners, in reply to a question from the Turkey merchants, declared that the escort had orders to set out with the first fair wind; and, what sounded more reassuring still, Vice-Admiral Rooke, who had been appointed to the command of that squadron, was sent down in great haste.

But all these pleasant appearances proved deceptive. February passed, and March, and the Mediterranean squadron was delayed.

The Levant merchants' patience was exhausted. In great bitterness of spirit, they drew up, on the 13th of
They knew that "the common enemy of Christendom" was as resourceful as he was unscrupulous; and knowing that, they scanned the gazettes and listened to the gossip on 'Change with puckered brows.

What they read and heard was not calculated to diminish their anxiety. On the 1st of June the "London Gazette" published the disquieting report that the French Fleet had left Brest a full fortnight before ours had left the Isle of Wight, and this report was corroborated by statements which had already appeared in several foreign journals. As the days went by, rumours about the movements of the enemy's navy became more and more alarming. On the other hand, it was inconceivable that information which was public property ashore should have eluded the admirals afloat; and those admirals could be trusted to take their measures accordingly. The forces under their command were more than a match for the Brest Fleet, which was said to consist of 70 capital sail, besides bomb-ketches, fire-ships, and tenners. Even if that fleet effected a junction with the Toulon squadron, still the odds, so far as numbers went, were in our favour; and, numbers apart, was it not universally acknowledged that one English seaman was worth ten French ones?

Meanwhile, the Allied navy, and their precious charge sailed down the Channel, making such progress as the wind and the cumberomeness of the heavily-laden merchantmen permitted, neither seeing nor hearing anything of the enemy. So, in accordance with the original plan, on the 6th of June, when they were about fifty leagues off Land's End, the main body of the armament, under Killigrew and Delaval, turned back to guard the waters and coasts of England, leaving Sir George Rooke with his dozen English ships and Vice-Admiral Vandergoes with his half-a-dozen Dutch ones, to escort the floating magazines on the rest of their voyage.

The reappearance of the Grand Fleet in Tor Bay turned the anxiety of our merchants and of the general public into consternation. All the news that had reached London since the beginning of the month had gone to strengthen the suspicion that the French admiral's objective was not the shores of England, but England's riches afloat. His actual whereabouts was a matter of surprise; but it was manifest that the two English admirals in leaving that immense amount of wealth under the protection of so small a convoy had taken unnecessary risks. However, nothing could be done now to remedy their mistake—nothing except send the fastest sailer available to warn Sir George Rooke of his danger. This was done—as it appeared afterwards, in vain. On parting company with the main body of the armament, Rooke had steered southward, and, the weather being favourable, had made good headway in the direction of Gibraltar, so that the warning from home never reached him. Nor did he see anything in the Atlantic to excite his apprehensions.

For ten days the Allies sped along, and, the weather being favourable, had made good headway in the direction of Gibraltar, so that the warning from home never reached him. Nor did he see anything in the Atlantic to excite his apprehensions.

What they read and heard by numbers, their gallant self-sacrifice, assisted by the advent of night, saved them. The bulk of the Allied squadron, and enabled Sir George Rooke to reach Madeira with only one loss. But things went very ill with the hapless merchantmen. Like a flock of frightened geese they had scattered over the ocean in every direction, seeking shelter wherever such could be found. Some fled south to Faro, St. Lucar, and Cadiz; others north to Corunna and Cork. Thirty-six fell into the hands of the enemy, go perished under his fire, and four of the Levant Company's best ships, which had run under the Rock, on realising the hopelessness of escape were sunk by their own crews in the Mole of Gibraltar.

From Madeira Sir George Rooke dispatched home H.M.S. "Lark" with the news of his misfortune.

(To be continued.)

Some Considerations on Class Ideologies.

I. There has been made, in previous articles, an attempt to show what are some of the principal elements in any possible social life which tend against the resolution of the existing situation otherwise than by means which would intensify the prevailing class-domination. We have seen that in face of these factors collectivist schemes, as currently promulgated, suffered collapse.

What, then, becomes of the National Guilds scheme when we have measured the strength of that element to which we have been constrained specially to attend—property?

When the question arises of the possible establishment of some desirable state of affairs like social freedom, and it is seen that it incurs the resistance of something inherent in the nature of things, or particularly in human nature, it is usual to turn to recorded history. We look for an example of an institution which has stood the test of continued existence, but which has yet embodied some of the main principles which enter into the project now in contemplation. This is the resort of those in especial who see in National Guilds a solution of the antagonisms of capitalist society. There was a time, they point out, when a guild organisation of industry prevailed and flourished. The answer to our question, then, would be that this was so in a society in which property was, though in different forms, or recognised in different ways, as definitely present as it is to-day, or is likely to be. Thus, even if it were to be shown that this guild system came to an end precisely by the development of activities involving a certain acquisition and use of proprietary rights, it might not be on that account unreasonable to expect that a social order, in which certain of the characteristic features of that system are reaffirmed against some of these later developments, may be possible of achievement.

But it is understood that, among the means by which this system could be established, the definite and organ-
ised activity of a class, the proletariat, is essential. As such an activity it must be selected as against alternatives. Thus, the sustained effort required will be limited by an ignorance on the part of present alternatives. Such activity is readily occurring among the members of that class. Although more or less unconscious changes are characteristic of important historical developments, yet for the thwarting of such changes the conscious and deliberate adherence to other ways of a very limited number of individuals is normally sufficient to be efficient. Is there reason to suppose that the suggestion of solitary economic freedom, strong as is its inhibitory effect even if its positive possibilities are negligible, is likely to become weaker concurrently with the development of the situation? Is there not the clear probability, when we consider the multiplicity of difficulties and crises incident to this development, of its growing stronger?

To these questions an answer has been given whose facility it would seem to be which has recommended it to some minds. This is a solution suggested by the literature of "scientific socialism." What is the proletariat? It is the dispossessed of the "poor," the people with no stake in the country. But, again, what is capitalism if it is not a system of society in which a proletariat is continuously manufactured and maintained? Let capitalism prevail for a sufficient time, and the members of that class will have lost the desire to own by mere disuse. The tradition will have disappeared.

It might be sufficient to reply that in that event the conditions of freedom have likewise disappeared. A class which was defined by its passivity and its mere lack could not be thought capable of any deliberate activity. It is not the fact that there has not been found possible to imagine an "economic emancipation of the proletariat" without taking inclusive account of the activities of people who simply cannot be defined as the "have-nots." Those, for instance, who advocate the "guild" solution have only been able to suggest a feasible method of acquiring the control of industry by bringing in what they call the "salariat." In fact, the proletariat has now to be understood to mean the class of those whose industrial, or generally productive, activities are carried on without an owner's interest in the process. Their only investment here is in the production itself. But here arises the difficulty that among the individuals connected with such a class there are many who are of another class than this at the same time; in whom opposing interests meet. Now it is individuals that must be considered when it is a question of organised activity. There is accordingly as little to be said for neglecting the possible force of the suggestion of ownership upon the "salariat" as there is much to be said in favour of presuming upon the absence of such motive in the case of the poor.

What, then, can the proletariat be expected to do? We are now face to face with the whole question of what have been called class-ideologies. We are not done with a class when we have recognised its place in the economic system. We have certainly not thereby put ourselves in a position to estimate its relation to possible social changes. For that we must look to the social estimations and variations in status of certain institutions and customs which are historically correlated with the predominance of various economic interests. What, then, is the "ideology" of the proletariat? Is there any?

The pure negative definition of that class, which was assumed in the doctrine we examined above, reveals a neglect of the reality of other aspects of a class than its economic basis. The "scientific socialists" taught that the key to society was to be found in its class-structure, and, further, that social classes were to be distinguished from one another by reference to economic considerations. Yet, the whole purport of Marxism, and of those other theories which follow it on this point, is that the nature of a class is no longer reckoned by the whole civilisation which is bound up with its economic predominance. This it will not be misleading to call its "ideology" if we bear in mind that by that is meant not a set of first principles clearly conceived and deductively applied to life, but something which is customary and traditional in its operation. Yet withal, if the general theory is sound, we should even now be able to attach some positive social meaning to the emancipation of the proletariat. Unless we can find that the proletariat "stands for" something, we shall have to consider as merely a custom or actio
tion of individuals who are not owners of capital. There will be simply the classes of those who have succeeded in realising a certain aim in life, and those who, with exactly the same aim, have failed. This is, indeed, the common view. In this event no new type of civilisation is to be imagined. Marxism cannot have it both ways. If the proletariat is so negative as to have no tendency to backsliding, or going off on other lines of development than that prescribed, that means that there is in it no power of social development at all.

There are peculiar difficulties in the way of an attempt to estimate the character of a civilisation based on the economic emancipation of the proletariat, or on the attempt to realise it. In respect to other classes we have whole epochs of history at our disposal. For it can now be recognised that it is rather from the civilisation of an epoch than from the ideas and habits of the individual representatives of the interest therein predominant that the real nature of that interest is to be ascertained.

We are by this time sufficiently familiar with the fulminations of the enlightened against "middle-class morality." There is, doubtless, some advance to be recorded where we discover that fault is found with the "middle-class" instead of the "conventional" character of what is objected to. Only, before we are too generous, let us take care that there is no confusion; for it is readily assumed in views of this type that it is only "middle-class" morality that is conventional, and that other sorts are "creative," "individual," "constructive," "poetical," and all the rest of the bag of tricks. Do that as it may, there are many people who cannot find it in them to behave like shopkeepers, and tell us they won't be made to, or (with some self-con
duction) won't allow their minds to be formed and disposed to do.

Such outpourings of the spirit do no more than reach the fringe of the question. For we have also, in studying "middle-class morality," to consider the position of the people who deal with shopkeepers, great or small, those who are employed by them, those who would like to be successful shopkeepers and can't, or those who are unable to see any alternative to a shopkeeping society. Few of the enlightened fail to come under several of these heads, or others similar. But, in truth, most ideas current about class "morali
ties" get no further than descriptions of the individual people reckoned as members of the several classes. This is the weakness of such works, admirable as Sombart's "Quintessence of Capitalism," which aims at giving the history and psychology of the modern business man. "Psychological" explanations of this kind can only tell us, in the end, how it is that a given individual comes to belong to one class rather than another, or why one man and not another is to be found in a given class in society. Much the same must be said of the explanations by heredity of class-distinctions or of the formation of orders of men, such as are to be gathered from the writings of Nietzsche, and are revealed in its authors, E. H. Virtual and George Meredith. But for an explanation of the foundations of Capitalism as a social order, it is not sufficient to point to a certain
quality or set of qualities inhering in certain individuals and simply absent from all others. It is necessary to understand in all its complex conditions the passivity of the proletariat, as well as the activity of the capitalist class. Why do workers look on wage-labour as a natural duty? Whence the maximum, “A fair day’s work for a fair day’s wage”? Why is this the order? In short, “bourgeois morality” is a system for all or none. Everyone has his place in it. There is quite clearly much in it that is not prescribed to capitalists at all, but to the proletariat. How often, besides, do we not hear from people “in the know” about the extent to which its most sacred precepts are binding only on the proletariat, and not at all on captains of industry? In this Sombart, indeed, sees signs of the break-up of capitalism. The capitalist spirit seems to be leaving us when there comes to be a wide deviation of the standards of the private life of the business man from those he follows, or latterly makes more and more a matter of machinery, in his business. Is this really a sign of the break-up of capitalism? Only if we make capitalism, in the way suggested, mean the existence of certain mental states in certain men. Rather we may believe to see in such a tendency the articulation of capitalism, its systematic consolidation. Why should we waste good moral energy by expending it indiscriminately all day? In any case, investment is necessary to capitalism as well as “business,” and there is no sign of its disappearance.

The idea of the emancipation of the proletariat assumes the disappearance of classes in the sense heretofore considered. It is the last class to be emancipated. Thus, there is no whole social order in history to which we can look for the purpose of finding what might be the characteristic features of another class. That this “proletarianizing,” or the exploitation of man by man, was absent as a general principle. It is mainly to conditions and tendencies in the present proletarian status, under which the “salariat” is brought at the same time, that we must look for such information.

Now, when we consider the views of most of those who have hitherto professed to see in the proletariat the salvation of society we find that, stripped of their revolutionary phraseology, they amount to a general principle. It is mainly to conditions and tendencies in the present proletarian status, under which the “bourgeois” formula of natural rights! Morris, perhaps, does not do that, but he would make use of the hapless proletariat to much the same purpose. All this is rather imposing upon a class which we think it ought to stand for, than dealing with things as they are.

It would, again, be carrying the application of evolutionary conceptions to society to the point of absurdity to expect that those who find in economic classes the main principle of social development should look to see in the modern proletariat some sort of preformation of a social order which might supervene upon the capitalist. Nevertheless, unless the negative definition assigned to the proletariat in the economic world is to be carried over into the whole field of its social capacities, if by its emancipation we are not to mean the mere negation of social institutions, like property or the family, or, in general, the state of affairs given classic expression in the formula “in society—communism, in religion—atheism, in politics—republicanism,” there must be some means of discovering, from the prevailing conditions of this class, some hint as to the positive features of a distinctive social order which that emancipation, or the process of attempting it, would make possible.

W. ANDERSON.

The British Consular Service.

V.

We have seen how the system of uncontrolled office allowances results in the under-staffing of British Consulates, in the aggravating the unpleasantness of their situation, and in lowering the dignity and efficiency of the Service. But, in this connection, there has been at least some recognition of the necessity for reform, and we are comforted by the knowledge that, when the existing Consular furniture has at length been broken up for firewood, everything purchased for office use since April, 1914, will remain the property of the Consulate, and cannot be removed or sold by the outgoing official, unless he can prove that his purchases after that date were not made out of his office allowance. It will not be difficult to make such a claim, inasmuch as no check whatever has been placed over the expenditure in question since the new order was made. However, if honesty in these matters suddenly prevails, British Consulates in existence prior to April, 1914, will, in the course of years, naturally become the absolute owners of, possibly, a typewriter—if a new machine has by accident been acquired subsequent to the order—and a few trifles of less utility. Needless to say, very little has been purchased subject to the new rule, and, except in the case of young officials recently appointed to independent Consulates, the men who have been misusing public funds for the greater part of a lifetime are not going to be caught napping. Since they do not scruple to falsify the returns of their office equipment, and charge the taxpayer for newspapers and periodicals which cannot even be borrowed by their staff, though ostensibly for official use, it is improbable that they will leave much to their successors.

The “graft” which they are encouraged to extract from their office allowance is not the only form of loot practised by His Majesty’s Consular corps. In every Consulate there is displayed a table of fees, from which the public may learn the charges made for the various services performed. A Consular fee stamp to the value of the amount paid is affixed to the document which has required attestation, or to the receipt, in the case of other services, and no fee can be taken without this form of acknowledgment. The total amount of fees received must correspond to the value of the fee stamps issued to each Consulate, subject to certain deductions. All fees charged under Parts I and II of the Table, that is, for compulsory services, go direct to the Foreign Office, but those charged under Parts III and IV go, either wholly, or partly, into the pocket of the senior Consular officer. The intention of this differentiation was excellent, as the fees under Parts III and IV are mainly for extra and voluntary services, such as translations, attendance to ships, or other business, outside the office, or during hours when the Consulate is closed. In short, the retention of all, or a part, of these fees is a payment for overtime, designed to compensate for the inconvenience and labour involved by the discharge of emergency duties.

In practice, this arrangement has fostered one of the most scandalous abuses in the Civil Service, the sweating of Consular employes by officials anxious to augment their income, not in their own spare time, but in the spare time of their staff. The evil is most prevalent in seaports, where the Consul’s business lends itself to a demand for the services specified under Parts III and IV of the Table of Consular Fees. Every British ship which remains more than forty-eight hours in a foreign port must deposit its articles and registry from capitalistic "fruits of the British Consulate's business" pay off or sign on men in the presence of a Consular officer, whose chief function in any port is to represent the Board of Trade, and to administer the laws imposed by the Merchant Shipping Acts. The chief source of revenue to the Consular Service are the fees payable
for services performed in accordance with the provisions of these Acts, and Consuls are naturally desirous of getting as large a "take off" as possible within the limitations of the regulations. They remain within the law, but succeed in deflecting public revenue, and grossly exploiting both the salaried and unsalaried officers under their jurisdiction. It will be simpler to illustrate their methods by actual example than by a general and theoretic statement of the facilities for evil conferred upon them.

Obviously the first step is to arrange that as much business as can be transacted outside the Consulate shall be done after, if not during, office hours, preferably the former. In shipping work this is easily accomplished by a tacit or definite understanding with the person who supplies seamen for British ships. When the latter are commissioned by a captain to procure twenty or thirty men to complete or make up a crew, they proceed to make a tour of the various boarding houses, saloons, and seamen's resorts, until they have made up the requisite number of men. When satisfied that the material will be forthcoming, they inform the person who has engaged the night before the vessel sails, nor does he wait for the regular hours of the office. If they do sign on the office all day is compelled to devote the evening to earning extra fees for the Consul, who does not give a penny of the money to the person who actually does the work.

One Consul-General, in a very busy port, used to make from £500 to £600 a year out of fees so extra. But he was an expert in the art of grafting. The Vice-Consul, who looked after the shipping, used frequently to be engaged on "outside work" for several days in succession, during which time the other Vice-Consul had to undertake his extra duties. The Vice-Consul would then take the time off and go to the office, while the Consul-General sat in his private room calculating the revenue he would receive from the extra fees. The "shipping master" was saved the trouble of performing the service for which he is exorbitantly paid, namely, procuring and delivering the men, for, by signing them on board the ship is about to leave, he is saved the trouble and responsibility of seeing that they join the ship at the appointed time, and that all he has to do is to give orders for one of the Vice-Consuls to be on board to sign them on. This ceremony usually takes place at daylight, so that the vessels may lose no time on the journey, and the Consul-General, glad to pocket the ten shillings per hour allowed for such attendance, ordered one of the staff to be on board at whatever time the "shipping master," or pimp, expects to have the men assembled. He never inquires why the men are not engaged the night before the vessel sails, nor does he order them to be brought to the Consulate the previous afternoon, so that they may sign on the articles during the regular hours of the office. If they do sign on beforehand, his good friend the pimp declares they cannot come to the Consulate, and somebody must attend to them on board, so a man who has been busy in the office all day is compelled to devote the evening to earning extra fees for the Consul, who does not give a penny of the money to the person who actually does the work.

When the latter are commissioned by a captain to procure twenty or thirty men to complete or make up a crew, they proceed to make a tour of the various boarding houses, saloons, and seamen's resorts, until they have made up the requisite number of men. When satisfied that the material will be forthcoming, they inform the person who has engaged the night before the vessel sails, and, instead of ordering his ship to sail, that all he has to do is to give orders for one of the Vice-Consuls to be on board to sign them on. This ceremony usually takes place at daylight, so that the vessels may lose no time on the journey, and the Consul-General, glad to pocket the ten shillings per hour allowed for such attendance, orders one of the staff to be on board at whatever time the "shipping master," or pimp, expects to have the men assembled. He never inquires why the men are not engaged the night before the vessel sails, nor does he order them to be brought to the Consulate the previous afternoon, so that they may sign on the articles during the regular hours of the office. If they do sign on beforehand, his good friend the pimp declares they cannot come to the Consulate, and somebody must attend to them on board, so a man who has been busy in the office all day is compelled to devote the evening to earning extra fees for the Consul, who does not give a penny of the money to the person who actually does the work.

Once a Consul has found it profitable to encourage the belief that his staff can be called upon to work overtime, irrespective of emergencies and cases of absolute necessity, the business of the Consulate tends increasingly to come under the provisions of Parts III and IV of the Table of Consular Fees. Not only "shipping masters," to whose advantage it is, but all sorts of people having regular dealings with the Consul fall in, voluntarily or involuntarily, with his profiteering system. People who might have been taught to call during office hours for the transaction of their affairs, develop the habit of telephoning at the last moment to announce that they will be coming to the Consulate, which must be kept open for their convenience. As the Consul receives five shillings for each hour his staff remains, though he may leave punctually, he is far from discouraging such visitors. A parallel would be the case of a bank whose manager let it be understood that no attention need be paid to the official hours, as customers had only to send a message to have the place kept open indefinitely. Consular officials who observe the punctual closing of doors in our banks and other public institutions, and see their colleagues in the Home Service leaving regularly after the day's work which they have been chartered to perform, must wonder what is to be done when their superiors are not only not entitled to such a system, but are rightly guaranteed to Civil Servants in exchange for certain curtillements of liberty and ambition. The Consular Service knows none of the traditional advantages of Government employment.

Apart from these, whose laziness, carelessness, or interest enable them to benefit by this disorganisation, there are people who submit to it through ignorance. Like so many others, they are ignorant of the nature of Consular work, and are not in a position to judge whether it is being done as it should be. If they see on a Consular receipt that a charge has been made under Part IV, they have no means of knowing exactly when fees of that class are payable, and even if they are sufficiently curious to read the Table of Fees, they may assume that these payments are made to the official who undertakes the extra duty, and are a recognised part of his emoluments. For example, a firm of brokers, whose experience of the Consular Service was by no means limited, submitted for years to an abuse of the extra fee system, in circumstances that seem incredible. It was the duty of this firm to get certain papers certified by the Consul as soon as goods in port. The loading usually was completed late in the evening, after the Consulate was closed, and regularly before closing time they notified the Consul that they would be bringing documents during the following day. The Consul closed until he signed the papers, the Consul charged these people the fee of ten shillings per hour for "attendance," and, knowing that his signature would not be required until several hours after closing time, he proceeded to his residence in the country, about an hour's journey from the city. One of his Vice-Consuls would then sit in the Consulate waiting for the arrival of the papers, which were then taken to the Consul, although the Consul's signature was equally valid. The train service was very intermittent, and often three hours would elapse between the time the papers were received from and returned to their owners. This period, plus whatever number of hours the Vice-Consul had to wait in the Consulate, was charged to the firm, who seemed quite unaware that no fee could be levied for time lost during the Consul's absence. One of his Vice-Consuls often worked literally from daybreak to sunset.

In addition to the gross injustice of this premium upon sweating, there are many reasons why the retention of fees should not be permitted. Even were a portion of the fee received by the official who has earned it, the system is a bad one. It is not possible to check such fees, as nobody can decide whether a case really necessitates attention after office hours, except those financially interested in proving that it does, or rather did, for the matter could not be passed upon
by a disinterested authority until long after the event. A Consul who has one or more members of his staff out half the day, or all day, earning profits, must deplete by so many his already under-manned office. In the average Consulate, where there are at best two Vice-Consuls capable of attending to the wants of the public, the absence of one throws far too much work upon the other. In the extra, he will be forced to work all day without food, there being noody to relieve him at lunch time. If, on the other hand, there is not a rush of work in the Consulate itself, it is ridiculous for one Vice-Consul to be sitting idle and bored, while his colleague is signing on crews or performing some other busy duty. They would be, if the Consul did not find it more lucrative to exploit his employes. If the crew which is being signed on by a Vice-Consul on board the ship were brought to the Consulate, the fees chargeable would all go to the Foreign Office. By the other method the Consul gains so much for the time occupied in getting to and from the vessel, as well as for the time on board, where there is often a wait of several hours, while men are being collected.

That this particular form of graft is an abuse of well-intentioned but unintelligent regulations is evident from the fact that there is no proportion between the gross fees levied and the portion retained by the Consul. At New Orleans, for instance, out of some £2,000 gross fees, £1,500 were retained, while at New York only £42 went to the Consul-General out of a fee total of £5,850. This significant fact was mentioned at the Royal Commission on the Civil Service in 1914, and demonstrates how slight is the relation between the business of a port and what is ostensibly a charge for extra work. The Consular profiteers could never adequately express their amazement at the innocence of their New York colleague, who deliberately reduced outside work to the minimum actually contemplated by the regulations. It is a serious reflection that questions so vitally important to the welfare of the Consular Service as a whole, and so profoundly affecting its personnel, should be left to the impulse of men utterly devoid of any spirit of public or national service.

George Berkeley.

The Value of Nationality.

By Ramiro de Maistu

We have shown the essential arguments of the Teutonic theory of nationalities. We call the "Teutonic theory" that of Dr. Spann, because it coincides with the official point of view of the Central Empires in the present discussion on the reorganisation of Europe. The arguments of this theory are four in number:

1. The nation is a community in respect of cultural products (science, philosophy, religion, art, and morality).
2. The nation is a gradual concept, both in extent and concept.
3. The value of every nation is that of its cultural products.
4. Corollary: the right of nations to be recognised is measured by the value of their cultural products.

We have already seen that the fallacy of this theory must be sought in its first and fundamental affirmation. The nation is not a community of cultural products but a community in an historical situation. A nation is born when, in the course of history, the individuals of one collectivity feel themselves to be politically solidarity as opposed to others. Where there is a group of individuals who prefer autonomous government to government from outside, there is a nation. What the principle of nationality says that every group which aspires to political autonomy has a right to it.

Such was the proclamation of Mazzini, the great apostle of nationalities. And the recognition of the principle of nationality in the Allies' Declaration does not mean, and cannot mean, anything else.

I should mention that the manner in which Mazzini formulates his principle does not seem to me accurate. I do not believe that a nation has a subjective right to govern itself; for I do not believe in subjective rights, either those of men, those of authority, or those of nations. But the principle of nationality may be formulated in this other way: "It is the duty of all men and of all States to respect the wish of a group of men who desire to govern themselves autonomously." Formulated in this way, autonomy ceases to be a subjective right. It is an act of will which must be respected by other wills in so far as it does not contradict the natural or rational principles of legislation.

But, while the Allies' Declaration affirms the principle of nationality for the peoples of Europe—Italians, French, Poles, Czechs, Slavs, Slovaks, etc.—it denies it to the Turks, asking for their expulsion from Europe and the liberation of the peoples—the Armenians, the Arabs, and the Syrians—who suffer under their yoke. We have here an apparent contradiction, which is not solved, and cannot be solved, in the Allies' Declaration. For this Declaration is not a treatise on the principles of nationalities, but merely a memorandum of the objects aimed at by one group of belligerents in the war.

This contradiction need not vex the public, for the public knew very well that the Czechs and the Roumanians and the Slavs and the Italians and the French behave in their political life in a very different style from the Turks, who never hear themselves spoken of in the world except by way of protest against their atrocities. Hence, no arguments are required to convince the public that the respect of European nations should be confined to one another and not extended to the Turks.

And the ground for the Allies' demand that the Turks should be expelled from Europe is none other than their continual violation of the most elementary principles of civilisation. When the Young Turks came on the scene in 1908 the world cherished the hope that the massacres of Christians in the Turkish Empire would cease. The hope was disappointed. The worst Sultans of Turley never split more Christian blood than the members of the Committee of Union and Progress. We may prove this one of these days by documentary evidence. What interests us now is the problem of principles, in view of the contradiction in the Allies' Declaration. If European nationalities must be respected, why not Turkish nationality also?

The answer is not difficult. It is not a question of destroying Turkish nationality, but of preventing the Turkish State from butchering Christians. It is the Turkish State which has become a negative value, that is to say, a positively evil value. For that reason it must be reduced.

This distinction between nation and State solves in a satisfactory manner the apparent contradiction. The principle of nationality says, in effect, that the will of any nation which wishes to form itself into a State must be respected. What it does not say is that we must respect the sovereignty of every State, even when such sovereignty is exercised to the scandal of civilisation. And, while a nation is merely a potential value, deserving of respect simply because it is a potential value, a State, on the other hand, is an active value and must be judged by its acts. A nation is like a child. A child is of no actual value, for it neither produces nor preserves value—and in my opinion it is absurd to speak of the "right" of a child to exist, as it is a potential value, in so far as it may, later on, produce or preserve values, it ought not to be destroyed; it is a crime to destroy it. In the same way,
it is a crime to destroy a nation; not because it is an actual value, but because it is a potential value.

But when a nation realises its aspiration of forming itself into a State it actualises its potentialities; and the State must then be judged by its works. Are they in harmony with the principles of civilisation? Then the State deserves respect. Are its works not in harmony with the principles of civilisation? Then it does not.

The German theory judges the value of nationalities without having previously respected them. This is as absurd as if I planted my two feet on the back of a man’s neck, as he lay on the ground and asked him: “What are you doing there, underneath my feet? Why, instead of complaining, do you not set yourself to produce a science, a philosophy, a religion, a morality, or an art that I can admire?”

The first thing to be done with nations is to respect them. Once they are respected, that is to say, once they have been placed in such an environment that they can exercise their function in the concert of peoples, once they have become States, then their potential value is transformed into an actual value, and they must be judged by their acts. A nation which is not a State cannot be judged by its acts, for it does not act as a nation. Only its individuals act in it. But when the nation has become a State its potential value has turned into actual value, which must be respected if it is positive and not respected if it is negative, as in the case of Turkey.

But even if the Turkish State is broken up at the end of the war, there should be no question of destroying Turkish nationality; for a nation should in no case be deliberately destroyed. In the case of a colony peopled by a backward race, the mother-country must seek to civilise it. What it must not do is to destroy its nationality, if such exists. To use force in order to denationalise a people, as has been done by Germany in the case of the Poles of the Province of Posen, is to commit one of the gravest sins of history.

It is possible that in the process of civilising a backward race it may develop a desire to identify itself with the civilising race. In such an event it could object to the growth of the civilising race. But it is also possible that in the process of being civilised the backward race may develop a consciousness of nationality distinct from that of the civilising race. In this case the nationality must be respected.

Every nationality is a potential value, and, as such, intangible and sacred.

**An Industrial Symposium.**

Conducted by Hustly 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 following two questions to representative public men and women:—

(i) 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?

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

(44) **Mr. W. Lionel Hitchens.**

(Chairman of Messrs. Cammell Laird & Co., Ltd.)

There are few problems more interesting to speculate upon than the industrial situation after the War; none where prophecy is more dangerous. For one cannot deduce that the inexorable logic of events will bring this or that conclusion. It goes without saying that we are in an age of violent upheaval, when old landmarks are vanishing, and the one certain fact is that things can never be the same again. The next few years after the War will be pregnant with great opportunities for good or for evil; the tide will be at the flood, and will carry us on to the black rocks of destruction, or to the calm waters of concord if each man learns to fulfil his appointed function as a member of the ship's company. An impartial student of the industrial situation before the War, and even during the earlier part of the War, would probably have favoured the hypothesis of shipwreck. 'For,' he would have argued, "the mass of the people are wholly incapable of making any real progress, and refuse to face the great industrial issue, just as they and their leaders refused to face the Irish question, the European question. They prefer to be carried down the swift stream of time, and to develop an abstract, philosophic or lethargic shrug of the shoulders, that there is bound to be trouble one day. ‘Let us, however, wait and see.’"

That way lies ruin, for the first essential is that all parties should desire, should have the will, to bring about a fair settlement. But does the will exist now? I believe it may be answered that the War has worked that miracle; that there is now a firm determination on the part of the leaders of Labour and of the employers to face and overcome the difficulties with which the problem is beset; and, what is of even more importance, it is clear that public opinion has been aroused, and has determined that matters shall be allowed to drift. For nothing is more significant than the prominence which is given to the industrial problem in the columns of the Press; it is no longer debated merely by a few enthusiasts—it has touched the imagination of the masses. And herein lies our chief hope that a solution will be found.

But one must not be carried away too far and forget that there can be no cut and dried solution of the problem, that no panacea will ever be found, as the enthusiasts of every new "ism" are apt to believe. It is important, in fact, to remember that the road must wind up hill all the way, even to the very end; that progress must be patient and continuous, "like the stars, without haste, without rest."

For the problem concerns the relation of ever-changing values of infinite complexity; hence constant adjustments, with consequent possibilities of friction, are inevitable. The principles of justice are eternal, but it needs just men to apply them in particular cases, and unless there is mutual trust and confidence on either side, we are really no nearer to a solution.

I have said that the first essential is that all parties should have the desire to bring about a fair settlement. The second, I would suggest, is that Labour and Capital should trust each other. While I think it is true to say that the leaders on either side have earned the respect and the confidence of those on the other, I should maintain that, speaking generally, Labour and Capital still regard each other with open suspicion, and not animosity. And the Governments of recent years have done little to allay, but much to engender, these suspicions. Briefly put, the attitude of Labour appears to be that the richer classes have no real understanding of their responsibilities. Vast masses of the population, it is urged, are poorly housed, poorly clad, underfed, and under-educated, while the few are clothed in purple and fine linen and fare sumptuously every day. This, they say, is the result of the system inaugurated by the industrial revolution and of the unrestricted working of the laws of political economy—the rich man's science. The richer classes are held responsible for having created these conditions, and are credited with the desire to perpetuate them. At the present moment there is a widespread suspicion among the working classes that employers are employing to secure military power for themselves, under the guise of national service, in order that they may drag down the employees into the condition of Prussian slaves. This suspicion is altogether without solid foundation, but that it should be widely believed is eloquent of the state of mind of the working classes, and, I am afraid, too, that class suspicions might spell national disaster.

Employers, on the other hand, are apt to talk of the sullen faces of the workmen, their lack of pride in their work, their idleness, their trade restrictions, their delibere limitation of output, of the ignorant selfishness...
which leads them to act as if wages should bear no relation to the value of the work produced, the uterine
indifference of many pieceworkers to good time-keeping so long as they can escape paying any tax. Esprit de corps, they say—a sense of loyalty to the firm that employs them—is considered bad form by the men, and a maximum wage with a minimum output tends more to the formation of a community among the workers.

Who shall say that either side is entirely wrong—or entirely right? How can we reasonably expect to find contentment and lofty ideals amongst uneducated people condemned to live in squalid surroundings? Surely some of the roots of the matter must lie here, and we must expect to reap what we have sown. Unless we have the common honesty to admit that these conditions are a disgrace to a civilised country—to any country with a real belief in democracy, and to which we have the courage to apply the remedy, cost what it may, we must expect, having sown the wind, to reap the whirlwind. Similarly, how can we workmen reasonably expect good wages if they do not give good work in return? For wages are not paid out of some inexhaustible treasure-house of the rich; they are the fruits of industry, and depend entirely on production. If everyone and determined to do no work, but live on his income, the world would swim in wealth, but sink in its own tears. It is, in fact, abundant evidence of bad organisation, I think, if industry is honestly to face its own short-comings and to show by its actions that it means to deal justly by the other, the existing suspicions will never be allayed, and we shall drift into the state that always befalls a house divided against itself.

The urgent need of the day is for statesmanship in industry. There has been a tendency in the past for the bigger employers to become too much immersed in their immediate concerns and to neglect the wider problems of industry; both employers and employed may receive a broader and more statesmanlike

such as questions affecting foreign or imperial trade, research, or the education of apprentices.

But there are many industrial questions which affect more than one industry, and there may be important functions to be performed by the recently formed Federation of British Industries as a federation of associations. There is, it appears to me, a tendency for this body to conflate its functions as an inter-trade federation with those of an individual trade association, and this tendency, if not checked, may lead to disaster which would be regretted by all those who recognise the possibilities that lie before this federation and who admire the foresight of those who initiated the movement.

This, in outline, appears to be the type of industrial organisation needed on the employers' side, and it is important that Labour should seek to develop something similar on the trade union side, in order that there may be the closest cooperation between Capital and Labour at every stage. For I would suggest that the fourth essential to a solution of the labour problem is that the closest relations between the organisation of employers and workers should not be a

so far as to make a square, or to pluck the fruit, it would bevisionary to suppose that employers and employed will always be able to compose their differences. Possibly even such complete accord, if attainable, could only be achieved at the expense of the consumer, who is the third party to all the transactions of industry. The State must therefore hold a watching brief, and, I submit, just as in all other walks of social life, be prepared to settle such differences as Labour and Capital cannot adjust for themselves. For, after all, the function of the Government of a State is to maintain the true balance between conflicting interests, not to follow slavishly the dictates of the majority, however paradoxical this may sound in its application to a democracy; and it is to the Government, as representing the principle that reason and order must prevail over violence and anarchy, that our supreme allegiance is due. I admit that the opposition to State intervention is strong, and, to secure cheerful acceptance, it would appear to be necessary that first the tradition of the existing distrust of politicians by both Labour and Capital should be removed. It would be outside the scope of this discussion to develop this theme, but, in brief, it is of far-reaching importance, for it is by reason of this distrust that powerful sections of the community attempt to justify their attitude in setting the law at defiance and negotiating secret agreements with the Government. This road leads toarchy.
Towards National Guilds.

The present paragraph is worth more than usual consideration, since it concerns personal liberty. The experience of sincere Liberals during the war has been of an unbroken series of bitter disappointments. Every right that had apparently been won by the individual has been ruthlessly invaded and conquered by the State until, in the end, the audacious doctrine was advanced that, as against the State, the individual has no right whatever. The disappointment at the discovery of the power of the State was only enhanced by the realisation that not even a good fight could be put up by the individual for his liberties. Everywhere he turned he found only forces either in league with his enemy, or themselves disarmed. The Press abandoned him, the friends were in the same peril as himself, and even wealth could not save him. But to see their protegé (for the solitary individual is the ewe lamb of the Liberal and Radical groups) done to death while they remained helpless spectators was a terrible experience of an unbroken series of bitter disappointments. Every Liberal and Radical group done to death while they don their thinking-caps for the first time since the days of Mill. How comes it, they ask, that the individual in these democratic days is so powerless against the State? Why is it that every barrier we counted upon has proved unable to defend our darling against the bureaucracy? The question is still being asked in Radical circles, and is still without a clear reply. But the reply is to hand, and, in fact, been knocking at their doors. Let us ask a question. Why is it that all the defences of the individual—the Press, the Church, the Trade Unions, etc.—went down like ninepins before the first demands of the State? Surely it was because not one of these bodies had an existence independent of the State. Each way, as it were, a mere county in the British State, and not a sovereign dominion in any degree. But this suggests the answer which we said was knocking for admission at the Radical gate. The only possible defence of the individual against the State is membership of a body of equal sovereignty with the State—a National Guild, for example. Can it be supposed that a National Guild charged with a national function would tamely submit its members to the absolute control of the bureaucracy which itself consists only of Guilds? Against the Civil Guilds of the State, which also shall be as simple as shelling peas. Very easily that we might not have seized the opportunity to insist upon retaining their rate of wages in view of the increasing shortage of labour and the intensified demand for coal. Yet we are told, as if it were a matter of course, that the reduction was agreed to. We wish our readers would file this paragraph for reference. Fleet Street would be dumb before it.

It is a mistake to suggest that we seriously object to the purchase by the capitalist classes of Labour leaders. A Labour leader who can be bought by any means whatever is a source of weakness to us, whether he is nominally on our side or against us. Thus, when Mr. Hodge assures us that he has the confidence of the employers and the "Times" calls him "the right man in the right place"—we smile at the transparency of the deception, and feel well rid of a man who has finished with Labour. What, however, is a little less amusing is the reflection that is cast upon the intelligence of our employing classes. For we wish to think well of them. But how is it possible, since they can persuade themselves to believe that a Mr. Hodge may be useful to them? In buying him, on the contrary, they have obtained less than nothing of the substance of the Labour movement. He is a mere throw-out. And when something serious arises in the affairs of Capital and Labour, and Mr. Hodge is expected by his new masters to deliver the goods, he will find himself crying in the wilderness with none of the rank and file to heed him.

Mr. Massingham recently detected in the writing of the Trade Union articles in the "Times" the hand of Mr. Webb. Later on, however, when he realised that the writer was objecting to the restoration of Trade Union rules, he concluded that it was some sinister person at work—and, hence, could not be Mr. Webb. In any event, nevertheless, the thing is a fact: the Trade Union regulations suspended during the war have been restored of it, and nobody can bring them to the clock to put its hands back; and this way, undoubtedly, will be followed by a good many conservative Trade Unions. The third way—and our way—is to admit frankly that the old rules have gone for good, but to see that the Trade Unions receive the equivalent in of new privileges.

* * *

"At meetings between workmen's representatives and employers at Newcastle yesterday, reductions in wages consequent upon the reduced selling price of coal were agreed to." Thus the "Observer" and other journals a few weeks ago. The event, however, ought not to be dismissed in a line or two without reflection; for surely we have here one of the thousand examples of the grandeur of working-classes. Were they the monsters of Fleet Street invention, how easily might they not have seized the opportunity to insist upon retaining their rate of wages in view of the increasing shortage of labour and the intensified demand for coal. Yet we are told, as if it were a matter of course, that the reduction was agreed to. We wish our readers would file this paragraph for reference. Fleet Street would be dumb before it.
Strachey, and denounced us as Utopians for imagining that Duty can be a substitute for Greed and Fear. We are Englishmen to whom the word Duty is not altogether uninspiring; and we have seen the Army. But that is not all the story. The English, we believe, have the most elevated and spirited, the most manly and delicate sense of Duty that any nation in history was ever possessed with; and its more familiar name is Playing the Game. The idea of Playing the Game is, we know, the most magical trumpet-call of the English soul. It will arouse them when nothing else in the world will. Our plan is simply to base our industry upon this motive of Playing the Game, and to require our guildsmen to play at industry as they play at war or cricket. The battle of Waterloo, we are told, was won upon English playing-fields. National Guildsmen assume that the same motive of good cricket will win for the nation any economic battle conducted under the rules of Sport or Manly Duty. Now you may laugh, Mr. Strachey! NATIONAL GUILDSMEN.

English Writers and the Jews.

A cursory glance at works of fiction written in this country reveals that within a large degree they abound with Jewish characters. But, also, one is immediately struck by the fact that they are nearly all bad characters. If an author is in search of a villain of a deep dye who could be checkmated by his hero towards the end of the book he finds a Lazarus Levy or Jacob Isaackstein close at hand extremely suitable for the purpose. He has but to endow the Jew with an unlimited quantity of cash and vices, and can rest assured that few readers will quarrel with him over the figure he has depicted. Even many Jews will not raise any dispute. It is remarkable how the Hebrews have become accustomed to being painted black, and, in many cases, they believe that they actually are as black as they are painted. But though the Jew may acquiesce in being maligned, the wicked Jew of English fiction with his Machiavellian schemes is not at all a reliable portrait. Writers always cast him in the same mould. Marlowe produced the model, and the Jew of the novelist is composed of immigrants of whose inner life we know next to nothing. We have read little concerning these Jews, who spurns him and spits at him, there were no Jews in England; King John had extracted from them their teeth and their money, and drove them out of the country. Not until Cromwell was Protector were they re-admitted. How was it possible for Shakespeare to play the Jew with veracity it is essential to depart from the rules of the Jewish religion and certain Jewish customs which distinguish the Chosen People from the rest of mankind; principally the Jewish religion and certain Jewish customs which are glaring anachronisms. Neither do we perceive that the writers comprehend the Jews’ traits which embody the artfulness of the Orient alloyed with the methodical commercial shrewdness of the West; they striving to live in Rome, and do as Rome does, but not in the Roman manner. And, if writers could only realise if, what a comic situation arises when people with such temperaments try to mingle with races possessing different ideals and aims. A deal of artificiality by its singularity, inspire works of art, is instrumental in merely giving ideas for puerile novels. To write of the Jew with veracity it is essential to depart from convention. Mr. Shaw has done this, and, as a result, in the “Doctor’s Dilemma,” we have an undistorted picture of a cultured Jew.

The unexplored field of Jewish life is vast. In England itself the greater part of the Jewish population is composed of immigrants of whose inner life we know next to nothing. We have read little concerning these toiling, wan folk, suffering, rejoicing, praying, hoping. Amongst their peculiarities the most striking is the assimilated; the modern Jewish captivated by the glamour outside the Gheto. The younger generation pushing itself where it is looked upon with aversion; these are but a few of the phases of Jewish life which stand out in relief. The writer who has the courage to deal with these phases frankly and without prejudice will be hailed as an audacious artist. For such a writer we are waiting. The great Jewish novel is yet to be written. J. Bulvar Schwartz.
II.—A MOUNTAIN GARRISON.

This long day’s ride was wearisome, but not so the night. I spent it in a village, and some very curious inns at a very curious hostelry, kept by a fat native Christian, named Elias, who laid claim, upon the signboard, to furnish food and lodging "alafraja"—that is, in the European manner. There was one large guestroom, and an adjoining bedroom of the same dimensions, for some thirty travellers. I had to find a stable for my horse elsewhere. A dining-table was provided, and we sat on chairs around it; but the food was nowise European, and the cooking was degraded Greek. A knife, fork and spoon were laid for every guest, but several cast these on the floor and used their fingers. In the long bedroom were a dozen beds on bedsteads. By day there were two, three, even four together. An elderly offering a trifle extra I secured one to my self. In others cast these on the floor and used their fingers. In the evening I had to find a stable for my horse, and an adjoining bedroom of the same dimensions, for some thirty travellers. I had to find a stable for my horse elsewhere. A dining-table was provided, and we sat on chairs around it; but the food was nowise European, and the cooking was degraded Greek. A knife, fork and spoon were laid for every guest, but several cast these on the floor and used their fingers.

"O man," he chided. "Art thou mad or what, thus to arouse our passions by thy talk of women? Be silent, or we hosen; men here present will wring thy neck and take thy woman from thee. Dost thou understand?" He shook that jealous husband as a dog shakes a rat.

"By Allah, well," was my reply. The jealous one was silent after that. But there were other noises to arouse our passions by thy talk of women? Be silent, or we hosen; men here present will wring thy neck and take thy woman from thee. Dost thou understand?"

"I call all here to witness that Rashid, the son of Ali, called the Fair, is free henceforth to go what way he chooses.

"To me he said: "Rashid is a good lad, and you will find him useful. The chief fault I have found in him is this: that, when obeying orders, he is apt to think, and so invent a method of his own, not always good. Also, he is too susceptible to female charms, a failing which has placed him in some strange positions."

"My son, praise Allah for thy great good fortune in finding favour in the sight of one so noble and benevolent as our beloved guest, who is henceforth thy master. Remember, he is not as one who has been what thou art, and so knows the tricks. Serve him freely with thy mind and soul and conscience, not waiting for commands as in the Army. Come hither, O my son, grasp hands with me. I say, may God be with thee now and always! Forget not all the good instruction of thy soldier days. Be sure that we shall pray for thy good master and for thee."

The last remark evoked much laughter, relating, evidently, to some standing joke unknown to me. Rashid looked rather sheepish. Hasan Agha turned to him, and said:

"My son, praise Allah for thy great good fortune in finding favour in the sight of one so noble and benevolent as our beloved guest, who is henceforth thy master. Remember, he is not as one who has been what thou art, and so knows the tricks. Serve him freely with thy mind and soul and conscience, not waiting for commands as in the Army. Come hither, O my son, grasp hands with me. I say, may God be with thee now and always! Forget not all the good instruction of thy soldier days. Be sure that we shall pray for thy good master and for thee."

The old man's eyes were wet, so were Rashid's, so were the eyes of all the soldiers squatting round.

Rashid, dismissed, went off to change his uniform for an old suit of mine which I had brought for him, while Hasan Agha, talking of him as a rather timid, explained to me his character and little failings.

At last, I took my leave. Rashid was waiting in my cast-off clothes, a new face of civilian shape upon his
head. He held my stirrup, and then jumped on to a raw-boned beast which had been "borrowed" for him by his friends, so he informed me. It might be worth my while to buy it for him, he suggested later, the price was only eight pounds Turk. The whole garrison escorted us to the last houses, where they stood a long while, waving their farewells. Two hours later on the mountain-ridge, beyond the wady, we turned to look at our last on Kasamayn. It stood amid the flames of some castle of the clouds.

We returned, then, to the "alafranga" hosteltry; but Rashid, having heard the story of my sleepless night, would not allow me to put up there. I paid my debt to the proprietor, and then he found for me an empty house to which he brought a mattress and a coverlet, a lot of cushions, a brazier, and the things required for making coffee, also a tray of supper—all of them borrowed from the neighbouring houses. I might be pilgraged, brought to destitution, and eventually murdered by him, as my friends had warned me. At least, the operation promised to be comfortable.

We Moderns.
By Edward Moore.

The Old Gods. Perhaps there is too much made of anthropomorphism. Man's first gods were not "human" gods; they were stars, animals, plants, and the like. It was not until he became an artist that he made gods after his own form; anthropomorphism is just an artistic convention! For gods were in their context superhuman. There has never been a man like Jehovah or Zeus or Odin. The essential thing in them is that they embody an ideal, a fiction, adumbrating something more than Man. Religion is poetry in the grand style, and, as poetry, must have its conventions.

The Old Poets. In primitive times the poet was far more both of an inventor and a liar than he is at present. For many centuries the lies of the poets have been innocent lies, a convention merely, and to be recognised as such before "esthetic" enjoyment can begin. But the lies the old poets told were believed literally—as they were meant to be! Yes, the poet at the beginning was just a liar, a great liar. How else, if he had not deceived Man, could he have peopled the heavens with Man's deities? And as the father of whole families of gods, he has done more to decide the fate of Man associated any idea of guilt. Rather the contrary; he regarded the act simply as unfortunate, just as at the present day we regard as unfortunate the foolish princess in some fairy tale. So the Fall was not to him a crime, branding all mankind with a metaphysical stigma.

That conception came much later, when the conscience had become deeper, more subtle and more neurotic; when individualism had been introduced into morality. And at that time, too, the ideal of the Redeemer became vitiated. Early Man, if he did envisage a Redeemer, envisaged him as one who would set him back in the Garden of Eden again, in the literal, terrestrial Garden of Eden, be it understood: theology had not yet been etherealised. And this Redeemer would redeem all men: the distinction of the individual came afterwards. It was not until later, too, that this ideal was "interpreted," and, as a concession to the conscience, salvation was made a conditional thing: the reward of those who were successful in a competition in credulity, in which the first prize went to the most simple, most stupid. The "guilt" now implicated in the Fall was not purged away from all men by the Redeemer, but only from such as would "accept" it. And, lastly, with the passing of Jesus, the redemption was still further deactualised. It was found that acceptance of the Redeemer did not re-instate Man in an earthly Garden: paradise was, therefore, drawn on the invisible wires of theology into the inaccessible heavens. Salvation lay at the other side of the grave, and there it was safe from assault.

Nevertheless, what our primitive poet meant by the Fall and the Redemption was probably something entirely different. The tree of the knowledge of good and evil—that the Fall was invented. The doctrine of Original Sin was simply an interpretation which was afterwards read into the story, an interpretation, perhaps, as arbitrary as the orthodox interpretation of the Song of Songs.

How would the fable arise? Well, a primitive poet one day in a fit of melancholy made the whole thing up. Out of his misery, his hatred, his anger, he supposed later the price was only eight pounds Turk. The whole garrison escorted us to the last houses, where they stood a long while, waving their farewells. Two hours later on the mountain-ridge, beyond the wady, we turned to look at our last on Kasamayn. It stood amid the flames of some castle of the clouds.

We returned, then, to the "alafranga" hosteltry; but Rashid, having heard the story of my sleepless night, would not allow me to put up there. I paid my debt to the proprietor, and then he found for me an empty house to which he brought a mattress and a coverlet, a lot of cushions, a brazier, and the things required for making coffee, also a tray of supper—all of them borrowed from the neighbouring houses. I might be pilgraged, brought to destitution, and eventually murdered by him, as my friends had warned me. At least, the operation promised to be comfortable.

We Moderns.
By Edward Moore.

The Old Gods. Perhaps there is too much made of anthropomorphism. Man's first gods were not "human" gods; they were stars, animals, plants, and the like. It was not until he became an artist that he made gods after his own form; anthropomorphism is just an artistic convention! For gods were in their context superhuman. There has never been a man like Jehovah or Zeus or Odin. The essential thing in them is that they embody an ideal, a fiction, adumbrating something more than Man. Religion is poetry in the grand style, and, as poetry, must have its conventions.

The Old Poets. In primitive times the poet was far more both of an inventor and a liar than he is at present. For many centuries the lies of the poets have been innocent lies, a convention merely, and to be recognised as such before "esthetic" enjoyment can begin. But the lies the old poets told were believed literally—as they were meant to be! Yes, the poet at the beginning was just a liar, a great liar. How else, if he had not deceived Man, could he have peopled the heavens with Man's deities? And as the father of whole families of gods, he has done more to decide the fate of
Reconstruction and Ancient Greece.

By Huntly Carter.

There are reconstructionists set on realising the small self-subsisting State who believe that we might do worse than ask early Greece for an outline of structure and policy capable of being extended into large practice. Early Greece surely provides the best example of natural outline of structure and policy carried into practice by people who seem to emerge from the soil for the purpose. It certainly offers the oldest and best story of a nation naturally arising from a condition of comparative absence of property-wealth (using property in the strict sense of economic necessities to which money value has been attached), to great influence, indeed to that over-proportioned and profiteering condition which invariably conducts nations to decline.

This groundwork of a complete economic State is not considered in Mr. A. E. Zimmern's interpretative study of "The Greek Commonwealth" (Oxford University Press). Although Mr. Zimmern has no particular liking for the occupational (in the sense of industrial) side of mankind, being, like Ruskin, absorbed with the moral, yet his reconstruction of social, political and economic Greece is by far the best at our disposal as yet. He has reconstructed Greece according to a model which is very fashionable with the new regionalist, and, beyond this, according to a concept of Empire which it is thought will presently hold up Commonwealth as the re-shaping idea for European nations. This raises the book to considerable immediate importance. The fact that it is written to the regionalist model (and written remarkably well) explains why the first step in the building of the small isolated economic State is omitted. The new regionalist is largely concerned with what he terms "human geogaphy," and begins his observations with geographical origins. He follows closely the line of Le Play, who was the father of this Earth system. He was the first to plough the Earth for men. And he found the ground indeed fit with human grain. "Let it alone," he appears to say, "and it will proceed to throw forth human particles from itself, like the sun casts forth planets. Some of the particles are suited to green fields, others to hill-tops, others to potter among reeds, while others are equipped to build birds' nests, which, inhabited by a nightingale or two, may be trusted to provide them with eternal song and soup." Reasonably, it may be assumed that all human beings thrown off in this way possess the fundamental economic condition of good living. Each has the ability to measure values by energy in such a way that he can secure an adequate subsistence without being led to beg, borrow or steal from his neighbour—or labour in any vineyard not his own. The regionalist does not stop to consider this question of early and extreme individualism; nor does Mr. Zimmern. He begins nearer democracy. He sees a framework of Greek structure and policy to which he thinks we might, if he liked, apply the title of Earth, Greece, Heaven and Hell. It is a very good framework indeed. Here it is:

"Greek civilisation," Mr. Zimmern wisely observes, "differs from our own both in its material environment.
and in its feeling and ideas. Our method will be to
deal first with the main features of that environment;
next with the political institutions which the Greeks
established within it; next with their means of livelihood,
and last with the conflict which arose in many
civilised communities, between the driving necessities of
economic development and the accepted institutions and ideals of
civilisation—a conflict which brought inward unhappiness and
outward disaster upon the foremost Greek community at
the very height of her greatness."

This is followed by a plunge into economic biology,
wherein emerges the Greek himself. It is fascinating to
watch the latter expanding in ever-widening circles
under the influence of environment. First, he puts on
individual characteristics, then group characteristics as he
embraces the family and fellowship; then expands
nationally under public sentiment and opinion, and
lastly with the political institutions which the Greeks
developed, into their services, that

views and reviews.

The last of the pemmican.

It is impossible to write a life of Herbert Spencer ; he
never lived. Books were published which bore his
name; but they were not lively books, and cannot,
therefore, prove the existence of a lively author. Be-
sides, in such a case as this, we have the authority
of Byron for refusing to accept the design argument.
Byron’s hypothesis of the identity of “Junius” is stated
in “The Vision of Judgment.” “Tis that what Junius we are wont to call
Was really, truly, nobody at all.

I don’t see wherefore letters should not be
Written without hands, since we daily view
Them written without heads; and books, we see,
Are filled as well without the latter too.

But if this be too extreme an inference, we can always
fall back upon Blake. The Synthetic Philosophy was
an attempt to state the development of the individual
in one generalisation; and “the man who generalises
is an idiot,” said Blake, with disastrous consequences to
the judgment of his own intelligence. According to
Blake, then, Herbert Spencer was an idiot; according
to Byron, he was a nonentity; according to Mr. Hugh
Elliott,* he was a “Maker of the Nineteenth Century,”
which is a Radha-mahatne phrase of condemnation.
Need I say that he was adored by the intellectuals of
Russia?

He had none of Hamlet’s diffidence in setting
the world right; at the age of twenty, he wrote to his
father: “I was thinking the other day that I should
like to make public some of my ideas upon the state of
the world and religion, together with a few remarks
upon education.” He was perfectly equipped for the
task; he had boundless confidence, no training, and
neither desire nor aptitude for research work. Only
once, Mr. Elliott tells us, did he ever undertake a
practical investigation, and that was a study of the circulation
of the sap in plants. He had the good fortune,
when a young man, to read in Von Baer that the
embrionic development of animals is always from the
homogeneous to the heterogeneous. “It obliged him;
he went about applying it all round; every kind of
change around him presented itself as a progress from
homogeneity to heterogeneity; this mode of develop-
ment appeared to be illustrated in every class of
natural phenomenon. Gradually the law grew.
Development was not only from the homogeneous to the
heterogeneous; it was from the simple to the complex;
from the incoherent to the coherent; from the indefinite
to the definite, and so on. Spencer was a mono-dyist;
the same idea revolved incessantly in his brain,
gathering
to itself every sort of cognate doctrine, until at last
it seemed to fill the whole universe. And here, again,
it must be remarked what a fortunate coincidence it was
that a raw and unlearned youth should have seized by
chance the one doctrine which has since been the
basis of all subsequent researches in the
field of the science of evolution. The marvel is that his immature opinions should
so rarely have failed to be supported and established by
subsequent inductions.”

He got as much out of the universe as he put into it;
his statement of the law of evolution: “Evolution is an
integration of matter and concomitant dissipation of
motion; during which the matter passes from a rela-
tively indefinite, incoherent homogeneity, to a rela-
tively definite, coherent heterogeneity; and during
which the retained motion undergoes a parallel trans-
formation;” was the seed that he carried in his shoe
throughout his pilgrimage. It is to be regretted that
Herbert Spencer did not write, and, therefore, Mr.
Elliott does not quote. the following translation of one

*“Herbert Spencer.” By Hugh Elliott. (Constable.
6s. net.)
of the earlier versions of the law of evolution; "Evolution is a change from a nohowish, untalkable about, allunkeness to a somehowish and in-general talkaboutable, not-allunkeness, by continuous somethingelseness and sticktogerations." But Spencer only swore once in his life, and he never joked; and the learned fiddlers and Japanese probably recognised a kindred spirit.

He invented many things; notably a binding-pin for loose music, a fishing-rod joint, an invalid bed, a new escapement for watches, improvements in planing machinery, in dressing artificial flies. He also tried to make a flying machine, but the greatest of all his inventions was The Unknowable, which Huxley said was written with a capital initial for the same reason that grenadiers were supplied with busbies, to make them appear more formidable than they were by nature. Spencer knew a lot about The Unknowable, enough to fill a hundred pages; it was a First Cause, it was Absolute, it was Infinite, and, as it was incapable of being related to anything that was known, it might be supposed that nobody need bother about it. But Spencer insisted that it was the function of religion to contemplate this "ultimate mystery." It was perhaps a proof of Spencer's utilitarian genius that he could find a use for religion by setting it to watch The Unknowable; but a little of Huxley's modesty would have taught him to avoid the absurdity. "I do not very much care to speak of anything as 'unknowable.' What I am sure about is that there are many topics about which I know nothing; and which, so far as I can see, are out of the reach of my faculties. But whether these things are knowable by any one is entirely one of those matters which is beyond my knowledge, though I may have a tolerably strong opinion as to the probabilities of the case. Relatively to myself, I am quite sure that the region of uncertainty—the nebulous country in which words play the part of realities—is far more extensive than I could wish.

The fact is that Spencer, like all a priori thinkers, was a very vain man; he held the mirror up to Spencer, and called the reflection Nature. His "ghost theory" of the origin of religion is a striking example of this; Mr. Elliott truly says of Spencer's primitive men that "he depicts them rather as miniature Spencers, and their mythology as a miniature Synthetic Philosophy." In other words, in the beginning was Herbert Spencer; he was so eminently reasonable, and so incapable of emotion (he never even fell in love), that he reversed the order of evolution, and asserted that, first, reason, next, instinct, then, last, reflex action appeared. It was reason, reason everywhere, except in The Unknowable, and that was a postulate; and he put his "Principles" even in his titles. The universe was, to him, a nice, compact theorem, that existed for no other purpose but his proof of it by reasoning. Mr. Elliott wisely concludes his chapter on "Evolution" with the words: "The future must decide whether Spencer has presented a true and genuinely significant account of evolution in the universe. Up to now it can only be said that the discovery, if genuine, has proved It has led to no progress in any branch of science; it is, indeed, too uncertain a hypothesis to argue from. Yet it is undesirably interesting, and may represent not only a truth, but a profound one. It is not discredited by Spencer's failure to prove it, nor by the lightness of some of his arguments. It was his character to produce his doctrine in a form of finality, well rounded and established for ever on the most secure basis. But it is not in the nature of things that such a theory should be indubitably established by all the laws of physics and logic. It is discovered."

It may or may have been in Nature, but it was in Herbert Spencer; and we read him now, if at all, for his facts, and relegate his theories to The Unknowable.

A. E. R.

---

**Reviews.**

**Colour and its Applications. By M. Luckiesh. (Constable. 16s.)**

This is the most important book on the scientific application of colour that has appeared since Chevreul's work on the subject of the harmony and contrast of colour. The two books have a resemblance. Both aim to place the subject of colour science upon a definite scientific ground, and each is the result of several years' laboratory research work, and demands to be studied, not merely read. They differ according to the experience of their authors. As we know, Chevreul discovered a new law—the law of simultaneous contrast of colour which altered the whole conception of the application of colour to painting. M. Luckiesh is not so fortunate. He, however, goes beyond Chevreul in conclusions, which are based upon data derived from a very substantial body of one hundred authorities from Plato to Lord Rayleigh, many of which, arising from discoveries and inventions, was not available to Chevreul. Indeed, he tells us quite plainly that recent colour research has vastly extended since the great Frenchman died, leaving in the hands of the scientist ample proof that colour resides, first of all, in light. The outcome of facts on light—that is, light conceived as absolute colour—observed, defined, described, and thereafter generalised in statements of colour. Moreover, he has produced it on the assumption that we are entering upon a colour age for the first time in our history, in which there will be a very wide and intelligent application of colour indeed. Our present knowledge of the subject is, however, very limited, and we desire someone to tell us about the power that lies at hand. M. Luckiesh, accordingly, exhibits this power in a possible way. And we gather that though colour is anxious for high flights, it has yet to add some inches to its wings. For one thing, it is not definitely related to the emotions. "The experimental work has not yet been done which should form a basis for expression and arousing emotion by means of colours." This is stated in a chapter on mobile colour, wherein the author advances the view that certain recent attempts to relate colour to sound in what is termed 'colour music' are superficial only. Both Rimington's scale and Scriabine's code of colour relation were apparently "chosen arbitrarily," and in spite of the scientific fact that the ear is an "analytic instrument" and the eye a "synthetic" one. Thus, while the ear devotes itself to breaking up sound, the eye is desirous of accepting the colour equivalent, as a whole. Of course, a confusion between the senses is the result. The point deserves closest consideration, seeing that it affects the whole question of colour "atmosphere" in the theatre. It is little use dressing an emotional scene in colour equivalents, if the colours themselves do not match the emotions. Imagine what might happen if Mr. G. B. Shaw expressed a crimson motive, and the spectator received a pea-green one. Mr. Shaw might suggest an escape by way of his celebrated receipt, "the real thing." But it seems that realism would help as little to achieve Mr. Shaw's emotional effect as the imaginative use of colour. M. Luckiesh is careful to glance at the question whether Nature suggests colour music, and assumes that Nature herself might be persuaded to yield a corresponding colour sound if squeezed and squandered for the purpose. Elsewhere, however, he appears to dismiss the possibility of realism in forms of art. Considering "The Effect of Environment on Colour," he points out that "a deep red object illuminated by direct sunlight is painted red by the artist." The fact is, the smallest difference of light so affects colour, that though a realistic effect may be ob-
tained, it cannot possibly be maintained, and, therefore, transmitted, except under the precise conditions by which it was obtained. "It is a fundamental principle that, excepting in special cases, a coloured fabric cannot appear the same under two different illuminants." Apply this law to theatre "decoration," and a world of absurdities appears. And one is forced to a consideration that as he did so, he drowned herself. He went to Westminster Cathedral, but God would not allow him to pray; and he joined the French Staff with the determination of finding a cure for his evil dreams.

When the Wicked Man—By Guy Thorne.

When the wicked man turneth away from his wickedness that he hath committed, Mr. Guy Thorne writes a novel about him. Of course, he lived in Paris, where the poets drink absinthe and brandy mixed, and die in the bosom of Holy Church; Paris, where even the cookery is immoral, and the purveyor of "Aux Produits du Midi" is a souteneuse. He was a very wicked man, whose salon was decorated with the picture of a harlot, whose income was derived from beer, and who was spent in gratifying the lusts of the body. Women? Oh, swarms of women, painted, scented, jaded hussies, perhaps insanitary, certainly precious, and very expensive. But he longed for purity, to rejuvenate himself with the fresh vigour of a maiden, to experience love. He took her to Greece, and of what happened in the sanctuary of Athena, it is impossible for Mr. Thorne to speak.

Let it suffice that his hero "thought that he cursed and rejected the God of his youth with a loud sound, and that as he did so there came a chord of music as the Ancient Ones rose from their sleep in answer to his hommage. The Ancient Ones at last made him desert his Rosamira and join the Army; and in England he met the love of his life. But she happened to overhear the story of his career of iniquity, and, in a frenzy, drowned herself. He went to Westminster Cathedral, but God could not allow him to pray; and he joined the French Staff with the determination of finding death in battle. By devious ways he was led at last to revenge a case of saeculage, "to fight for God," as he put it. He was wounded, of course; and at death's door, he remembered, let us hope, the French play, "The Sacrament of Judas," for he plagiarised it shamelessly by confessing his seduction of Rosamira to her brother. But at the touch of the Holy Oil, he took a turn for the better; Mr. Thorne even refers to the epistle of St. James and the experience of a nurse at the London Hospital to make the miracle credible. He recovered. He became a good Catholic and the great friend of Rosamira's brother, he tried to save Rosamira from a life of sin in revue, but she scorned him and married a peer's son; so he took lodgings in Victoria Street, and spent all his beer-money in the service of the Church.

In Far North-East Siberia. By I. W. Shklovsky. Translated by L. Edwards and Z. Shklovsky.

This is a record of travels among a people who "at the end of the nineteenth century were living the life of troglobytes, knowing nothing of bread, obliged to do without salt, obtaining fire by the primitive method of friction, not knowing the use of soap, having no linen, but taking the place of cumbersome methods of scene-shifting." If this is moving towards simplification, it does not take us away from the aforesaid emotional objection. Still, the volume leads one to believe that light as colour is imaginatively emerging from realistic obscurity, and, therefore, it is fitted for the new age.
and wearing their fur clothing upon their naked skins." To them, the Russian conquest of Siberia has meant two things, small-pox and syphilis; and the entire disappearance from the district is a matter of time." To them the "haillaks," or criminal exiles, are an additional burden, but principally in the Takutsk district; and if we add vodka, "specially prepared with leaf-tobacco and copperas," the list of benefits conferred by Russian conquest upon these people is complete. Their habit of drinling, their folklore, M. Shklovsky gives an interesting account, the Cheokochi people are particularly interesting, and of their carvings and drawings there are many reproductions in this book.

It was not until M. Shklovsky returned to the comparative civilization of Takutsk that he discovered the uses of a revolver, or the necessity of barred doors; and it was with something like regret that he turned his back on the barbarians.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

VOTES FOR WOMEN.

Sir,—Those opposed to women's suffrage will welcome the warning in "Notes of the Week" that the subject is in danger of being flooded by sentimentality. (One certainly cannot help anticipating with a shudder the comment of the writer of the "Pilot," who laments the "ghastliness" of the work of the suffragists.)

If, on the other hand, she votes with her husband, their votes cancel one another, and each party is in danger of being flooded by sentimentality. (One certainly cannot help anticipating with a shudder the comment of the writer of the "Pilot," who laments the "ghastliness" of the work of the suffragists.)

Sir,—I should be glad if you would allow me to make a few comments on your recent remarks about women's suffrage. Though entirely agreeing with you that "a year or two of emergency service" is not a reason for awarding the vote, I see something that is wrong with the principle of differentiation between the sexes. I doubt whether we are justified in assuming that participation in political affairs is a purely masculine function. Now, the only criteria for settling what is masculine and what feminine are nature and civilisation. The latter shows the progress of our race and the functions of its members. There is no law of nature delegating the right of voting to the man, or the duty of exercising that right from exercising her judgment in that way. On the other hand, the standards that have been, and gradually are being, fixed by civilisation, do not forbid women's suffrage. Humanity, as a whole, is too much interested in the causes of its own welfare to allow any one to exercise of it. The suffrage of women, if based on their enfranchisement of women, implying their identity with men, is a profound mistake, being based, as it is, upon a lie against nature. . . .

The weight of the sentence is, no doubt, to be found in the italicised words, but I venture to ask whether any one of Nature's great truths.

Just here seems to me to lie one of the greatest arguments in favour of women's suffrage, that man cannot sound the needed noise in that part of the government which necessarily affects the feminine part of domestic and, lately, of industrial life.

Although it seems absurd that a man's vote might be cancelled or duplicated by his wife, it is a fact that this has occurred in the warfare with his elders. "Blue-bells" is only fit for girls; but "Iron-Blue" is worthy of Izaak Walton, and the illustrations are the mental pictures that all fishermen see before they put their catches upon the scales. The concluding story, "The Birthday," is the most convincing nightmare story we have read for a long time; and if boys can be terrified by awful consequences, it should have prevented many from over-eating during the Christmas holiday. But we incline to the opinion that most boys will try the experiment in the hope of obtaining as thrilling a nightmare as Mr. Greene describes. "Terror has its inspiration as well as competition," said Disraeli; and to experience anything approximating to Mr. Greene's conception, most healthy boys would empty the larder.

Sir,—Although few subjects offer a wider scope for discussion than women's suffrage, there is one aspect of it I should like to raise in connection with your "Notes," and especially with the following passage occurring therein:—" . . . Everybody who employs his common sense knows that the enfranchisement of women, implying their identity with men, is a profound mistake, being based, as it is, upon a lie against nature. . . ."

The weight of the sentence is, no doubt, to be found in the italicised words, but I venture to ask whether any one of Nature's great truths.

Just here seems to me to lie one of the greatest arguments in favour of women's suffrage, that man cannot sound the needed noise in that part of the government which necessarily affects the feminine part of domestic and, lately, of industrial life.

Although it seems absurd that a man's vote might be cancelled or duplicated by his wife, it is a fact that this has occurred in the warfare with his elders. "Blue-bells" is only fit for girls; but "Iron-Blue" is worthy of Izaak Walton, and the illustrations are the mental pictures that all fishermen see before they put their catches upon the scales. The concluding story, "The Birthday," is the most convincing nightmare story we have read for a long time; and if boys can be terrified by awful consequences, it should have prevented many from over-eating during the Christmas holiday. But we incline to the opinion that most boys will try the experiment in the hope of obtaining as thrilling a nightmare as Mr. Greene describes. "Terror has its inspiration as well as competition," said Disraeli; and to experience anything approximating to Mr. Greene's conception, most healthy boys would empty the larder.

Sir,—Those opposed to women's suffrage will welcome the warning in "Notes of the Week" that the subject is in danger of being flooded by sentimentality. (One certainly cannot help anticipating with a shudder the comment of the writer of the "Pilot," who laments the "ghastliness" of the work of the suffragists.)

If, on the other hand, she votes with her husband, their votes cancel one another, and each party is in danger of being flooded by sentimentality. (One certainly cannot help anticipating with a shudder the comment of the writer of the "Pilot," who laments the "ghastliness" of the work of the suffragists.)

Sir,—I should be glad if you would allow me to make a few comments on your recent remarks about women's suffrage. Though entirely agreeing with you that "a year or two of emergency service" is not a reason for awarding the vote, I see something that is wrong with the principle of differentiation between the sexes. I doubt whether we are justified in assuming that participation in political affairs is a purely masculine function. Now, the only criteria for settling what is masculine and what feminine are nature and civilisation. The latter shows the progress of our race and the functions of its members. There is no law of nature delegating the right of voting to the man, or the duty of exercising that right from exercising her judgment in that way. On the other hand, the standards that have been, and gradually are being, fixed by civilisation, do not forbid women's suffrage. Humanity, as a whole, is too much interested in the causes of its own welfare to allow any one to exercise of it. The suffrage of women, if based on their enfranchisement of women, implying their identity with men, is a profound mistake, being based, as it is, upon a lie against nature. . . .

The weight of the sentence is, no doubt, to be found in the italicised words, but I venture to ask whether any one of Nature's great truths.

Just here seems to me to lie one of the greatest arguments in favour of women's suffrage, that man cannot sound the needed noise in that part of the government which necessarily affects the feminine part of domestic and, lately, of industrial life.

Although it seems absurd that a man's vote might be cancelled or duplicated by his wife, it is a fact that this has occurred in the warfare with his elders. "Blue-bells" is only fit for girls; but "Iron-Blue" is worthy of Izaak Walton, and the illustrations are the mental pictures that all fishermen see before they put their catches upon the scales. The concluding story, "The Birthday," is the most convincing nightmare story we have read for a long time; and if boys can be terrified by awful consequences, it should have prevented many from over-eating during the Christmas holiday. But we incline to the opinion that most boys will try the experiment in the hope of obtaining as thrilling a nightmare as Mr. Greene describes. "Terror has its inspiration as well as competition," said Disraeli; and to experience anything approximating to Mr. Greene's conception, most healthy boys would empty the larder.
women to exercise political functions, yet now both women's sphere of activity and the sphere of legislation have changed and considerably widened. Women are now far more than of yore engaged in politics and social "questions," to the great advantage of both themselves and social conditions; laws enter many areas hitherto untouched, some of them particularly women's areas. It would be a contradiction of progress to insist on "the maintenance of the present position." That the enfranchisement of women implies, as you say, "their identity with men," is a mistaken idea. What, if it would imply is that women were as much concerned as men in the welfare and good government of the State; and surely there can be differentiation of interest here as elsewhere. The woman's point of view and help are now needed in addition to the man's; though these points of view and help expressed through voting can effect less than by other means. The vote is, both for men and women, a much coveted privilege and responsibility, and its proportional value is lower than most suffragists suppose.

With regard to the married woman's vote, if she votes on the opposite side to her husband, in the aggregate her vote no more cancels his than does that of any other man or woman voting with her. But in the majority of cases she would vote as her husband does; and their household would, quite rightly, be represented by two votes. Which should have the greater deciding power on the opposite side to her husband, in the aggregate with children? Is there any doubt as to the answer?

We cannot judge these questions now from the 19th century standards. On the eve of a reconstructed Empire, all available energies and resources are needed in all spheres, and among these must be included, even if it is a minor factor, the woman's vote.

E. M. WHITE.

THE PRESS OF TO-DAY.

Sir,—Nothing more analytic of the whole policy of official publicists and the Official Press has been written than Mr. Belloc's recent articles in The New Age. I feel, however, that much more can still be said about the influence of the Free Press upon the minds of the younger journalists and artists of the Official Press. One rarely meets a journalist who is ignorant of the existence of the Free Press in England and abroad. The press passes from hand to hand like a tit-bit or a boom, but for the Press-Cutting, with his eagle eye for New Age cuts in the Official Press. They were a social study in themselves, and have been missed by many readers recently. A few weeks ago, for instance, a writer in "London Opinion" made special reference to the influence of The New Age.

The Free Press is always discovering new talent. Far more so than the Official Press, because that Press wants names rather than literature. The New Age need not advertise its contents, like the "English Review." Your readers do not buy the journal because of any particular title—bit or boom, but for the entire paper. A new name is as good as an old favorite. This Free Press willingness to give the new man a place in the ranks of its contributors has been a vast gain to English thought. Many of these names pass to the Official Press. To look at the lists of your past contributors for proof of this fact. These carry with them the spur of the Free Press and its influence even in their more servile after-days.

One other reason for the influence of the Free Press is seen in the large proportion of articles written for that Press which afterwards appear in book form. The quality of the writing in the Free Press is bound to give it a progressive history. It would be an interesting experiment to take the last five years of The New Age and the "Spectator" and compare the number of articles now reproduced in book form. I think the Free Press would win in the comparison.

It may seem sometimes to the worker on the Free Press that he is always ignored and disregarded. Time is slowly proving it to be otherwise. In a great spiritual revolution it is not always wise to be digging up the soil to see if the tree is taking root. The word "profiteer" tells its own story. That story may well give courage and hope to the men of the Free Press.

H. G. OYSTER.

NEWSPAPER POSTERS.

Sir,—Strange devices continue to appear upon the "Banners of Public Opinion." The following are of some interest:—

Government's Bad Example.

Government Post Holes.

Bomb in the Funk Holes.

Man and Woman Muddle.

Still No News.

Eighteen More Ships Down.

Blockaded.

POO Hogs.

Hunt for Fat Men.

Talk and See.

Even Calder Still.

Of what political significance is the last? Is the constructor feeling hungry?—S. H. BUDGE.

SIR JOHN COCKBURN AS IDEALIST.

Sir,—Sir John Cockburn, when I used to meet him, was an idealist and, I think, a Socialist. Now he advocates a tariff for:

(1) Preference within the Empire.

(2) Most favoured nation treatment of Allies.

(3) A special tariff for neutrals.

(4) With additional duty for enemy countries.

With (1) and (2) I have no quarrel, but upon what grounds are neutrals, who have preferred peace to war, to be penalised by a higher rate?

As for (4), this from Sir John makes the future almost hopeless. The present enemy is always to be an enemy. What an ideal!—ALFRED HICKS.

Memoranda.

(From last week's New Age.)

What Mr. Chamberlain proposes to do with the doctors and the clergy is exactly what we have suggested he should do for Labour in general, namely, put the responsibility on the existing organisations.

The House of Commons is no longer the servant of the nation, discharging the function of controlling the Executive; but it has become the servant of the Executive in controlling the nation.—"Notes of the Week."

Nations are formed by history and not by philosophy.—RAMIRO DE MAESTU.

It may well be that, instead of the last industry to form a Guild, agriculture may be the first.—BERNARD GILBERT.

To those who find all truth in the past, the modernist who seeks new truth in the present will always appear as an enemy and a blasphemer. Reverence for truth implies and demands irreverence for error.

The Jews made a strong case for Jesus's blasphemy because they judged Him not by conscience but by what tradition had taught them to expect.—THE REV. CAVENDISH MOXON.

Christian love is a unique passion, differing in kind from every other mode of mutual attraction.—R. H. C.

It is a profound mistake to attempt to play melodrama naturally.—JOHN TRACY HOPKINS.

Luxury is the leakage in the grand system of economic production.

An economic system works well only when the demands made upon it by spenders are right demands. The object of restricting open competition in the market is to keep up prices on the part of privileged competitors. The division of labour is designed to bring perfection to bear upon every part of production.—"Notes on Economic Terms."
PRESS CUTTINGS.

And yet the difficulties are appalling. To infuse a spirit of revolution into our millions of moderately contented wage-earners, blind as they are to the fact of the inferiority of their present social status, would seem a hopeless and impossible task. Of our total proletariat population majority are outside organised labour altogether. The organised minority no doubt are drawn from the most intelligent classes, but even of these by far the greater number regard their particular craft as an end in itself, and are progressive exactly as any other interest and unemployment, while the smaller militant section has never got beyond the idea of fighting for higher wages or resisting capitalistic encroachment on their status as a whole.seriously-not to the Employers' Parliamentary Council, improvement is. to be gained for the multitude of men.-

militant section that we find individuals who realise that Trade Unionism at its best is only a palliative, and a failing palliative at that, for our social miseries, and who understand that it is not the abuse of our present economic system that we are up against, but that the system itself (the Wages System whereby labour power is bought and sold as a mere commodity) is fundamentally immoral and inhuman, and must be smashed for good and all if any permanent improvement is to be gained for the multitude of men.—E. Broom in "The Shop Assistant."

Upon a business world faced with great uncertainties and readjustments, and struggling back to normal health, the burden will fall with paralysing effect. For though a large proportion of the taxation which must fall on business profits, rents, and interest may be returned by the State to its debtors in the shape of interest, the waste of this process, combined with the uncertainties of incidence, will exercise a most disturbing influence on reviving trade. Nor is the financial and economic situation heightened by considering the past effects of the prodigious borrowing which last week reached its climax in what is officially described as the Victory Loan. If that expression means that it will "see us through" upon the monetary side, it is definitely untrue. Even if the "Times" is somewhat pessimistic in its statement that £60 million of the new money of the loan will be wanted to cover the net deficit in the current financial year, it is evident that the whole of the available sum, however large it turns out to be, will not suffice to foot the national bill, even if the war end this summer.—"The Nation."

Employers propose, as their programme of reconstruction, a shameless repudiation, not only of specific pledges, but also of the whole course of social organisation for the past half-century, and a return to the extreme rigour of the game of anarchical individual competition—always neglecting private property and the abandonment of the labourer to just whatever conditions of existence the strategic position of the capitalist may enable him to impose. We want to say, very seriously—not to the Employers' Parliamentary Council, which we know to be beyond our arguments, but to every responsible captain of industry throughout the Kingdom—that if this is to be the mind of the employer, this country is coming face to face with the longest, fiercest, and most widespread industrial strife that it has ever, in its darkest moments, imagined. Such a policy as is here outlined amounts to a declaration of war, not only on the Trade Union Movement with its 4,000,000 of members and its £6,000,000 of accumulated funds, but also on the whole wage-earning class, whom it seeks to throw back to the condition of the "hungry free-lancers." To propose what will everywhere be regarded as the "Great Betrayal" of a refusal to restore the Trade Union conditions that the workmen patriotically laid aside, without any offer to the Trade Unions of something that they will accept as at least an equivalent—coupling this Great Betrayal, indeed, with explicit proposals to put down strikes by law, repeal the protective sections of the Factory, Mines, and Merchant Shipping Acts, and stop all remedial action by the municipalities—amounts to such a political absurdity, at a moment when the electoral franchise is about to be more effectively democratised than even the Chartists expected, that we may seem to be hardly warranted in discussing it. The officials of the Employers' Parliamentary Council are fully conscious, through those who support them by subscriptions may not be, of their powerlessness to influence either the House of Commons or the Cabinet to any effect in Parliamentary legislation. What is so serious, as Trade Unionism is concerned, and the reorganisation of the conditions of the factory, the report of the Employers' Parliamentary Council does, we regret to say, put definitely into words what a very large number of employers are vaguely feeling. They have no present intention of fulfilling, in their factories, their written pledges to restore the practices and conditions that prevailed before the war. What is wanted, if they should resign of thinking out in detail any appropriate equivalent, of equal value to the workman and to his Trade Union, which they could offer as an alternative for the honourable fulfilment of their undertakings.—"The New Statesman."

I affirm it as my conviction that class laws placing Capital above Labour are more dangerous in the public at this hour than chattel slavery in the days of itsightest supremacy. Labour is prior to and above Capital, and deserves much higher consideration.—Abraham Lincoln.

Among the new developments which have come about as a result of the war, to me by far the most interesting is the demand which is everywhere being made that commodities sold to the public should bear a fixed price, for I am persuaded that it marks the turning point in our economic history, inasmuch as it promises to transform the relations of men to each other from the commercial to the communal.

In a recent article contributed to The New Age I drew attention to the significance of this new development to the extent that it might fairly be recognised as the first step towards the restoration of Guilds and to showing how the whole range of Guild regulations are from one point of view necessitated by the desire to maintain fixed prices. To fix prices it is necessary to uphold a standard of quality, and, as such a standard cannot be defined finally in terms of law, it becomes necessary to organise Guilds, a consensus of opinion among the masters of which becomes the final court of appeal.

But fixed prices have other blessings in store for us. As the system becomes more widely applied, we shall find ourselves in a position to deal in a practical way with the problem of unearned increment. It is the weapon which will enable us to secure a more equitable distribution of the wealth of the community. Consider for a moment what has happened hitherto. If the workers increase their wages by striking, the Government decides to tax profits, as it recently did, the capitalist finds himself in a position to recuperate himself by raising the price of his commodities to the public, but, if prices were fixed, this would no longer be possible. A tax upon profits would be in practice what it pretends to be in theory. It would take away from the capitalist some of his ill-gotten gains.—A. J. Penty.
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