NOTES OF THE WEEK.

The natural impatience which many feel towards Russia at this moment must not be allowed to find expression. It is necessary, as Mr. Bonar Law reminded the House of Commons, to put ourselves into "the real atmosphere of war," and to reflect that to a greater or lesser degree every published word is an act of war for good or for evil. In the case of Russia it is true that for the time being, and, perhaps, for the remainder of the war, we shall not be able to count upon the active co-operation of her troops. That remains to be seen, though we may still hope for the best. On the other hand, if even we have nothing to gain and can at most expect nothing more than the continuance of the present immobilisation of Russia, we have a great deal to lose, the preservation of which is well worth caring for by every means in our power. Russia immobilised may be a disappointment to us; and, as we say, we ought to leave no policy untried that promises the prospect of her renewed activity. But Russia actually demobilised would be considerably worse for us; and it is to prevent this calamity; if we cannot ensure the greater good, that should be the object of our immediate policy. For this reason we counsel patience and understanding, above all, understanding. We are, it must be understood, in the presence of a phenomenon which nobody could have foreseen when the war was begun but which most assuredly demands a new perspective. The Russia in whose company the Allies entered the war is no longer the Russia with or without whose company the war must now be continued. That is the chief fact to be taken into account; and it is one that will bear a great deal of reflection. To talk at this moment as if the Russia with whom we have now to deal were in any respect the Russia with whom we have formerly had to deal is to be under the prejudice of history, and to miss, in consequence, the reality of the present. Russia, we repeat, is for all practical purposes a new country, and prospectively, therefore, a new Ally. From a position upon the extreme Right of the Alliance, Russia by means of her Revolution has taken up her position upon the extreme Left; with this consequence, that her former relations with the Allies must be entirely revised.

In order, however, to revise these relations it is essential that the Allies should understand the new point of view of Russia. This is not too consistently expounded in the Russian manifestoes; and there would seem, indeed, to be some confusion in the minds of the Russian Revolutionaries themselves. On the one hand, to students like ourselves who are familiar with the principles, Marxian for the most part, from which the Revolutionaries’ opinions are derived, it is certain, that in intention the programme of New Russia is essentially anti-capitalist in the spirit of the Marxian International. That is to say that the new Russia under its new leaders is at bottom a Socialist-Democratic nation, and the first in history; and that from this point of view, if only Russia clearly realises herself, her position in the Alliance is comparable with the position of a Socialist-Labour group that has not yet entered into coalition with its national and bourgeois Government, but is contemplating doing so. On the other hand, precisely as a Labour party, though strictly economic in its intentions, usually becomes political in character when invited to co-operate with an existing Government, the Russian Committee shows signs in its most recent proclamations of abandoning or compromising upon its economic intentions, and of expressing itself in political terms. As Socialists we might deplore this transubstantiation in Russia as we have deplored the same declension in our own Labour party. Better if it were possible, we say, that a party or a nation, having seized an economic view, should maintain it through thick and thin, and compel political action to fall into
opposed; that the proposed permanent League of Nations formed of the present Allies is in violation of international democracy, which cannot contemplate a permanent division of peoples arising from a permanent division of Governments; and, finally, that such an Alliance, even if it should succeed in ending the present war to its satisfaction, would inevitably in the settlement the seeds of future wars. So much in criticism; and we beseech attention for it, since it contains at least some elements of truth. As an alternative suggestion of a constructive character let us now see what it is that Russia puts forward. In place of an Alliance of Governments, temporary or perpetual, Russia suggests an alliance of peoples as represented by the Socialist and Labour movements of the various nations, which shall be both temporary for the purpose of ending the present war and permanent for the purpose of preventing war in future. And in place of opposing groups of capitalist and bureaucratic governing cliques, whose division is in contradiction of a world-commonwealth, Russia suggests an international federation of peoples, each of whose members is sworn to procure and to exercise control over its Government in the event of a threatened war, or of war itself. Now, nobody can deny that we have in this a plan as definite as the plan at present before the Allies, or that it is, on the face of it, any less reasonable and worthy of consideration. What, on the other hand, is equally apparent is that the two plans are not only different but are in opposition; with this practical consequence that if both are maintained by their respective parties, without compromise and without discussion, the two parties can never agree. In other words, if Russia is to remain or to become an active member of the present Alliance against Prussia, either one plan or the other must prevail after fair discussion, or a compromise must be found. Which is it to be? For our part we have no doubt it must be compromise or nothing. It is not possible, in our opinion, that Russia will consent to the plan of the Allies as at present formulated, for the simple reason that the second part of the plan, if not the first, is in manifest contradiction of the Russian plans for the future. And for other reasons it is no less impossible that the Russian plan will be adopted in its entirety by the rest of the Allies. The only course remaining to be taken, therefore, if the Alliance is to be re-cemented, is a compromise between the two plans—a compromise which, we believe, might be brought about without much difficulty. What are the conditions of it? In the first place, we have to prove to Russia, both by word and by deed, that the existing Allies, notwithstanding all the doctrines of Marx, are, in fact as well as in theory, democratic in intention, or, at least, in potentiality, far beyond the degree of democracy reached or possible in the Central Powers; in other words, that the victory of the Allies is essential to the very democracy that Russia claims to represent. And, in the second place, we have to prove, again by both word and by deed, that the instrument of the International to which Russia is disposed for the moment to trust for ending the war and preventing future wars, is not merely inadequate at present for either purpose, but is likely in use to turn against the hands that venture to rely upon it.

To take the second point first, since at the moment it is undoubtedly the pet idea of the Revolutionaries— we may argue first upon theoretical grounds. To begin with, we may point out that the International was in existence before the war, and that it proved utterly unequal to the task of preventing the war. Is there any better hope that if the International were to meet tomorrow, what it failed to do before its own ranks were divided by war it can do after three years of mutual estrangement? The facts are against it. On the contrary, we are quite certain that, whatever eventu-
ally the International may become, its present constitution is more unequal to the task of ending the war than ever it was to preventing it. Have we not, it is clear, more than ever lacking in it. At a single Conference of the International, if it should now be held, not only will several nations (Japan, for example) be wholly unrepresented, but the nations assembled will be represented in differing degrees of responsibility. As to one or two nations, perhaps (Russia herself, for example), the Socialist representation may be conceivably regarded as competent to speak on behalf of its Government, and to act, as it were, as a full plenipotentiary; but as to the majority of the constituent nationalities, some of the Socialist representatives will wake and to act, as it were, as a full plenipotentiary; but as to the majority of the constituent nationalities, some of the Socialist representatives will speak with more, and others with less, power, to bind their Governments to the findings of the Conference. But what will be the use of decisions arrived at between groups, some of which are principals, others of which are junior partners, and still others of which are no more than the errand boys of their respective Governments? Is it not clear that an International, thus composed of unequal units, cannot bind the nations it professes to represent; but would end, if it reached any decision whatever, in binding some and in leaving other Governments—and those the worst—free? The conclusion is clear: that until an International can be assembled whose members are equal in representative authority, not for their party only, but for their national Governments as well, it has no real power to end the war, or to dictate the terms of peace.

To these theoretical objections, however, Russia may reply that she does not admit the weight of them. And it is scarcely to be wondered at; for in the grand a priori logic of idealism nothing would seem more simple than to assemble the proletariat of the world and to persuade them to exercise their inalienable power to put an end for ever to wars waged at their expense. Trial, however, would convince the Russians of their error; and it is for this reason that we urge the Allies to do everything in their power to facilitate the assembling of a genuine International Conference. For the assembly of the International would put an end to many illusions, if not to war. It must, on the other hand, if it is to be the school of experience we design it to be, meet upon the freest possible terms; and with the indulgent approval of the Allied Governments in particular. Nothing should be wanting in the Russian eyes to make it the success they dream is possible. Upon this condition, unfortunately, we have, however, already committed a blunder which it will be hard to retrieve; a blunder, moreover, which the Russian Committee has been quick to point out. It appears that Mr. Henderson, in his mission to Russia, required of the Russian Committee their consent to the following conditions preliminary to the convocation of a full International: first, a pre-arranged agreement among the Allied Socialists; and, second, the consent of their respective Governments before any decision of the Conference should be agreed upon. But what was this but to require, in the first place, that the International should not be International, but repetitive simply of the existing Governmental groups—a contradiction, once more, of the democratic doctrine; and, in the second place, an admission of the "tied" and dependent character of the constituent Socialist delegations? If, as the Russian Committee observed, the present division of Governments is to be formally maintained at the Conference, and each group is to speak, not on behalf of its "people" but on behalf of its own Government, the International would be dead before it was born. Upon such terms no International of any value even as an experiment is possible; and we hope Mr. Henderson will receive fresh instructions. No, we repeat that the condition of the success (that is, the failure) of the Conference is that it shall be formally unfettered, formally completely representative, and formally free to arrive at any resolutions it pleases. By this means and by this means alone can Russia be convinced that her proposed plan for settling the world at an International is impracticable.

The precautions laid down for Mr. Henderson were the more mistaken for being totally unnecessary. Who, outside Russia, ever imagined that the Allied Socialists would attend an International without preliminary discussion if only of an informal nature; and who, again, outside Russia, imagined that, in fact, the various Socialist groups, being, as they are, economic and political minors in their own country, could bind their nations to any decision without their Governments' consent? Conferences do not assemble out of the blue; and the resolutions of a Conference are as a rule the register simply of foregone conclusions. On the other hand, a "free" Conference—a Conference, that is, not formally restricted—would be bound, we think, to arrive at certain common observations favourable rather than unfavourable to the Allies. It would be evident, to begin with, that the division of Governments is more real than Marxians are disposed to admit; in the fact, that could not be concealed, that of all the nations represented at the International, the nations of the Central Powers alone have no Socialists in their Governments. But what is this but to say that the Allied Governments, however capitalist in fact, are in reality as socialist and democratic as their peoples like to have them? It is not, therefore, to the political constitutions of the Allied countries that the fact of proletariat under-representation in their Governments is due, but to the proletarians themselves. In the next place it would be evident that this is not the case with the constitution and governments of the Central Powers. In Germany and elsewhere a Socialist movement may be in existence and in considerable strength without being able to register a single representative in the Government of its nation. The Socialists of Germany are, in fact, the numerically strongest single party in the nation; yet they cannot claim and have not been given even so much as an under-secretaryship in the actual Government. But this, we make bold to say, is an impressive as well as a significant fact; and it is a fact, moreover, that could not be concealed even from the Russians present at the Conference. And when it is contrasted with the fact that in every Allied Government the Socialist party has all the power it deserves, the fundamental difference between the two groups of autocratic and democratic Powers is established. We do not say merely that the chances are that a "free" International will arrive at this conclusion, and at the further conclusion that the autocracies must go; we state it as a self-evident fact. As certainly as M. Branting has declared that Kaiserism must abdicate or be forced to abdicate, the International would do the same. And this result, it is obvious, would more than justify all the facilities the Allied nations can provide for its immediate assembly.
A decision such as this would place both the German and the Russian Socialists in a practical difficulty from which, again, the Allies may anticipate nothing but advantage. Let us suppose that the German Socialists declare themselves unable to bring about the constitutional revolution recommended by the International. That, at least, would be a declaration of importance, separating them, as it would, from the Socialists of the rest of the world, and emphasizing thereby the undemocratic character of the Prussian State. But even this consequence would not stand alone; for the obligation would then be laid upon the Prussian Socialists also to do all in their power to deliver the German people from a tyranny which would be confessedly unable to remove by themselves. And if, at this point (and to return to the first part of our diagnosis) the present Allies were to intervene with a common, emphatic, and unambiguous declaration in favour of putting an end to the Prussian system of government for the democratic purpose of releasing the German people, the adherence, the active adherence, of the Russian Socialists with the Allies might be taken for granted. What, in fact, would be left for them to do in view both of the failure of the International and of the conclusion to which the International would be brought that the remaining political enemy of democracy is Prussian autocracy? By consenting to its demands for the convocation of a free and universal International the Allies would have appeared to be willing to allow the Russian Government to make its daring experiment; and by observing and pointing the moral of its failure they would, in the alternative, be recommending their own plan. It would then remain for the Allies, in the acknowledged failure of the International, to carry their demonstration of democracy a step further, in order, we believe, to obtain once and for all the active support of Russia to the very end. What is that step further, however? We will now consider it.

There are, it is clear, two parts in the immediate policy of the Allies. One of them is the military defeat of Prussia, about which, as we said last week, there is little or no radical difference of opinion. But the other part is the sequel to it; in other words, it concerns the future of Germany when Prussianism has been destroyed. And it is upon this that differences have arisen, and will continue to arise, and in fact intensified unless the Allies speak in less uncertain and in more democratic terms. The position for Russia when the International has been held, will be somewhat as follows: On the one side Russia must agree, that the International is not at present the instrument of peace, for as much democracy as it is possible for the International to have been disappointed, will they be contravened the still unvoiced law of democracy. The

The demand for reprisals, though natural under the circumstances, is, like our impatience with Russia, to be deprecated in a people fitting themselves for democratic statesmanship. Reprisals have all the disadvantages congenital with weakness and other disadvantages as well. They are an admission, in the first place, that we have no ready counter defence to make against the original attacks; and that they are thus an invitation to the enemy to repeat them. In the second place, they are a substitute for thoughts of defence, and in no sense defence itself. And, in the third place, there is no end to them; like one of Dante’s hells they spiral downwards bottomlessly. The proper reply to any actual, or even to a possible, conflict is the preparation, and less, we believe, by the policy of the Allies, to carry Russia with them in their first step, to forswear the undemocratic intentions towards defeated Germany which threaten to dictate their second step. For beyond the first step Russia will assuredly never go; nor will she take the first until she is assured that the Allies will not take the second.

The proper reply to attack is reprisals; and the best reply to the reprisals of the enemies of democracy is to make a fresh attack. Thus, while we are considering Mr. Churchill’s policy, it is well to remember that the proper reply to any actual or possible conflict is the preparation, and not the adoption, of policies that may be interpreted as a threat to the Allies. The proper reply to attack is reprisals; and the best reply to the reprisals of the enemies of democracy is to make a fresh attack.
The Larger Discipline.

In last week's issue, the writer of the "Notes" touched with sound instinct upon the permanent and serious aspect of the question to carry Messrs. MacDonald and Jowett on their mission to Russia. The incident is more than a passing episode; it marks a new departure in Trade Union policy, and may create a precedent pernicious in the extreme. For the first time, so far as I know, a Trade Union has deliberately thwarted an act of national policy—a policy, be it noted, that had no bearing on Trade Union interests or organisation.

Viewed narrowly, there is some justification for the Seamen's Union. Their members had been drowned and murdered on the high seas. They were engaged in carrying food to a beleaguered population—in bringing sustenance to the delegats (if delegates they were) to the Leeds Conference. These sailors were not belligerents; they had not undertaken any naval responsibilities; did not enjoy the protection of thick armour and great guns; were not entitled to naval pay or pension. From the "Lusitania" to the least insignificant tramp, these sailors were engaged on their "lawful occasions," and hundreds had paid the final reconving in the deeps. As with the agricultural labourer, so with the seaman, the nation had suddenly discovered that here was a serious excess of his labour-commodity price. It was in these circumstances that the delegate of the Seamen's and Firemen's Union (in this instance a genuine delegate) rose to plead his constituents' cause at the Leeds Conference. He was received with tumultuous disapprobation, with shouts of "Judas" and other uncivilising obscenities. As the rowdy conditions being hardly compatible with the high purpose of the Conference or conducive to serious thought and speech. So far as the records go, neither Mr. MacDonald nor Mr. Jowett raised a voice in favour of fair-play for the seamen's representative; probably thought that it served the fellow right for entertaining vindictive and unpeaceable sentiments towards his fellow-craftsmen the crews of the U-boats. Mr. MacDonald is not precisely famous for his chivalrous support of the struggling minority in Labour and Socialist Conferences. The net result was that the seamen naturally felt aggrieved at their treatment and equally naturally determined "to get a bit of their own back." It is easy to imagine the moral excitement which these sentiments were expressed. As a purely personal issue, Mr. MacDonald richly deserved the snubbing he received. And even though he may pose as a martyr, he knows he deserved it.

The Secretary of the Seamen's and Firemen's Union, however, appears to have grasped the fact that an act such as this of mere personal remonstrance is hardly sufficient justification for setting at naught a fellow-citizen's passport. So he takes firmer ground. He contends that Mr. MacDonald, on the strength of a fraudulent mandate from a spurious conference, tried to go to Russia as a Labour representative. That is common ground that he was only a minority representative. But, asks the Secretary, what constitutes a minority? If Mr. MacDonald can secure the support of 500,000 Trade Unionists, well and good; he shall be carried across the sea, unless a German submarine should inadvertently interfere with the programme. This rather neatly puts Mr. MacDonald on the horns of a dilemma: if he really is a Labour representative, even though in a minority, then let some properly constituted Labour organisation appoint him; if, on the other hand, his brief is purely political, then let him drop all pretence to Labour representation and come out in his true colours as an incurable politician, one to whom politics is as breath to the nostrils. It is certain that as a Trade Union, the Seamen had some reason to object to carry Mr. MacDonald, who is not and never has been a Trade Unionist, and who has all his life exploited Trade Unionism for exclusively political purposes. Mr. MacDonald cannot have it both ways. But if he elects to stand as a politician, as he must do, having no Trade Union status, his mission to Russia is more or less sterilised; it is only as a Labour man that he could exert any influence with the Labourists of Russia, who are in a much better position to utilise the elements of national politics of the MacDonald type. We may be sure, however, that Mr. MacDonald will continue to straddle Labour and Liberalism just as long as he is permitted. His Labour colleagues are assuredly either long-suffering or short-sighted.

But when all has been said in favour of the Seamen, the broad fact remains that they have taken the law into their own hands; have usurped a prerogative to which they are not even distantly entitled. Messrs. MacDonald and Jowett were well within their rights as citizens to travel by any common carrier to Russia. The Government had given special consideration to the case; it was no casual affair. Not only that, the Russians had particularly requested their visit. Public policy demanded the mission; the Seamen were in duty bound, and in obedience to a larger discipline, to transport their numbers to the Leeds Conference. The Secretary of the Seamen's and Firemen's Union claims the right to pick and choose the travellers it will carry, where are we to draw the line? Are the Compositors to edit the manuscripts they set? Has a Trade Union the right to knock the "Times" be suppressed, and "Tit-Bits" quadrupled? (Incidentally, wasn't it the "Times" that called for the suppression of "Pravda," but protested against the compositors' suppression of "Novoe Vremya"?)

Not to labour the point, it is evident that a vital issue is raised between citizens' rights and industrial power. In its propaganda for National Guilds, THE NEW AGE has consistently advocated the ultimate sovereignty of the State, or, in other words, that if, at any time, a struggle should supervene between the State and the Guilds, the State must decide by men as citizens, not by men in their capacity as guildsmen. To that end, the function of the Guilds must be limited to the economic, the function of the State being in the broad sense of the word spiritual, or whatever may be the term most clearly in contradistinction to economics. And the real work of the future lies in the differentiation of State and Guild functions—a differentiation that cannot be final until there can be no conceivable clash between the responsibility of the State and the function of the Guilds.

If, however, the action of the Seamen's Union is to pass unchallenged, it is tantamount to an admission that public policy no longer rests with the State, as representing the general body of citizens, but is now vested in the Trade Unions, who, apparently, are free to bend and twist public policy to their own sectional interests and purposes. That way lies syndicalism and disintegration.

It is unfortunate that this discussion should centre round a man who, in the pursuit of his ambition, has always confused the political and economic functions, and whose position, in consequence, is essentially false and poisonous to true social growth. But even though we may entertain a certain sympathy for the Seamen, and appreciate their spirit, it is of first importance that we should resist any and every invasion of our citizen sovereignty.

S. G. H.
Thoughts for a Convention.

III.

By A. E.

11. It is necessary to speak with the utmost frankness and not to slur over any real difficulty in the way of a settlement. Irish parties must rise above themselves if they are to bring about an Irish unity. They appear on the surface irreconcilable, but that, in my opinion, is because the spokesmen of parties are under the illusion that they should never indicate in public that they might possibly abate one jot of the claims of their party. A crowd or organisation is often more extreme than its individual members. I have spoken to Unionists and Sinn Feiners, and find them as reasonable in private as they are unreasonable in public. I am convinced that an immense relief would be felt by all Irishmen if a real settlement of the Irish question could be achieved, a compromise which would reconcile them to living under one Government, and would, at the same time, improve relations with neighbours. The suggestions which follow were the result of discussions between a group of Unionists, Nationalists, and Sinn Feiners, and, as they found it possible to agree upon a compromise, it is hoped that the policy which harmonised their divergencies may help to bring about a similar result in Ireland.

12. I may now turn to consider the Anglo-Irish problem to make specific suggestions for its solution and the character of the government to be established in Ireland. The factors are triple. First, there is the desire, widespread and deeply felt, that no Irish political party ever had authority to pledge the interests of the nation to a scheme and wait to strike a blow. Though the dream of the convention may be handed on from them to their children and their children's children, yet they will hope sometime to give the last vengeful thrust of enmity at the stricken heart of the Empire.

13. If it is believed that this scheme or any diminutive of it will settle the Anglo-Irish problem, British statesmen and men who trust them are only preparing for themselves bitter disappointment. I believe that nothing less than complete self-government has ever been the object of Irish Nationalism. However ready certain sections have been to accept instalments, no Irish political leader ever had authority to pledge his countrymen to accept a half-measure as a final settlement of the Irish claim. The Home Rule Act, if put into operation to-morrow, even if Ulster were cajoled or coerced into accepting it, would not be regarded by Irish Nationalists as a final settlement of the Irish claim. The Home Rule Act, if put into operation to-morrow, even if Ulster were cajoled or coerced into accepting it, would not be regarded by Irish Nationalists as a final settlement of the Irish claim. The Home Rule Act, if put into operation to-morrow, even if Ulster were cajoled or coerced into accepting it, would not be regarded by Irish Nationalists as a final settlement of the Irish claim. The Home Rule Act, if put into operation to-morrow, even if Ulster were cajoled or coerced into accepting it, would not be regarded by Irish Nationalists as a final settlement of the Irish claim. The Home Rule Act, if put into operation to-morrow, even if Ulster were cajoled or coerced into accepting it, would not be regarded by Irish Nationalists as a final settlement of the Irish claim. The Home Rule Act, if put into operation to-morrow, even if Ulster were cajoled or coerced into accepting it, would not be regarded by Irish Nationalists as a final settlement of the Irish claim. The Home Rule Act, if put into operation to-morrow, even if Ulster were cajoled or coerced into accepting it, would not be regarded by Irish Nationalists as a final settlement of the Irish claim. The Home Rule Act, if put into operation to-morrow, even if Ulster were cajoled or coerced into accepting it, would not be regarded by Irish Nationalists as a final settlement of the Irish claim. The Home Rule Act, if put into operation to-morrow, even if Ulster were cajoled or coerced into accepting it, would not be regarded by Irish Nationalists as a final settlement of the Irish claim.

14. Any measure which is not a settlement, which leaves Ireland still actively discontented, is a waste of effort, and the sooner English statesmen realise the futility of half-measures the better. A man who claims a debt he believes is due to him, who is offered half of it in payment, is not going to be conciliated or be one iota more friendly if he knows that the other is able to pay the full amount and it could be yielded without detriment to the donor. Ireland will never be content with a system of self-government which lessens its representation in the Imperial Parliament, and still retains for that Parliament control over all important matters like taxation and trade policy. Whoever controls these controls the character of an Irish civilisation, and the demand of Irish Nationalism is that the Home Rule Act should be radically changed to give Ireland unfettered control over taxation, Customs, Excise, and trade policy. These powers are at present denied, and, if the Act were in operation, Irish people instead of trying to make the best of it, would begin at once to use whatever powers they had as a lever to gain the desired control; and this would lead to fresh antagonism and a prolonged struggle between the two countries, and in this last effort Irish Nationalists would have the support of that wealthy class now Unionist in the three Southern provinces, and also in Ulster, if they were included; for they would then desire as much as
Nationalists that, while they live in a self-governing Ireland, the powers of the Irish Government should be such as would enable it to build up Irish industries by an Irish trade policy, and to impose taxation in a way to suit Irish conditions. As the object of British consent to Irish self-government is to dispose of Irish antagonism, nothing is to be gained by passing measures which will not dispose of it. I can say that the practically unanimous claim of Nationalists, as exhibited in the Press in Ireland, is for the status and powers of economic control possessed by the self-governing Dominions. By this alone will the causes of friction between the two nations be removed, and a real solidarity of interest based on a federal union for joint defence of the freedom and well-being of the federated communities, be possible, and I have no doubt it would take place. I do not believe that hatreds remain for long among people when the causes which created them are removed. We have seen in Europe and in the Dominion the continual reversals of feeling which have taken place when a sore has been healed. Antagonisms are replaced by alliances. It is mercifully true of human nature that it prefers to exercise good will to hatred when it can, and the common sense of the best in Ireland would operate, once there was no longer interferences, to ally and join in order these turbulent elements which exist in every country, but only become a danger to society when real grievances based on the violation of true principles of government are present.

17. I have stated what I believe to be sound reasons for the recognition of the justice of the Irish demand by Great Britain, and I now turn to Ulster, and ask whether the unstable condition of things in Ireland does not affect it even more than Great Britain. If it persists in its present attitude, if it remains out of a self-governing Ireland, it will not thereby exempt itself from political, social, and economic trouble. Ireland will regard the six Ulster counties as the French have regarded Alsace-Lorraine, whose hopes of reconquest turned Europe into an armed camp, with the endless suspicions, secret treaties, military and naval developments, the expense of maintaining huge armies, and, finally, the inevitable war. So surely as Ulster remains out, so surely will it become a focus for Nationalist designs. I say nothing of the injury to the great wholesale business carried on from its capital city throughout the rest of Ireland, where the inevitable and logical answer of merchants in the rest of Ireland to requests for orders will be: "You would die rather than live in the same political house with us. We will die rather than trade with you." They would, I think, be wrong to act in this way; but I foresee the trouble. There will be, lamentably and inevitably, a fiercer tone between North and South. Everything which happens in one quarter will be distorted in the other. Each will lie about the other. The materials will exist more than before for civil commotion, and this will be aided by the powerful minority of Nationalists in the excluded counties, working in conjunction with their allies across the border. Nothing was ever gained in life by hatred; nothing good ever came of it, or could come of it, and the first and most important of all the commandments of the spirit that there should be brotherhood between men will be deliberately broken, to the ruin of the spiritual life of Ireland.

DEAD LEAVES.

Oh, the calm glory of the red setting sun,
Tinting the trees with hues like the autumn leaves
Blowing so roughly and carelessly on the ground.
They are dead, they are parched, they are crisp, they are hard and dry,
Yet not in their lifetime looked they so wonderful,
Seemed they so glorious, grand, and magnificent,
As now when they toss on the breast of the dying wind,
Blown through lanes in the bright crimson after-glow
Of the sun that has cast its last beams o'er the countryside.
Had they known death was this, they would have pined for it.
The things we hold dear in life, holiness, bravery,
Cleanliness of flesh and soul, faith and devotion,
The beauty and tenderness, sadness and hope of Love,
The joy and the happiness of motherhood, fatherhood,
When the tiny voice blesses the greatness of Love and Life,
Is not the thought of the quiet approaching grave,
When labour has ceased to be and cares are grown silent,
When, all the long years behind, trouble shall be no more.
Is not this among the great things we hold dear in life?
When the calm wind shall blow the tree branches overhead
And all shall be still.
An Industrial Symposium.

Conducted by Huntly Carter.

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

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

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

(7) REV. N. E. EGERTON SWANN.

1. (a) Labour will, during the War, have strikingly proved its indispensability, and its power, when it chooses to assert itself; also, its members returning from active service will have enjoyed a more honourable state, and had opportunities of co-operation, and a wider and more adventurous outlook on life. They are not likely to settle down easily to the industrial routine on the old conditions. Further, the War will have put many gentry out of business, and causes of irritation; Labour is likely to be in a mood of acute revolt. On the other hand, Trade Union funds will be depleted and organisation thrown out of gear; and there will be a reaction against the introduction of large masses of less skilled and more docile Labour, and by the wholesale hoarding of methods and installation of new machinery on lines dictated solely by efficiency of production, and not subject to the normal operation of collective bargaining.

(b) Capital will find itself, as just remarked, in some respects in a peculiarly strong position as against Labour. The losses of the competing balancing factors already indicated, it may be tempted, by the hope of fabulous profits suggested by an unexampled world-situation, to abuse its position in a way most detrimental to the community, and, in the end, to its own interests among others.

(c) The possibility of an enormous increase of production has been proved, and, if the ticklish issues between Labour and Capital can be satisfactorily adjusted, the Nation should be in a position to take advantage most effectively of any openings which the general state of world-commerce may afford it. What exactly these will be it would be rash to prophesy, but it is possible that the War may mean the final end for England and Germany alike of anything like their former industrial position: industrial supremacy; may pass into the hands of the United States, possibly with the same result as must have caused the capital invested in foreign countries in the past. It must find some solution of the rivalry of the craft and industrial ideals in this sphere, and must recast the constitution of the Unions so as to adjust satisfactorily the relations of local leadership (shop stewards' movement) to the central administration.

(ii) In any case, with a view to securing whatever demands it may decide on, Labour must be consolidating and bringing up to date Trade Union organisation. It must find some solution of the rivalry of the craft and industrial ideals in this sphere, and must recast the constitution of the Unions so as to adjust satisfactorily the relations of local leadership (shop stewards' movement) to the central administration.

(iii) It must be willing to renounce without qualification the policy of restriction of output. But this it cannot do, unless it is frankly given adequate safeguards in lieu of this.

(iv) It must by all means maintain the right to strike, through the more it can avoid the actual exercise of the right, consistently with a continual advance in its position, the better.

(v) It should throw itself enthusiastically into the Co-operative Movement, and at the same time strive for the linking up of this in the closest manner with Trade Unionism.

(vi) It should devote the utmost care to the securing, through the State, of power for rousing generation, and to its own continued self-education by means of such agencies as the W.E.A.

(b) Capital should meet frankly and sympathetically the claims of Labour. It should be willing to act honourably, in every particular, up to the spirit of the Trade-Union-conditions pledge. In particular, it should recognise that it can only reasonably demand: the abandonment of restriction of output on the basis of a thorough recasting of industrial relations. More generally, it should be ready to treat Labour frankly as a real partner in industry.

(c) The State should insist on such a solution of the difficulty as to the organisation of competition as may be heartily accepted by the Trade Unions themselves. It should pursue a steady policy of industrial conciliation; however, not in the interests of peace-at-any-price, but on a basis of peace with thorough justice to Labour. It should further promote the steady nationalisation or municipalisation of such industries as from time to time become ripe for this; thus converting as rapidly as possible the present shareholders' rights into modern company rights, having only a fixed annual claim on the product of industry and no voice of any kind in its management.

(ii) In all industries so taken over it should give a definite and large share of control to the Trade Unions. It should further pursue a strenuous policy of developing the natural resources of the nation and (subject to the just rights of native races) of the Empire. It should also push on with a very advanced programme of national housing and education. The heavy taxation, required for these measures and for the interest on the War Debt, it should throw, in constantly increasing measure, on the rentier class.

(73) MR. GEORGE RUSSELL ("A. E.").

National (Ireland).

I do not think that an Irishman permanently resident in Ireland and without first-hand knowledge of industry in Great Britain could make any suggestions of practical value towards the settlement of its after-war problems. I think the menace of the peace before us is greater than the menace of the unconcluded war. I have forebodings that the conditions of Labour in a few years after peace is declared will be worse than they have been for nigh a century. It seems to me inevitable in a social order, where Labour is regarded as a commodity like soap or candles, that the flooding of the market with labour will result in the lowering of the market value of labour. But this it is impossible to prevent. To prevent this is impossible when the flood of labour is due to genuine need. But this is the case at the present moment, when the flood of labour is due to genuine need.
Jews and Assimilation.

(To the Editor of The New Age.)

Mr. Bulvar Schwartz has solved the Jewish problem. It is only necessary “to treat the Jews with kindness and tolerance,” and “despite their marked resemblance to their caricature” (whatever that may mean), they will “learn to despise what is condemned by Englishmen,” they will “look with aversion upon the uncommendable traits of their fathers,” and they will be “initiated to a new code of honour, to an improved standard of ingenuousness. Avarice and perfidy will of the Jewish people, first of all here in England, become odious to them,” and eventually, I suppose, we poor heathen Jews will be transformed into highly respectable citizens, in a Bulvar-Schwartzian Utopia, where we shall live happily ever after. The whole purpose of Mr. Schwartz’s article is to prove the assimilation of the Jews. His argument is that Anglo-Jewry has shown the way, and “that nothing can prevent the Jews from gradually becoming swallowed up.” Even in Russia, “their newly gained freedom may cause a reaction, and their extreme orthodoxy may give place to religious indifference.”

The turn of this last sentence suggests that Mr. Schwartz is under the impression that what he would term the “Jewish religion” is the only obstacle to his ideal of assimilation. Actually there is no such thing as a Jewish religion. There is a Judaism, which is a system of life, a complete national civilisation, economic, religious, ethical, social, aesthetic, and cultural. What connection is there between religion and Jewish life; he has absorbed a little English culture which he has not digested; and he has rushed into print with a smoothly written, tongue-in-the-cheek-like examination of Anglo-Jewish conditions, based upon a number of over-emphasised half-truths, which are made to point towards the inevitable “swallowing-up” of the Jewish people, first of all here in England, and, later on, “even in Russia.”

I wonder if Mr. Schwartz knows anything of Russian Jewry. What would happen if 14 per cent. of the population of the United Kingdom were Jews, as is the case in Poland? Imagine a Jewish population of more than six million in the British Isles! Why, there are more Jews in the Russian town of Berditcheff, or in Warsaw, than there are in the whole of England! What influence can the Bulvar-Schwartzian assimilation of Anglo-Jewry have upon the Jewish people, which numbers thirteen million, the bulk of whom are indifferent. Mr. Schwartz has noticed a few superficial happenings in Jewish life; he has absorbed a little English culture which he has not digested; and he has rushed into print with a smoothly written, tongue-in-the-cheek-like examination of Anglo-Jewish conditions, based upon a number of over-emphasised half-truths, which are made to point towards the inevitable “swallowing-up” of the Jewish people, first of all here in England, and, later on, “even in Russia.”

Jewish nationalism in England is stronger than it has ever been before, and it is only a very small minority of the Jewish population which is not more or less in sympathy with the Jewish national aspirations. Writings of the character of Mr. Schwartz’s article are dangerous, because they mislead people, because they misrepresent movements which are vital to millions of men and women. There is a class of writers, to which Mr. Schwartz appears to belong, who have no sense of responsibility nor reverence for ideals which inspire multitudes. For the sake of an essay they will destroy what others are laying down their lives to build up. They have no sympathy, no earnestness, no understanding. They have torn themselves from their people; they look down upon them with an amused contempt; they know nothing of their traditions, of their sorrows, and of their hopes, and yet they dare to speak in the name in the public Press. They do not know what it is to throw themselves into the glowing enthusiasm of a great movement, to feel intensely the soul of our own people, to speak for them because we are part of them, because we believe in them, because we share their ideals. They are too broad-minded to narrow themselves down to a love of their own people. They do not realise that it is only in such nationalism that we can go deep—to the very heart of things. Such people have no right to meddle in affairs which concern the well-being of millions of men and women. They should stand on one side, and watch the cablewhat that is being done. In God’s name, have these people no sense of decency?

These three years of war have meant suffering for the Jewish people. In Russia, Poland, Galicia, and Rumania, millions of Jews have been torn from their homes, and are wanderers, compelled to live on charity, condemned to misery and starvation. Jewish towns have been destroyed, Jewish men and women and children have died of hunger. Nearly three million of a million of Jews have been fighting in the various armies, and have suffered in proportion to their numbers. The very foundations of Jewish life have been shattered. Our people, gipsy between life and death. It bleeds from a thousand wounds. Only now are the wounds beginning to heal.

The Russian Revolution has freed the Jews of Russia. Immediately they have united to demand national independence. The Council of Soldiers’ and Workmen’s Delegates has adopted their demand into its programme, and the principle of granting the demand will in all likelihood be embodied in the new Russian Constitution.

In Galicia, in Poland, and in Rumania, the Jewish populations are also demanding national autonomy. The Jewish masses everywhere are organising nationally; they demand the recognition of the Jewish nation; they claim the right to build their national destiny.

We have wandered about on the face of the earth for two thousand years. We have been strangers in every country, more or less grudgingly tolerated. “Go back to Palestine!” has always been hurled at us with hatred or with sneers by the rabble of every land, not even excluding this country. We have lived incomplete, distorted lives. We have been compelled to absorb alien cultures; we have been unable to develop our own individuality; we have frittered away our energies; we do not ask for “toleration and kindness.” This is no time for sugar-sticks and gingerbread. We want to live our own life. We want no pity, no cajolery, no respect. We have no need of alien languages and of alien cultures. We want to develop our own individual life. We have built for others long enough; it is time that we should build for ourselves. If we can produce statesmen and artists for others, why cannot we produce them for ourselves? We have been slaves for two thousand years. Is it not enough?

The future of our people is at stake. Everything hangs in the balance. Every fibre in us cries out for action, for immediate, strong, sincere action.

And in such a time, when it is necessary to exert all our energies, in order to preserve our national existence, these smooth-tongued prattlers, whose only occupation is the smoothing and polishing of life to suit their puerile theories, come along and pique about the inevitability of assimilation, and sneer at our national aspira-
tions and at our Palestinian hopes. They say in effect to the world at large: "Really, you know, it isn't an advisable to take these people seriously. They're only making a lot of fuss about nothing. You see, they're going to be swallowed up to do nothing. And it is for these reasons—and for their Palestine—well, it isn't a land flowing with milk and honey, and they don't really want to go there. So there's an end of that." If "Palestine is not a land flowing with milk and honey," there are enough young Jews in England and in Russia, and in every other country, with ideals enough and with courage enough, to go out and make it so, as it was of ancient days. We are not afraid of work. But we are not afraid of the sacrifice. And for those who have sacrificed, we are the less afraid. We are a nation, and we want to live our national life. It may even be that Palestine, which contains wonderful possibilities both as an agricultural country, with willingness. We have made our sacrifices voluntarily. We have not considered our services as the payment of a debt. Such debts can never be repaid. We have only done our duty to the lands in which we lived. But we have still another duty beyond the duties of our citizenship. We have our duty to our own people. We cannot allow the tragedy of this war, with all the sufferings it has meant for us, to pass by, without making a strenuous effort to draw out of it the solution of our problem of national life. It is impossible to continue to live the abnormal, disconnected life of before. Our will to live is strong. We demand the right to live under healthy, normal conditions of nationality. We do not deny the existence of assimilationist Jews. They exist, but they are not the Jewish people. We have no complaint against the assimilationist Jews as such. We do not deny them. We only ask that they are dishonest in their attitude. They have found a means of reconciling the irreconcilable, to their own satisfaction. They have made no effort to fight against the tendency of alien cultures, whose elements are interwoven with the atmosphere of their environment. They have surrendered their specific Jewish individuality; they have drifted along the stream of least resistance. It is possible that they are perfectly true to themselves, although it is difficult to believe that they are true in themselves. They observe certain Jewish rites; they are Englishmen and Frenchmen, or at least so they say, who are members of a religious sect, whose beliefs are almost identical with those of Theists. They have lost the spirit of Judaism. Thank God, they are few in numbers. We have no quarrel with them. They may go their own ways. They are free to speak for themselves. But it is intolerable that they should seek to pass off their views as the sentiments of the Jewish people. Let them explain what they mean only for themselves. We do not ask their assistance. We prefer that they should leave us alone. Let them call themselves Englishmen or Frenchmen, or whatever in God's name they will. Let them observe Jewish ceremonial or not. It does not matter to us. They may not be the mass of the Jewish people. They are only withered leaves which have fallen from the Tree of Judaism. They are not even a new appearance in our life. We have always had our assimilationists. As a great Jewish writer has said, the greater the nation, the more room there is for dust to fall upon it. We had our Jewish assimilationists in Egypt, when we were cornered and driven to the pyramids. We had them in the wilderness, where they made themselves a golden calf. We had them in Palestine, in the most glorious periods of our history, when they were wont to "go a-whoring" after strange gods. We had them in Babylon, where they mingled with the people of the land, and forgot Zion and Jerusalem. We had them in Rome, in Greece, in Spain; we have them in Poland, in England, in France. (And in passing I might add that "assimilation is impossible in Germany," "because of the anti-Semitism of the Germans." Germany is the home of modern assimilation, the home of the best-known and most active Jewish assimilationists. Assimilation is independent of the attitude of the people towards the Jewish population. It exists in the most liberal and in the most anti-Semitic countries. It is the result of the tendency towards submission to more powerful forces.) There have always been Jews who have been ready to adapt themselves to the conditions of life around them. There have always been Jews who have been willing to embrace the customs of the people of the land. There have always been Jews who have been content to be servile flatterers to the rulers of the countries in which they have lived. We have always had our assimilationists. But their fate has always been to leave the Jewish people, or to die out, and the Jewish people has gone on living. Assimilation means being eaten up, being swallowed up into another organism; it means self-extinction. It is an impertinence that Jewish assimilationists should come along, with their smattering of culture, and pretend to solemnly to discuss the future of Jewry, basing their conclusions upon what is happening in the little Anglo-Jewish community of about 200,000 souls. It is intolerable that they should come down from their Olympus of isolation and pull down to the Jewish people what they are to do. It is like a suicide club preying self-extinction to humanity. This is a time for work. We must concentrate all our efforts. The tragedy of this war, the tragedy of all peoples, the tragedy of our own people, has given us a new name for dilettantism and for cynical witticisms. There is no room for assimilation in this world. Every people means something for the progress of humanity. Each national culture is another link in the structure of civilisation. And we Jews also have our culture. We demand the right to develop it freely under national conditions. We have given the world much spiritual treasure. We shall not be content to have achieved it in the past. We shall go forward. We shall continue our work. We shall make the world richer for our freedom. The nation which created the Bible, which granted "equal rights for the strangers who dwell among you," which looked forward to the glorious visions of the Hebrew prophets, is still capable of further contributions to civilisation. We have never been sparing in our gifts. We have given all that we have had, freely. We have never claimed more than the right to live our own life. We do not seek to dominate other peoples. We do not even wish to compel all our own people to be national Jews. We only claim that those of us, the greatest proportion of the Jewish people, who feel the need of a national life, should be given the opportunity to develop it under normal conditions. The Jewish people is struggling for its existence. It is a struggle for life or death. Let all those who have the welfare of the Jewish people at heart help us. We need workers—thousands of them. We want men and women who will help us to build the future of our people. But those Jews who do not feel the spirit of our people, who are content with the incomplete and negative ideals of assimilation, who ask assimilation to share in the rebuilding of our Jewish national life, we ask of them only that they shall leave us alone. We will do the work. We do not want their help. Our culture has absorbed foreign elements? Very well, we shall purge it. Our exile has bent our backs? Good! We shall strengthen them. Our hopes are impossible, impractical? Wait; we shall realise them. We only ask the right to be allowed to do these things. Help us if you will. But, in God's name, do not hinder the work! —JOHANN LIPWITZ.
Out of School.

It would be a very good thing for our attempt at an educational renascence if we could begin by realising that we know scarcely anything about education. A very respectable philosophy of education lies neglected before the practitioners of teaching; but it is vitiated, and its neglect is partly explained, by the fact that it is all in the air. Theory, irrefutably sound, is abundant, but knowledge is wanting of the means by which it can be brought to practice. The technique of education is still in its infancy.

It is something that our present educational reformers, having made their cautious attempts to increase the content of education, have begun to focus their attention—though the focus is somewhat blurred and wobbling—upon the teacher. The economic factor must come first; it is only by a miracle of good will that teaching is as good as it is, as professedly offers neither security nor prospect of security. But there must also come, with the rise in the standard of life that is accorded to the profession, or won by its closer solidarity, a revolution in our outlook upon the teacher's function.

That function is, not merely to teach, but to discover the means of teaching. The teacher must also be a diligent research worker, for he alone can effect the necessary union of practice with theory. In the excellent Report of the Scottish Education Reform Committee (why is Scotland, with its fine educational tradition, left unrepresented upon the Reconstruction Committee?) a wise distinction is made between theoretical and practical research. The former is of the highest potential value, but it will be sterile unless it is met by an answering spirit of investigation in the schoolroom. And there is always the danger that specialised, isolated research will become actually unreal and foolish, as well as merely seeming unreal and foolish to those who are not following up its suggestions and implications. The Memorandum of the Child Study Society, London, recommends a State Educational Research Board, a system of local 'experimental and observational schools,' and an endeavour to apply, in the general run of schools, the knowledge worked out in these institutions. The essential factor that is missing from this scheme, or is represented only by the vaguest of hints, is originate research carried out in the ordinary schools themselves. The distinction laid down between schools specialised for observation and experiment and schools not so specialised would lead to artificiality and formalisation in the specialised schools, and a blind misapplication of rule of thumb in the others. All schools ought to work together in one co-ordinated effort of research. Some, no doubt, would excel in this; but they would become psychological laboratories without ceasing to be schools, and their pioneer work would be integrated with the humbler efforts of their neighbours.

Educational psychology, in particular, has to beware of a tendency to become a mere branch of bio-physiology. Psychology is the science of the psyche, and if it mechanically follows the tram-lines laid down by the mature physical sciences it ends by leaving the psyche out of account. Its primary concern is to form qualitative and quantitative judgements. It has to discover the means of teaching these, as far as may be possible, in quantitative terms. By following the established tracks of method that have been grooved by the purely quantitative sciences, it tends, as they do, to eliminate the qualitative factor as a nuisance and a source of confusion. For this reason it would be useless to have teachers doing the practical work for which psychology provides a merely formulæ. The Child Study Society rightly insists that the research schools it recommends should be managed by people who are both educationists and psychologists; but I think that principle needs to be carried further. The psychology of education needs to be 

It is here that solid consideration is necessary of the problems that confront the ordinary teacher. The trained educational psychologist who wants to keep research in his own capable hands has the obvious reply to my argument, that the ordinary teacher is not fitted for research. The answer is that research will not have the collective authority and reality that are necessary to keep it out of blind alleys until the ordinary teacher is fitted for it. The training colleges are at work already, instilling the first principles of psychology; their only lament is that teachers go out and fail to carry the principles into effect. But in point of fact the teachers do carry away with them, often unconsciously, the something better which lies behind the principles that they have been taught—the impulse to create new principles for themselves, in accordance with the conditions and the needs that they come across in their very diverse experience of actual school work. It is upon the further and more conscious development of this impulse to originate experiment that the training colleges would do well to concentrate their attention.

After all, the main demand of a true psychology is that the teacher should discover and develop the essential psyche of childhood. He must discover it, not take it on trust as discovered by the professors (which it is not), or he will lose all the inspiration and motive force that is instinct in the process of collective discovery. And he must develop it for himself, not simply and solely as is instructed to develop it, because without creative partnership between teacher and children there is no education. The difficulty is to see how the main body of teachers can be set in motion along the lines of creative education without the instruction in a more or less enlightened rule of thumb which the specialists in psychology are now eager to impart. Then there is no immediate extinction of the imparted enthusiasm; its effect dies out in a month or so, and then reaction sets in. But how can we evoke the real and permanent enthusiasm? No doubt it is there to be evoked, or there would not be the thousands of teachers who are grinding on without hope of reward, material or spiritual.

I think the most practical suggestion is that teachers should be taught, not only how to teach, but how to invent their own methods of teaching. We have heard a great deal, since the spirit of Froebel has begun to speak to us again, about the primary importance of originate activity for children. It may be worth while to look further back, and to insist on the importance of originate activity for teachers. The training of teachers ought not to consist only in their attentive absorption of other people's ideas about the process called education, but in encouraging the development and formulation of their own ideas. We need, and we do not yet possess, a democratic system of education; we have begun to take in the idea that childhood is a democracy worth taking into account; the next step is to realise that teachers also have a collective soul, and need to become aware of themselves, both as a society and as individuals. If we can set the teachers free to think for themselves, their classes will not fail to understand what is meant by liberty.

KENNETH RICHMOND.
Drama,
By John Francis Hope.

It is a maxim of a certain section of the female population of this country that one might as well be dead as not be in the fashion, not recognising that they are dead because they are in the fashion. Unfortunately, this idea of being damned in a crowd is not limited to the female population; it affects playwrights, particularly those who, like Mr. Horace Amnesley Vachell, aspire to be successful playwrights. They are as imitative as monkeys, showing discrimination only by the fact that they ape success. Apparently, they choose their models by one test only, the number of performances; then they observe what they think is the distinctive feature of the play, and proceed to work that feature into a concoction of their own. For example, democracy is quite popular on the stage at the present moment; at the Haymarket Theatre (where Mr. Vachell's two successes, "Quinney's" and "Fishpingle" were produced), a tailor becomes a Brigadier-General and marries the daughter of a baronet. What could be more natural than that Mr. Vachell should jump at the idea, should perceive the comic possibilities of, let us say, a barber elevated to the peerage? Surely that would be as great a success at the Savoy as Mr. Harold Terry's "General Post" is at the Haymarket? No sooner thought of than done! (I believe that Mr. Vachell writes two plays a day between meals), and Mott's Hairdressing Saloon, Swasheumble-on-Sea, is created.

The barber-idea permits of various reminiscences of stage-plays. Old Eccles, in "Caste," set the fashion for speaking about the working classes; and if a cobbler is always a Radical, a barber must be at least a Socialist. Bert Mott's Socialism has very little to do with economics; it seems to consist of denunciations of the idle rich as represented by the House of Lords, a propaganda which, as recently as 1909, was adopted as the official programme of the Liberal Party. The denunciation develops no Socialist idea, and is not directed even to political action; but it enables Mr. Vachell to utilise a number of clichés, and to represent what he imagines to be a Socialist as considering them to be oratorical inspirations. The humour of elevating Bert Mott to the peerage that he has denounced is so obvious that Mr. Vachell could not miss it; and the inevitable scene of the plebeian in the drawing-room follows.

But Mr. Vachell's aristocrats are no better than his Socialists. Their good manners are execrably bad, for they are manifested only in continuous and meticulous correction. Who cares whether aristocrats say "sherry" or "sherry wine," for example? Yet Mr. Holman Clark has to descend to trivialities of that type, while Miss Fortescue wastes her time in picking monkeys, showing discrimination only by the fact that what soma of them really think of him; and the pigeon promptly flies from his pluckers.

But there is another feature of successful plays for Mr. Vachell to utilise. Lancashire comedy thrives on blackmail; and perhaps a little blackmail will enable Mr. Vachell to rescue his coiffeur-hero from the clutches of the aristocracy, and also to reveal him as one of the basely-born. Socialists, someone has said, are only aristocrats born out of their class; and if they can be registered under the heading of sinister by the simple admission of the distinctive feature of successful Lancashire comedy, so much the better. Incidentally, the playwright may claim that his dénouement is very distantly related to the fantasy of the "Arabian Nights"; also, it enables him to betray the contempt for dramatic technique that made Shaw so successful. On all grounds, then, a little blackmail scene may be introduced; and Miss Polly Emery appears with her little drop of gin and a demand for fifty pounds, and an annuity. But Mr. Vachell is an amateur blackmailer; women do not exchange babies, even if both babies are supposed to be dying. Besides, he has made his dénouement incredible by his previous treatment of the character of Mrs. Mott; she did not want Bert to be a peer, she wanted him to remain a barber, to marry his assistant, and to continue to denounce the Lords. A word, either to him or to the relatives of her deceased husband, and she would have had her way; but then Mr. Vachell would not have had his blackmail scene. As Miss Polly Emery has nothing to do that is worthy of her, this would not have mattered to the audience; but Mr. Vachell had got his play into such a muddle that it would have required some thought to discover another means of letting his hero down to the realities of life and love and labour, and then it is quite likely that that means would not be in the fashion of successful comedy. No; "Humpty-Dumpty" had to have a fall, and Mr. Vachell makes sure that he shall not bounce.

I hope that "Humpty-Dumpty" will have a real fall; it would be a disgrace to the English stage, even in war-time, if the skill of the actors were to give life to such stuff. Irving nearly succeeds in making a character of the barber, wasting his genius in a vain attempt to make us believe that the impossible is the comical. But he does not quite succeed; Bert Mott is not the creature of fantasy that Beverley was, nor the embodiment of grace like "The Angel in the House," nor a real character-study like Corporal Brewer; he is, as he says at last, "nobody," and out of nobody Irving himself can make nobody. When a self-correction of "sauvou" or "studio" for "shop" has to pass muster as comedy, I can only wish for another heat-wave worse than that which brought "Hamlet" to an untimely end. In that case, of course, we should lose the pleasure of watching Miss Mary Jerrold, who is delightful when she does not play Restoration comedy; but at the same time, we should not suffer the misery of seeing her on her knees to her adopted son, confessing to a duplicity that is impossible to her and is not germane to the plot. She cannot redeem, by all her charm, Mr. Vachell's clumsy descent from farce to tragedy; nor can the peculiarly appealing art of Miss Hilda Trevellian make Chrissie Parkins one of those borderland characters in which she delights. Chrissie Parkins is only real when, as in the third act, she scurries about like an infuriated rabbit as she hears from the barber that he is engaged to a lady; and as she never gets a real chance to display that sentimental fantasy that only Barrie can devise for her, she is wasted in the part. Anybody can scurry about like a rabbit, just as anybody could propose to the desolate barber in the same scene written by Mr. Vachell. O, heat, dry up his brain; if thou dost not write the author's bone, let Humpty-Dumpty be as wax and melt before July. Let not the stage of Savoy be a scene for Vachell's damnd incompetence; but give us back our "Hamlet." Shakespeare, whoever he was, could write, but Mr. Vachell can do nothing but plagiarise the author's bone, let Humpty-Dumpty be as wax and melt before July.
Readers and Writers.

Mr. W. B. Yeats' father emigrated to the United States some seven years ago when he was already seventy-three. At eighty, he is still, I am glad to know, hate and interested. The evidence being here before us in the form of "Passages from the Letters of John Butler Yeats," selected and edited by Mr. Ezra Pound, and printed and published by Mr. Yeats' daughters at their Cuala Press (1s. 8d. net). The letters were originally written to W. B. Yeats; and they suffer a little, therefore, from the careful eclecticism suitable to the relation of a robust man of the world to a "changeling" son. And to this defect of eclecticism has been added the customary irritation of a preface by Mr. Pound. For what reason I do not know, Mr. Pound takes a pleasure in irrelevant and untimely provocation. In this respect he is, in my opinion, rather Irish than American; for you may remember that some months ago during a friendly wrangle with "E. A. B." I diagnosed the Irish character as containing a large dose of pure mischief. Mr. Yeats' preface, I am glad to say, supports me in this: he says that "a perfectly disinterested, an absolutely unselfish love of making mischief, mischief for its own dear sake, is an Irish characteristic." And, undoubtedly, Mr. Pound possesses it. Here in this preface, where he is totally obviously dawdling along the road, he himself out of the way as quickly as possible, he must needs denounce as "a loathsome suspicion" the judgment we might form from the Letters that Mr. Yeats senior is a "preacher." What is there "loathsome" in the suspicion that a man like Mr. Yeats may, perchance, at the age of eighty have something to say of value; something, moreover, that he might wish to impress upon his son, and, through his son, upon the world in general? But the preaching so loathsome to Mr. Ezra Pound does nothing more than this: that a man may have both something to say and a desire to say it with effect. As a matter of fact, Mr. Yeats senior is a preacher: Mr. Pound; and all that is wanting to make him a good preacher is the same thing to say twice over. His eclecticism, his freshness of mind, his cultivated habit of stimulating thought rather than of thicket, all make him a preacher, if only of intellectual efficiency; but what, once more, is lacking to make him a good preacher is the possession of a single and integral standard of value.

It is obvious on reading these "Passages" straight through that Mr. Yeats senior belongs to the same class of thinker as the late Samuel Butler. The "Notebooks" of the latter might, indeed, very well have included the whole of Mr. Yeats' Letters; and the most discriminating reader would not, I think, have detected a second hand. Butler, it is plain, was an eclectic of the minor order. From time to time, that is to say, he put down in a notebook such ideas as occurred to him, regardless of their consistency with one another, and only concerned with the particular brilliancy or plausibility of the individual "reflection." That it would be easy to quote one against another, and to fail to discover any underlying unity—only the unity of the mind of Butler himself—Butler would have dismissed as objections of no importance. Who was he to claim consistency? Do I contradict myself, as Whitman asked? Then I contradict myself. Butler, it is plain, was an eclectic of the minor order.

The source of melancholy is that a man deny his own soul. Again I am provoked to a comment. It is not melancholy alone that arises from the denial of the soul. The denial of the soul is revealed in a ghastly cheerfulness that simulates the joy of life as the crackling of thorns under a pot simulates laughter. Outward symptoms, whether of melancholy or the reverse, are, therefore, misleading. The test lies in the inner psychological. The man who denies his soul is an exhausting bore, be he gloomy or cheerful.

Stendhal said that a novel should be a looking-glass dawdling along the road.
A gentleman is one who never thinks of "getting on." I call myself a Greek because I will not pretend to know what I do not know. The Greeks did not believe except as artists believe.

Of such sentences as the foregoing the Letters of Mr. Yeats are full. It will be seen that they are individually stimulating—but I had rather meet them anonymously, and one by one, than in a drove headed by Mr. Pound.

R. H. G.

We Moderns.

By Edward Moore.

CONVENTIONS.—The revolt against conventions in art, thought, life and manners may be due to at least more than one cause. It is usually ascribed to "vitality" which "breaks through" forms, because it desires to be "free." But common sense tells us that more than two or three of our friends abjure conventions for an altogether different reason—to be candid, on account on what I do not know. The Greeks did not believe in inability to endure restraint of any kind. And for the others, we shall judge their "vitality" to be justified instead of running their heads finally into illimitable space. Or does their strength not go just so far? There is something suspicious about this vitality which cannot create: it resembles impotence so much! Heaven preserve the moderns from their "vitality!"

"VITALITY."—When moderns talk of the "vitality" of their most lauded writer, what they mean is finally the size of his muscles, physical energy, or, at the most, strong emotions; not vigour of mind. Well, let us on no account make the opposite mistake and revile the large muscle and energetic feelings: they are admirable things. Let us point out, however, that vitality of emotion undisciplined by vitality of thought leads nowhere, is often disruptive and cannot build. But to build is our highest duty and our peculiar form of freedom—we who have realised that there is no freedom without power. As for the old freedom—it is only the slaves who are not already tired of it.

WHAT IS FREEDOM?—The athlete, by the disciplining of his body, creates for himself a new world of actions; he can now do things which before were prohibited to him; in consequence, he has enlarged the sphere of his freedom. The thinker and the artist by discipline of a different kind are rewarded in the same way. They are now more free, because they have now more capacity.

There are people, however, who think one can be free whether one has the capacity for freedom or not—a characteristically modern fallacy. But a man the muscles of whose body and mind are weak cannot do anything; how can he be free? The concept of Freedom cannot be separated from that of Power.

FREEDOM IN THE DANCE.—Even the most unbridled dance is a form of constraint. The completest freedom of movement is the reward of the severest discipline.

A MORAL FOR MODERN.—A spring gushed forth here on the airy height; but the soil was not hard enough to retain it; and the water sapped away among the soft moss. One day a man came and laid down on both sides, it now imperiously sought an outlet—and a miracle!—leapt glittering into the sunshine. The history of Freedom.

THE RENAISSANCE: A THESIS.—How unsatisfactory are these explanations of the Renaissance which give as its cause the breaking up of the restrictive intellectual canons of the Middle Ages—as if a mere negation could explain such a unique creative era! What has here to be discovered is how freedom and the capacity for freedom should have appeared at the same moment. Perhaps the Middle Ages have now been sufficiently reviled by the admirers of the Renaissance; perhaps that event owing more to than having to acknowledge to the centuries of mediæval repression and discipline. During these centuries the human spirit had been confined in the cranial channel cut for it by mediæval Christianity, a channel of which every mouth was stopped. In the fifteenth century the stream swept away every obstacle and leapt forth in a brilliant cascade, scattering almost pagan warmth and light. The fall of Constantinople and the other circumstances usually given as the explanation of this outburst were only its occasion; the cause lay much deeper, in the long storing up, conserving and strengthening of human powers. The freedom of which the Renaissance was an expression was more, then, than the simple removal of restriction. It was a freedom not political or moral, but vital; a positive enhancement of the natural power of man, who could now do things which hitherto he could not do—an event in the history, not merely of society, but of Man. Accordingly, the "freedom of the individual," so dear to some moderns, does not teach us much here. It was not because freedom was given that people, now created: the freedom was claimed because they now possessed more power, could do more, and had, therefore, the right to a large sphere of freedom. The more naturally free—that is, individually powerful—a people become, the more they will demand and obtain of "individual freedom"; but it is perhaps inexpedient to offer to a people individually weak any more freedom than they can use. They are still at the disciplinary stage; they are preparing for their renaissance; and to the student of human culture the periods of preparation, of unproductiveness, are more worthy of consideration than the productive periods. For in the future we must prepare for our eras of fruition, and not leave them, as in the past, to pure chance.

At the Renaissance, however, it was not even individual freedom in the modern democratic sense that was claimed and allowed; it was at the most the freedom of certain individuals, the naturally free, the powerful. Not until a later time was this claim to be universalised by the unconditional theorists, the generalisers sans distinction, the egalitarians. The French Revolution was the Renaissance rationalised and popularised.

THE UNPRODUCTIVE PERIODS.—Without the Middle Ages the Renaissance would have been impossible; the one, therefore, was as necessary as the other; and our repudiation of the former for its comparative inactivity is entirely without justification. If we happen to be living in an unproductive age, it is our misfortune, then; but we are not entitled, in contemplating this age, to the luxury of condemnation, reproof or scorn. What we may demand of any period now is that it should be a period either of preparation or of fruition. So the present era is, after all, deserving of condemnation, but only because it is not an era of preparation—not for any other reason.

"EMANCIPATION."—The rallying cry of the great writers of last century was "emancipation." Goethe, Heine and Ibsen alike professed as their task the emancipation of man; Nietzsche, their successor, elevated the freed man, the Superman, into an ideal, in the pursuit of which it was necessary meantime that man should discipline himself. The later moderns, our own contemporaries, have freed themselves from seeing in it nothing but a negation, the freedom from some one thing or another. But Ibsen and Heine, these men of true genius, who believed most sincerely that they were "brave soldiers in the war of the liberation of humanity," did, perhaps, place more powers in battling for a thing so trivial! It is barely possible that they meant by emancipation something much more profound; something spiritual and positive; indeed, nothing less than an enhancement of the powers of
man! Certainly both poets looked forward to new "developments" of man: Heine with his "happier and more perfect generations," Heine with his "happier and more perfect generations," begot in free and voluntary embraces, blossoming forth in a religion of joy; Ibsen with his perplexed figures painfully "working their way out to Freedom." It was the task of us in this generation, who should have been the heirs of this tradition, but are not, to supply the commentary to this noble vision; to carry forward this religion of hope further and further. But the cult of modernity has itself prevented this; the latest theory has always seized us and exacted our belief for its hour; the present has invariably triumphed; and we have discarded the great work of last century before we have understood it. Heine only by his predecessors; his healthy and noble seriousness, his desire to restore the harmony between the senses and the soul, as a means towards the emancipation of man, and as nothing else, has been perverted by them into worship of the senses for their own sake—a thing which to Heine would have seemed despicable. Ibsen has fallen among the realists and propagandists; all the spiritual value of his work has for this age been lost—and what a loss!—his battle to deliver man from his weakness and inward slavery has been reduced—it is no exaggeration to a battle to deliver the women of the middle classes from their husbands. The old story of emanation has been again repeated, with the distinction that here there is no trace left of the original source except negative ones! Well, we have to turn back again, as Mr. Chesterton is fond of saying; our task, second to none in grandeur, before which we may well feel abashed, is still the same as that of Goethe, Ibsen and Nietzsche, the task of emancipation. To restore dignity to literature, indeed, it would be necessary to create such a task if it did not already exist.

**GENEALOGY OF THE MODERNS.**—This is what has happened. The conventional moderns of our time are the descendants not of Heine and Ibsen, but of the race against which the poets fought. They live unthinkingly in the present, just as their spiritual ancestors lived unthinkingly in the past. But slavery to the past has long ago fallen into the second place among dangers to humanity; it is slavery to the present that is now by far the greatest peril. Not because they broke the tyranny of the past, but because they had an ideal in the future are the great fighters of last century significant. To think of them as iconoclasts is to miss the point. It is the form of their activity: the past lay between them and their object: on that account alone did they destroy it. But the great obstacle now is the diminution of the present; and were the demi-gods of the future already here, they would be fighting precisely against you, my dear moderns, who live so complacently in your provincial present, making of it almost a cult. To be a modern in the true sense, however, is to be a forerunner; there in this age, an age of preparation, no other test of the modern. To believe that there are still potentials in man; to have faith that the "elevation of the type Man" is possible, yes, that the time is ripe for prepare for it; and to write and live in and by that thought: this is to be modern.

In as near a casual tone as an interviewer may employ with propriety, I mentioned to Mr. Lucas that, during the disturbances in Russia, Maxim Gorki and a committee of artists took over the control of the museums and galleries of the Empire to administer them and to preserve them from harm, did Mr. Lucas, I asked, think that such a thing would ever be possible in England? Mr. Lucas, with the utmost politeness, gave me the name of three or four curators of London museums, and said he was sure they would be glad to give me any information I desired about their charges. To clear up the misunderstanding, I explained that I should value Mr. Lucas's opinions on the possibility of similar co-operation among English writers and artists.

Mr. Lucas replied, "I don't think writers in England are sufficiently sociable for anything like what you mention. But artists might be. Artists have large rooms; they invite people in, and that is good for their breadth of mind. And they have plenty of light; that is good for them, too. Why don't you go and talk to artists about this. You know, I'm so very—"

"Do you not find, Mr. Lucas," I said hurriedly, "that artists—in the usual meaning of the word—are much more limited in their ideas on general subjects than writers? As a rule, is not their whole interest fixed on their own form of art, painting, sculpture, music, pokerwork, or whatever it may be?"

"That is true," admitted Mr. Lucas; "but you must not forget that, to make up for this, we writers do not love one another. We hate." I suggested that personal hatred is not necessarily a bar to professional organisation; but even this did not satisfy Mr. Lucas. "This sounds like progress," he said, "and I do not believe in progress. I do not believe there is such a thing. I think men remain the same to-day as they were yesterday and will be in a thousand years' time."

Turning as few hairs as I could, I said that an organisation did not in itself imply any alteration in the nature of the human beings composing it, whereas its corporate power might be much greater that the sum total of the separate individuals.

Even this proposal came to grief. Mr. Lucas said, "I am an individualist. I believe that everything which has ever been done in the world has been done by individuals."

I asked Mr. Lucas what he thought of Mr. de Maeterk's demand for compulsory truth, and if it would not be a good thing for artists to establish a guild around this idea.

Mr. Lucas said the suggestion was not unlike one of Matthew Arnold's, except that what the latter wished to approach was clarity of thought, not the truth itself. Matthew Arnold wanted to have an English Academy on the model of the French Academy. "But, really," Mr. Lucas continued, "I'm no——"

I anticipated Mr. Lucas's expression of modesty by asking his opinion of academics.

Mr. Lucas said he has no high opinion of them in England. He even hates the sight of them. He dislikes all forms of committees, associations and academies, and never sits on any if he can possibly help it. "I am an impressionist," Mr. Lucas explained.

"Do you think," I inquired, "that there is any hope of compulsory truth?"

"Hope!" said Mr. Lucas; "Hope! That word is not in my vocabulary. I never have any hope of anything."

"Do you think, then," I asked, "that there is any danger of compulsory truth?"

"I am not a bit interested in the idea," Mr. Lucas replied. "For Mr. Lucas is a counsel of perfection, and I do not believe in perfection. And the idea is too original. That is why I do not think it is compatible with the English character, although it might be with the French."
I told Mr. Lucas that I had found almost anything might be compatible with the much maligned English character, and I gave an instance - Tanks.

And thus I fell. With an innocent smile, Mr. Lucas treated me to a long dissertation of a highly technical nature about Tanks. His ostensible aim, I gathered, was to show me how the possession of an original notion as much as an ingenious arrangement of already established inventions. Mr. Lucas ran over the history of the caterpillar wheel and its development, passed on to an examination of the use of armoured cars in warfare, and concluded with a sketch of present-day warfare, the last designed to show that the Tank will play a constantly decreasing part in the future.

When the conversation came back to England, I found that it had dropped all relation to its original subject. I wrote over in my notebook, and greatly agitated by the address'ness of Mr. Lucas.

Interviewers, I felt, should be made of sterner stuff.

Notes on Economic Terms.

CONSUMER. That is, of commodities. Commodities being things produced by Labour acting upon Nature, the consumer is the person for whose consumption such commodities are produced. He is thus both the producer, when he has produced, and the seller. There are, however, many points of interest in the conception of the consumer. In one aspect, he is the last link in the chain of processes that begins with Production and continues through Distribution until it ends in Consumption. From another aspect, however, he is the intermediary between Production and Production; for Production is not necessarily for the sake of Consumption; while Consumption may equally be for the sake of Production. In other words, while we do not necessarily produce in order to consume, we may consume to produce. From still another aspect, Consumption in general stands to Production in general as the processes of eating and assimilating stand to procuring and preparing food. The Consumer is one vast and multifarious appetite which the Producer is perpetually engaged in attempting to satisfy. All Nature, it seems, is to be "eaten" or consumed and assimilated by Man as Consumer; but it must first be exploited or adapted to human consumption by Man as Producer.

Yet, as to the old question - Do we eat to live or live to eat? - the answer is Neither - but we eat because we live and we live because we eat; so the strict answer to the question with which we are concerned is: Consumption for Production is Neither. We produce and consume because it is our nature to. The assumption, moreover, that we produce in order to consume is responsible for the creation of still another aspect of our subject. Assuming production to be for the sake of consumption, the consumer comes to hold a position of superiority over the producer - the latter being, as it were, the slave of the former; and this accounts for the relative degradation of the producer and our neglect of his rights and privileges.

Modern industry is chiefly concerned with the consumer, whose interests, appetites and whims constitute, in effect, commands laid down by him. He is the producer, when he has produced, is the seller. Yet the consumer is made to pay for the subordination of the producer; for the same instrument by which the producer is enslaved is employed to enslave the consumer himself. What is this instrument? It is Capitalism: the possession of both the tools of production and distribution. Capital stands, as it were, between the hands and the mouth; and while, by virtue of its possession of the tools of labour, it controls the hands; by virtue of its possession of the tools of distribution, it controls the mouth as well. The consumer, in short, while consenting to the tyranny of Capital over the producer consents, at the same time, to Capital's tyranny over himself.

OVER-PRODUCTION. Arises when goods produced are left "over" after demand has been satisfied; a glut in the market; an excess of Supply over Demand; more sellers than buyers. However, it is necessary to observe that supply and demand are here used in their economic sense only. Of a good thing there cannot very well be over-production or an excess of supply; and the non-existence of an economic or market-demand by no means implies the non-existence of a human reed or actual demand. Over-production, therefore, assumes an excess of supply over an effective or market demand only; in other words, an excess of demand that comes to market with money in its hand. It may, in consequence, be regarded from the other side as an absence of spending-power on the part of the would-be buyers. Give the latter more spending-power, and over-production would cease to exist; a glut in the market usually means only a poverty in the pocket of demand. Over-production is thus always possible and in imminent in societies where spending-power is inferior to producing-power. It means simply that we can, and occasionally do, produce more of this or that commodity than people in general can afford or have the spending-power to buy or effectively demand. The remedy is a better distribution of spending-power, and an increase in the buying-power of the consumers. This can be realized by increased wages, increased monied capital, or increased spending-power.

COMPETITION. Essentially Competition is sale by auction, and usually without reserve. All buyers and sellers are in effect both buyers and sellers; for the buyers when they buy are selling the liquid commodity of money for a fixed commodity; and the sellers when they sell are buying a liquid commodity for a fixed commodity. In every market operation, therefore, between buyers and sellers there is competition on both sides, each desiring to obtain as much as possible of the commodity (liquid or fixed) which he wishes to buy in return for as little as possible of the commodity (fixed or liquid) which he wishes to sell. And the price at which the exchange takes place is determined, as in an ordinary auction, by the relation of the number and appetite and spending-power of the buyers to the sellers. In a number of these transactions, it is true, a reserve price is placed on the commodities offered for bidding and exchange; and these commodities are withdrawn from the market if their price falls below the reserve put upon them. But in the case of Labour and of other perishable commodities, a reserve price is impossible, since the commodities will not keep or cannot keep themselves for a later occasion; competition is thus all in favour of non-perishable commodities (Capital in particular); but it is all against perishable commodities, and Labour in particular.

BLACKLEGS. Members of an industry who refuse to keep the rules laid down by their fellows for their common good. Though usually confined to wage-earners who remain outside their union and break its rules, the term "blackleg" may be as properly applied to members of other occupations (professions, for example) who not only refuse to be bound by the rules laid down by its members for the good of the profession as a whole, but exercise their power to break them.

A lawyer or a doctor, a stockbroker or a dentist, who refuses to accept and to carry out the common rules of these professions becomes guilty of unprofessional conduct, and renders himself liable to expulsion. Such a man has become a blackleg with respect to his profession. Usually, however, the blackleg, whether in professions on the wage-industries, has never been a member of the Association or Trade Union; but breaks their rules, the term "blackleg" may be as properly applied to members of other occupations (professions, for example) who not only refuse to be bound by the rules laid down by its members for the good of the profession as a whole, but exercise their power to break them. A lawyer or a doctor, a stockbroker or a dentist, who refuses to accept and to carry out the common rules of these professions becomes guilty of unprofessional conduct, and renders himself liable to expulsion. Such a man has become a blackleg with respect to his profession. Usually, however, the blackleg, whether in professions on the wage-industries, has never been a member of the Association or Trade Union; but breaks their rules, the term "blackleg" may be as properly applied to members of other occupations (professions, for example) who not only refuse to be bound by the rules laid down by its members for the good of the profession as a whole, but exercise their power to break them.

INDUSTRY. In general, Industry is the organized and intelligent application of Labour to Nature for the purpose of producing human utilities. In the particular, an Industry is the sum of processes by means of which a particular form of exploiting Nature is carried on. An Industry thus includes every process necessary to bringing a piece of Nature to the human
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market; and its scope is therefore defined by the character of the commodity and by the character of the Nature from which it is derived. The classification of men’s needs—needs, that is, that become effective demands, for needs without money in their hands are not demand in the economic sense—gives us, in general, the classification of industries. Not that industry being a mode of applying Labour to Nature for the satisfaction of man’s demands presupposes a human demand corresponding to its proposed supply; and hence it follows that a classification of human psychology is a classification of industries. An organised society is one in which not only is every industry organised for the most efficient available method of exploiting Nature; but in which industries find themselves valued in the scale of the needs to which they correspond. In short, a national organisation of industry is a Man writ large and in terms of his powers over Nature.

A Modern Prose Anthology.

Edited by R. Harrison.

III.—MR. J.-S-PH C-NR-D.

To tell the truth, as the skipper (so to speak) of living novelists, I was rather taken aback to find myself in so very prosy an anthology. Not that I wasn’t always ready to adapt myself (as they say in the trade) to whatever conditions were uppermost. I am and always have been a thorough-going merchant-man in that respect. There is a sort of unwritten law among us (as you reader-chaps probably know, and no true merchant-man—so far as I have heard—has ever broken it) which places beyond the pale any young bumpetty privater who endeavours to sell his barque against the tide of popular feeling. And quite right too, I say.

It is customary in these waters, whenever a man gets an idea, to spin it out and beat it and bury it and resurrect it till (as my old shipmate Penworthy used to say) you know Penworthy? I came across him only the other evening in one of those dirty little slop-shops on the quayside that I occasionally look into for old times’ sake; he was very down-at-heel, poor chap—but I managed to articulate hoarsely, but my dried-up throat managed to say—yes—and he stared at me and said—‘A breeze!” He scrambled awkwardly to his feet. I thought he would have killed me there and then.

I let him run on. I don’t like truth—no man does—but what I like is chance—chance is everything—the only reality—what it all means I can’t know. They can only see the shadow of it all, as you might say, and can never tell what it really means.

Trees, trees, endless forests, heat, and a beetle you could crush crawling insanely through it all, like a lost soul. That is what I mean—when you have gone through all this, and that it might also have

"The Shadowy East," by J.-S-PH C-NR-D.

ALMOST ANY CHAPTER.

He moved his blackened hand senselessly across his heated brow, making his meaning as plain as possible. . . . He shuffled his feet; he stared at me sightlessly, horribly; . . . I could not move, I could have crushed him—I hated him. God, how I hated him! Yet, he was fine, he was noble! ‘But the ship, Marlow (he called me that—the worm!), the ship . . .’ His voice ended in a drone. Nothing else moved; the palms swayed silently in the wind, the water lapped soundlessly on the ghostly shore. I felt I must shriek aloud to escape the horror of it, the dead weight of it like a sack that crushed my soul. ‘Speak . . .’ I managed to articulate hoarsely, but my dried-up throat gave back no sound. He looked at me pityingly. He was becoming cooler now, but he was still feverish; I think my silence irritated him. I saw his contempt moving like a shark in the turbid blue of those terrible eyes. For a moment the lifelessness of it suffocated me. I wanted to ask him, to drag from him—if necessary by force—what it all meant. But he had me in a vice, and he knew it. I demanded news. There was in that, if it could be got . . . He did not move, but lay like a log. I verily believe he had not heard, did not understand. Hate! Good God! Mustn’t a man ever—. I watched a thin breeze stir his hair, caress his cheek. I pushed him roughly, exclamining: ‘A breeze! A breeze!’ He scrambled awkwardly to his feet. I thought he would have killed me there and then. I hoped he would. I did, God forgive me! But all he said was “You . . . eh?” I don’t know why we behaved like lunatics. I moved back a step and nodded mysteriously. Then he spoke.

I cannot recall why the shipper stumbled and spat out his jargon. Yap! yap! gabble! screech! It was good to hear him. ‘Devil take you . . . That is right . . . That is real—that is!’ I let him run on. I don’t like truth—no man does—but what I like is chance—chance is everything—the only reality—what it all means I can’t know. They can only see the shadow of it all, as you might say, and can never tell what it really means.

Trees, trees, endless forests, heat, and a beetle you could crush crawling insanely through it all, like a lost soul. That is what I mean—when you have gone through all this, and that it might also have

"A breeze! A breeze!'' He scrambled awkwardly to his feet. I thought he would have killed me there and then. I hoped he would. I did, God forgive me! But all he said was “You . . . eh?” I don’t know why we behaved like lunatics. I moved back a step and nodded mysteriously. Then he spoke.

I cannot recall why the shipper stumbled and spat out his jargon. Yap! yap! gabble! screech! It was good to hear him. ‘Devil take you . . . That is right . . . That is real—that is!’ I let him run on. I don’t like truth—no man does—but what I like is chance—chance is everything—the only reality—what it all means I can’t know. They can only see the shadow of it all, as you might say, and can never tell what it really means.

Trees, trees, endless forests, heat, and a beetle you could crush crawling insanely through it all, like a lost soul. That is what I mean—when you have gone through all this, and that it might also have
something of the Irish atmosphere that I always found would escape me in the end. But pondering on the Yiddish language and what a beautiful language it was, though I had never been able to understand it, made me think I might write my novel in Hebrew and English simultaneously. In thinking of my early resolve to re-write the Old Testament in modern Irish. But I have never been able to read the Old Testament, I remembered.

And my thoughts flew suddenly to Bayreuth and little Gretchen who had read Genesis to me in German, when I had grown tired of listening to Wagner, day after day. Wagner has been superseded, I cried, and my thoughts floated away into a meditation on the coincidence that I should have been reading of Adam in a place so unlike Eden, and of the great beauty of Adam . . . I thought what a fine thing it would be if I could write a story about Ireland and set the scene in Palestine, and I began to smile, thinking of the ignorance of the British public in matters of art, and how they should be equally pleased if I set in a language. But my thoughts flew off at a tangent and I could not control them. And I took down a book, and began dipping into it, my mind still with little Gretchen at Bayreuth. It was the Apocrypha . . . . It will have to be the New Testament, I muttered. What was wanted was a new interpretation of the New Testament—Irish people talking Greek in Galilee, and I determined I would write it in Greek, and I wrote at once to Father Andrew—

(We are extremely sorry to cut short Mr. M--re's interesting meditations, but our space is limited. It must suffice that the author finally did write his book, and that he has graciously permitted us to choose a short passage from it for publication.)


CHAPTER XXV.

JESUS had been listening to the discourse of Brother Moses, who had been proving that the God of Judea was also the God of the Gentiles, and that there were not many gods, but one God, but never did Moses' discourse seem less interesting to Jesus, and very soon he went out and sat by himself near the door of the cenoby, amazed at his sudden indifference to all he had hitherto desired, and asking himself whether God were not only a dream or worse than a dream. And he fell to thinking of the pastures upon the hillside, and if this dream went on.

Every man to his last, he said. And a great pity it was that I should have gone out preaching that I knew God, so small that I am, no more than a Syrian dreamer. And my dreams very poor dreams at that, he decided, and his thoughts slipping again into care for his flock, he got up and had found his staff and was making for the hills, when Moses came out. And he caught the sound of the monks singing in the cenoby.

"By the rivers of Babylon, we sat down. Yes, we wept, when we remembered Zion."

He stopped; and then seeing the earnest look on Moses' face, he knew why he had preferred the sheep to the cenoby. It is because I am Irish, he said; and his thoughts began to wander again.

"How shall we sing the Lord's song in a strange land? If I forget thee, O Jerusalem." . . .

You have not cared to hear my discourse, Brother Jesus. I have been preaching the coming of the Messiah. Jesus thought how, in the bondage of an idea, his life had gone by, and he had forgotten his trust. You do well to admonish me, he said. But no sooner was he alone, than his thoughts were at tangents again, and he felt that he drew further and further away from God, and he began listening to the murmur of the brook which he seemed to have always had in his thoughts.

Views and Reviews.

THE TWO INTERNATIONALS.

Russia and America seem to be destined to bring into conflict two different conceptions of international action to secure peace. President Wilson, we know, advocates a positive method of preserving or "enforcing" peace, a method of arbitration, conciliation, and threats of military or economic war against whomsoever shall break the pact. To him the only obstacle to a lasting peace is the militarism of Germany. The League of Nations to Enforce Peace can come into being, the German army must be defeated, the prestige of the German military caste destroyed, and the German people itself be free to co-operate with the free peoples of the world. The peace that will ensued will pass all understanding, and will allow unlimited scope to the makers of perorations; but it will be a peace not dictated by the brute force of the Germans, but by the high resolution, the good intentions, the Liberal principles of their country. The division between this conception and that of President Wilson is complete; to him, the autocratic Government of Germany is the only obstacle to peace; to the Russians, the plutocratic government of industry is the only obstacle. But both agree that peace is desirable; just as it is often alleged that the interests of Capital and Labour are identical, so, in this case, the League of Nations to Enforce Peace (after the defeat of Germany) and the league of workers to combat all attempts of Imperialism to prolong the war in the interest of the well-to-do classes. The working classes of all countries can easily come to a speedy and solid agreement, but only if they are inspired with their own interests and remove the aspirations of Imperialists and militarists. The division between this conception and that of President Wilson is complete; to him, the autocratic Government of Germany is the only obstacle to peace; to the Russians, the plutocratic government of industry is the only obstacle. But both agree that peace is desirable; just as it is often alleged that the interests of Capital and Labour are identical, so, in this case, the League of Nations to Enforce Peace (after the defeat of Germany) and the league of workers to combat all attempts of Imperialists to prolong the war coincide in their objects. Both desire a secure and lasting peace; but which has stolen the other's thunder is an historical question which I do not intend to investigate.

The remarkable thing is that these two conceptions were opposed at the beginning of the war; but the Socialist ideal was then overwhelmed. When Müller, the delegate of the Executive Committee of the German Party, appeared at the Palais Bourbon on August 1, 1914, to ask the French Socialists what they intended to do, he was met with the declaration that "if France were attacked, despite her evident efforts in favour of peace, the Socialists could not refuse war credits in defence of their country." M. P. G. La Chesnais, in his book, "The Socialist Party in the Reichstag and the Declaration of War," cannot forbear to smile at the simplicity of the German Socialists in supposing that a common attitude was possible. "The idea of a common attitude corresponded to the theoretical conception of international proletarian solidarity in face of capitalist States, a conception valid only when economic phenomena alone are in question [that is, never]. To a less degree than in Germany, this phraseology was current also among many French Socialists. It did not take account of such facts as national sentiment. Accordingly, it was very quickly forgotten, in Germany as in France, as soon as national sentiment became the preponderating factor." The German Socialists, having learned a little real-politik from the French, also voted the war credits; and the International was practically destroyed.
But Russia, at least, kept the International faith. Mr. A. W. Humphrey, in his "International Socialism and the War," tells us that when the war credits were demanded from the Duma, M. Valentin Khanstof declared that they had convinced the working class that peace would find in international solidarity the weight to enforce peace at an early date. The terms of that peace will be dictated by the people themselves and not by the diplomats*; and he and the Socialists marched out of the Duma without voting the war credits or the resolution of confidence in the Government. The Revolution, suspended in August, 1914, succeeded in March of this year. But even in the first few months of the war it was impossible to make the Russian Socialists believe that Germany was the only obstacle to peace. The Central Committee of the Social Democratic Party stated in a Manifesto that "of a Russian victory over Germany or a German victory over Russia, the latter is the lesser of the two evils from the point of view of the Russian working class." M. Vandervelde, in November, 1914, told them that "a defeat, not of Germany, but of Russian Junkerdom is a question of life and death. . . . If Belgium should be destroyed, France and England defeated, and German militarism prove triumphant, that would erect a big and lasting hindrance to the progress of humanity and to the development of the free life of nations. The democrats, republicans, and socialists of Belgium, France, and England have resolved to prevent such a disaster by all their power. . . . The democratically-governed countries must count in this horrible fight upon the armed help of the Russian people." But the Russian Socialists remained obdurate; they were not, as the Americans are, "acustomed to deal with facts, not with sophistries." M. Lavin replied for the Minority: "The Russian Socialists know their Government better than other people do, and they remain the irreconcilable enemies of that Government. . . . But the Majority Group were even worse: "We recognise the anti-democratic character of the Prussian hegemony, but as Russian Social-Democrats we cannot forget another enemy of the workers-Russian absolutism in home affairs this enemy remains what it has always been, a merciless oppressor and an unceasing exploiter. . . . Should this war end in victory for our present Government, it will become the centre and mainstay of international reaction. . . . We hope that our interests are not considered as opposed to other European democracies. We are persuaded that Russian absolutism is the chief supporter of reactionary militarism in Europe and that it has bred in the German hegemony the dangerous enmity towards European democracy."

The Russians have done what they then declared it was their duty to do, "to utilise the difficult position in which the Government is now placed in the interests of Russian liberty. In the end that will prove itself to be the best service to the democracy which M. Vandervelde speaks. Being as "simple" as M. Chesnais says that the German Socialists were in August, 1914, they now imagine that it is possible for others to do as they have done, "to consider themselves, not representatives of the two belligerent parties, but representatives of a single movement of the working classes towards the common aim of general peace." These people seem to have no fear of Germany at all; General Smuts threatens that Germany will swallow any formula and them into the bargain, and still they do not tremble. President Wilson, apparently believing in the advocacy of this scheme a mere beating of the air. Mr. Ashbee is full of the windy generalities that have made the advocacy of this scheme a mere beating of the air. Mr. Ashbee is full of the windy generalities that have made the advocacy of this scheme a mere beating of the air. Mr. Ashbee is full of the windy generalities that have made the advocacy of this scheme a mere beating of the air. Mr. Ashbee is full of the windy generalities that have made the advocacy of this scheme a mere beating of the air. Mr. Ashbee is full of the windy generalities that have made the advocacy of this scheme a mere beating of the air. Mr. Ashbee is full of the windy generalities that have made the advocacy of this scheme a mere beating of the air. Mr. Ashbee is full of the windy generalities that have made the advocacy of this scheme a mere beating of the air. Mr. Ashbee is full of the windy generalities that have made the advocacy of this scheme a mere beating of the air. Mr. Ashbee is full of the windy generalities that have made the advocacy of this scheme a mere beating of the air. Mr. Ashbee is full of the windy generalities that have made the advocacy of this scheme a mere beating of the air. Mr. Ashbee is full of the windy generalities that have made the advocacy of this scheme a mere beating of the air. Mr. Ashbee is full of the windy generalities that have made the advocacy of this scheme a mere beating of the air. Mr. Ashbee is full of the windy generalities that have made the advocacy of this scheme a mere beating of the air. Mr. Ashbee is full of the windy generalities that have made the advocacy of this scheme a mere beating of the air. Mr. Ashbee is full of the windy generalities that have made the advocacy of this scheme a mere beating of the air. Mr. Ashbee is full of the windy generalities that have made the advocacy of this scheme a mere beating of the air. Mr. Ashbee is full of the windy generalities that have made the advocacy of this scheme a mere beating of the air. Mr. Ashbee is full of the windy generalities that have made the advocacy of this scheme a mere beating of the air. Mr. Ashbee is full of the windy generalities that have made the advocacy of this scheme a mere beating of the air. Mr. Ashbee is full of the windy generalities that have made the advocacy of this scheme a mere beating of the air. Mr. Ashbee is full of the windy generalities that have made the advocacy of this scheme a mere beating of the air. Mr. Ashbee is full of the windy generalities that have made the advocate of the principle is a mere slapdash of vague sentiment which the League itself does not endorse. What a ferment the idea has caused in America may be judged by the fact that the League expected no more than three hundred delegates to appear at the first annual meeting, and would have regarded it as a success if a number had appeared; but "two days before the date will be cut off from all succour and the co-operation of Western Europe, and a counter-revolution will be fostered and supported, Germany herself will lose her chance of freedom, and all Europe will arm for the next final struggle." Among the Russians, the Russians are employing Liberals in their enterprises. Let them once succeed and these men, now their tools, will be ground to powder beneath the weight of the great military Empire; the Revolutionists of Russia

Reviews.

The American League to Enforce Peace. By C. R. Ashbee. With an Introduction by G. Lowes Dickinson. (Allen & Unwin. 2s. 6d. net.)
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of the first session more than two thousand delegates, representing every walk in life, and from every State in the Union, not to mention Alaska, Hawaii, and Porto Rico, had registered at temporary headquarters at the New Willard Hotel, while others were coming in on every train. The little hall that had seemed ample to meet the modest anticipations of the committee on committees has hastily exchanged for the Bethesda Belasco Theatre. But the quality of the papers remains the most remarkable phenomenon of the Assembly; for each one of the speakers recognised that he was preaching to the converted, and that it was necessary to come down to details. The four general topics were: "The Platform"; "Practicability of the League Programme"; "American Interests Affected by the Programme"; and "Plans for giving Effect to the Programme." The range of the lectures, from the legal argument of ex-President Taft on the "Constitutionality of the Proposals" to Samuel Gompers on "American Labour," Professor Graefon Wilson's lecture on "The Monroe Doctrine," and Dr. Talcott Williams' delightful trip into the history of Porto Rico, had registered at temporary headquarters under the general title of "The Thought and Purpose of the People," which concluded the conference, brought practically every aspect of American life into relation with the League. American business, American agriculture, American ideals, the Churches, social progress, all these and many other activities were viewed in the light of the proposals of the League by men who were getting down to business. The frank recognition of difficulties, of objections, of the limitations of immediate possibility, and so forth, must be extremely gratifying to those who have been barking at the usual statements of vague good intentions; and if the publishers of Mr. Ashbee's book wish to do a real service to the cause, they will undertake the distribution in England of the League's "Proceedings." This volume of twenty-five addresses makes obsolete all the general appeals that English pacifists continue to repeat; pacifism itself is out-mooted by the constitutional suggestions made at this assemblage, and we are confronted not with a mere advocacy of peace, but with a definite conception of government. Not since Hamilton and his friends argued for the adoption of the Articles of Confederation has a constitutional proposal been treated in such detail; and a similar treatment, from the English point of view, is imperatively necessary.

The Menace of Peace. By George D. Herron. (Allen & Unwin. 2s. 6d. net.)

It is interesting to observe that America's entry into the war has stimulated the Americans to paradox. One public man was reported to begin a speech with the words: "I am a pacifist; I believe in peace at any price, and my price is now war." So long as men are willing to fight for peace, so long shall we have war; the militarists made war abominable, but the pacifists have made it admirable, have dignified it as a worthy means to noble ends. When we used to talk of menaces, we spoke of "the menace of war"; Mr. Herron confronts and confounds the pacifists with "the menace of peace." It is true that he claims that this is a spiritual conflict, in which all the right is on the side of the Allies, and the wrong on the Central powers; a familiar argument which has, at least, the merit of simplicity. But whether the argument be good or bad, the fact remains that it is a justification of war; and the most hardened militarists, even German militarists, will not object to this perpetuation of their spirit. Whether we accept Nietzsche's dictum: "A good war halloweth every cause"; or the "spiritual conflicters" reversal of it: "A good cause halloweth every war"; the result is the same; the constant in the two propositions is war. This being so, the statements of the details of the "spiritual conflict" have an extraordinary resemblance to the slamming matches which the Homeric heroes waged before joining in combat, and which, we believe, are meant to prove the preliminary of combat between groups of hostile Highlanders. The combatants no longer accuse each other of being basely born, nor do they dive into domestic history, canonical or apocryphal, for material of insult. They elaborate the general proposition that their opponents are "the spawn of Hell," and, with a pungent and fervent reticence, reproces their own side. Mr. Herron attempts to temper enthusiasm with judgment by regretting English bungling with the government of Ireland and India, by regretting the excesses of Russian governmental zeal. But what more did Carlyle do for Frederick the Great than regret his indefensible actions? The game can be played on both sides; an historian may regret the excesses of German government in Schleswig or Poland, Alsace, or, since the war, in Belgium and France, and yet write panegyrics of the "ordered liberty" of the German system. Mr. Herron, of course, makes the most of the German "mechanistic theory of man," but all systems are mechanistic, and become more so the more they are improved. A codified legal system, for example, is a mere automatic machine which fits itself to cases without regard to equity; and it is interesting to remember, in this connexion, that it was the tyrant or the democrat Napoleon who had the French system codified. It would be easy to show that "the mechanistic theory of man" is the creation of the people, who have always sought salvation from the unexpected by demanding systems. Even the caucus was a democratic invention for the purpose of destroying the monopoly of political representation then enjoyed by the land-owning class; and its effect was to lower the value of the personal qualities of the candidate, to restrict the choice of the voters to the acceptance of a party candidate, to transfer, in fact, the centre of interest from the individual to a system.

The Snare. By Raffel Sabatini. (Secker. 6s.)

Mr. Sabatini's story of the Peninsular War is none the worse for being true, nor is it any the better; indeed, fiction has become so like truth that truth is no longer stranger than fiction. Truth is a very dull jade; she is a cumbrous and again and again until the hero save him from conviction, was used some years ago by Mr. Locke in "Idols." The writers seem to be adapting the maxim of the readers: "When a new book comes out, read an old one!" and when a new war begins, tell a story of an old one. But Mr. Sabatini tells the story so well, so enjoys himself in his narration, that we pardon him for the tendency his facts have to fall into accepted melodramatic situations. Some of the best work in the book is in the political part of it, illustrating the difficulties that the English, under Wellington, had in teaching the doctrine of "military necessity" to the Portuguese. Lieut. Richard Butler sets the ball rolling by raiding a nunnery in search of better wine than that which had made him drunk; and thereafter the story widens until it includes the Council of Regency, the English Army system, the English Staff and Secret Service, and Wellington himself obliges at the court-martial of the hero. If the plans of the secret fortifications at Torres Vedras (the "Wellington line") were not stolen, that was only because the Adjutant-General to kill a perfect swordsman in a midnight duel without seconds. Mr. Sabatini's villain is well developed in the tradition of supernatural strategical insight that all secret service men possess; his "pumping" is even better than his sword-play. But the
real triumph of the book is the author's treatment of the growing jealousy of Sir Terence O'Moy until its issue in the determination to condemn the hero for the crime of duelling that Sir Terence O'Moy had himself committed. Here Mr. Sabatini is really at his best, and with it he brings into the story the melodramatic that he deserves all that Sir Terence himself committed. Here Mr. Sabatini is really at his best, and with it he brings into the story the melodramatic that he deserves all that Sir Terence O'Moy nearly becomes intelligent; and the hero is so conventionally melodramatic that he deserves all that Sir Terence would have liked to inflict. We would 'have him nine years a-killing.'

With the New Army on the Somme. By Frederick Palmer. (Murray. 6s. net.)

Mr. Palmer tells us in his last chapter that Sir Douglas Haig said to me early in the offensive that he wanted me to have freedom of observation and to criticise as I chose, and he trusted me 'not to give military information to the enemy.' We take this opportunity of informing Sir Douglas Haig that Mr. Palmer has done his duty; he has not even given military information to the friends. As for criticism, Mr. Palmer was too impressed by the perfection of things English and French to criticise. He saw everything from a "pip-squeak" to a prisoner; he had everything explained to him on the map, or in the field, by the Sir; but he is not going to tell anybody. He will write of moral; of the mastery of the air, of patent barrages of fire, of the "spirit that quickeneth" that he first heard of from Sir Douglas Haig; but he is incapable of giving military information to the enemy. He begins by quoting an American woman's remark at dinner: 'I've never kept up my interest so long in a thing as in this war'; and apparently he has written his book to maintain that interest. We think he has succeeded.

THE LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

THE SEAMEN AND FIREMEN'S UNION.

Sir,—It is a little surprising to find one who has been so consistent an advocate of the right to strike as The New Age adopting the attitude assumed in last week's "Notes of the Week" upon the refusal of the Seamen and Firemen's Union to carry the emissaries of the Leeds Committee of the Defence of the Dignity of Parliament on ships manned by their members. We are not supporting the wisdom or even the justice, but rather the right to strike as we seem to have read somewhere—economic power preceeds political power. We are content, however, to pass over The New Age's novel and curious passion for legalism which leads it to seek to bring the rights of the workers "into the courts for constitutional decision." These rights are not derived from, nor can they be vindicated by, "constitutional decision"; they depend upon the strength of the workers' organisations themselves, since—as we seem to have read somewhere—economic power preceeds political power.

Our object, however, in writing to you is to call attention to two important points of principle involved. First, it is surely impossible to distinguish between the decision of the Parliament and the decision of the courts as to what "public service" is. As for the "spirit of public service" under capitalism, the workers are incapable of giving military information to the enemy. As for criticism, Mr. Palmer was too impressed by the perfection of things English and French to criticise. He saw everything from a "pip-squeak" to a prisoner; he had everything explained to him on the map, or in the field, by the Sir; but he is not going to tell anybody. He will write of moral; of the mastery of the air, of patent barrages of fire, of the "spirit that quickeneth" that he first heard of from Sir Douglas Haig; but he is incapable of giving military information to the enemy. He begins by quoting an American woman's remark at dinner: 'I've never kept up my interest so long in a thing as in this war'; and apparently he has written his book to maintain that interest. We think he has succeeded.

THE NEW AGE

AN OPEN LETTER TO WILL THORBURN, M.P.

Dear Sir,—A few days ago I happened to read in "Justice" of the 7th inst. an interview with yourself, in which you are alleged to have said with regard to the Jews that "they are well represented on the Workmen's and Soldiers' Committees, and on some of them they have a majority," and you went on to say that "we discovered they were anxious for peace under almost any conditions. They stated frankly that they could not be put to a test of national defence, and fighting against their brethren of Austria and Germany." I have just arrived from Russia. I was present at the meeting of the Executive Committee of the Moscow Workers' as Sinn Feiners and C.O.'s

SIR,—Now that the British Government has granted to Sinn Feiners concerned in the Irish Rebellion unconditional release, what excuse can there be for keeping in prison members of the Russian Social Democrats. Surely the release of Allen, Stephen Hobhouse, Fisher Brockway, and hundreds of other young men whom Parliament intended should receive complete exemption from all the terms and conditions of the Military Service Act, as provided for by the courts for constitutional decision. These conscientious objects are filled with the rights of the workers and their refusal to labour in any other national service. The motives which prompt the workers to refuse their labour are their own affair; we may quarrel with their decision to refuse work, but so long as they do not refuse work for the purpose of maintaining the spirit of public service which is without fear or favour and that the right of the citizen to receive his coal cannot be vetoed by a union without a challenge being given to the whole conception of national life.

Moreover (and this is our second point), we have yet to learn that the "spirit of public service" can be demanded, or even expected, from trade unionists condemned by the very conditions of their labour to the status of wage slaves, to whose responsibility is clearly not explicitly, denied. The "spirit of public service" may be looked for from the Guild—indeed, it is the very spirit of the Guild idea—but even a Guild must not necessarily be expected to accept the dictation of the State as to what "public service" is. As for the "spirit of public service" under capitalism, let The New Age appeal for that to those who alone can be held responsible for the nation's industry today—the profiteers.

MAURICE K. RECKITT.
HENRY H. SLESIEL.

JEWISH SCHOOLS IN RUSSIA.

Sir,—I should be glad if you would kindly publish the accompanying letter.

G. TCHITCHERINE.

DEAR SIR,—A few days ago I happened to read in "Justice" of the 7th inst. an interview with yourself, in which you are alleged to have said with regard to the Jews that "they are well represented on the Workmen's and Soldiers' Committees, and on some of them they have a majority," and you went on to say that "we discovered they were anxious for peace under almost any conditions. They stated frankly that they could not be put to a test of national defence, and fighting against their brethren of Austria and Germany." I have just arrived from Russia. I was present at the meeting of the Executive Committee of the Moscow Workers' and Firemen's Union...
English people. I have heard all you said, all the replies which the members of the Executive have given you, and know well all the people who have replied.

I am a Russian revolutionary. I have been five times arrested and kept in prisons by the Government of the Czar, and was liberated by the mighty upheaval of the Revolution from life-long exile to Siberia.

I wish to ask you a plain question. Why and with what object are you giving false information about the composition of the Council of Workmen's and Soldiers' Delegates?

Where and in what Council have you heard Jewish delegates insist on peace at any price and say that they could not be instrumental in fighting against their brethren of Austria and Germany?

Are you not aware that the Jewish propertied classes, to my greatest regret, support with all their power Mr. Milyukoff in his position?

Do you not understand that such false information about the activity of the Jews on the councils is a libel on the Jewish population, and is an insult to the dignity of the Workmen's and Soldiers' Delegates, who have six representatives in the Provisional Government and are working in contact with the latter?—Yours faithfully,

J. B. BAUM

TEMPORARILY IN LONDON ON BUSINESS FOR THE COUNCIL OF WORKMEN'S AND SOLDIERS' DELEGATES.

NEW RUSSIA AND THE GREEK CHURCH.

Sir,—It would be entirely premature to express a decided opinion as to the effect which the Russian Revolution will have on the Greek, or Orthodox, Russian Church. It is, however, that the great transformation will not be confined to the political and economic side of life; it is bound to react widely on the spiritual life of Russia.

The interior working of the Holy Synod was utterly unfamiliar to non-Russians and even to most Russians, consequently foreign public opinion had little to say about that institution which worked so much havoc to the welfare of Russia.

For centuries the Greek Orthodox Church has been an appendage of the State. It was an ardent partisan, bound body and soul to the old regime and utilised to uphold and sustain the monarchy. It constituted itself a vigorous bar to progress, strong in the knowledge that it had behind it all the black forces of terrorism and persecution.

Modern Russia has good reason to suspect the Orthodox Church. During the long years of the Romanovs' regime it not only tolerated but acquiesced in the open persecution of the best and noblest children of Russia. Men like Herzen, Turgenev, Dostoievsky, Kropotkin, and women like Sophia Perovskya, Maria Milyukoff, and others, were tortured, exiled, and banished to Siberia, yet never was its voice raised in their defence, or a plea for clemency put forward.

The memory of 1905 is still fresh, and most people have not forgotten the pernicious rôle played by Gapon on "Bloody Sunday" in Petrograd. The still more recent exploits of the monk Rasputin are obvious evidence of the close connection between the Church and the Romanovs. The clergy invariably managed to place themselves at the head of every national movement, with the result that each step towards liberty and progress was carefully watched and immediately nipped in the bud by the political agencies. This has been the case, not only of late years, but throughout the time of John IV.

One cannot criticise the methods of the Russian National Council, the fringe of Christianity at large. Christianity, just like other institutions, passes through crises and transformations, and revolutions have nearly always been the direct impetus in the transition. But the internal growth and the principles of truth ever follow the manifestations of progress. Christianity was obliged to keep pace with the spirit of the age, and not alone Christianity but the other religious creeds of Russia as well. This is evident, for it is a law of progress and culture to embrace religion according to the period. One must admit, however, that the modern phase of Christianity has created a philosophy which is a challenge to the intellectual world, although it has reached no final cause, yet it has based itself on modern aspects.

While modern theologians have been studying and making research into the wisdom of Zoroaster and Confucius, the philosophy of ancient Greece, and the mystical teaching of the Vedas, the Russian clergy shamefully ignored the teachings of Christ and kept their flock in ignorance, obscurity, and superstition. There may have been individual men amongst them who were worthy of respect, but their few and far and few in number; most of them lacked in the aesthetic as well as the ethical knowledge of Christianity, and never troubled their heads with theology.

Small wonder then that the Russian, who is an acute thinker and not led away by religious phrases, suspects the Christianity of the Orthodox Church, and it can be readily understood that the Revolution was directed just as much against the Church as against the monarchy.

There is no doubt the old Church, with its un-Christian-like record, will find itself very much out of sympathy with the New Russia. Those who are naturally religious will feel the need of a great and sweeping reformation; no Church that does not teach and propagate the real teachings of Christ and the gospel of tolerance and brotherhood will adhere to the monarchy.

There will be a wider demand for universal education and a fuller Christianity which embraces the practical side of universal solidarity and brotherhood.

Undoubtedly the philosophy of Leo Tolstoi and Solovyoff exercise a strong influence on the Russian mind. No one had a clearer insight into the Russian character than Tolstoi. He was the real apostle, the sincere teacher, and happily the Russian intellectuals have embraced to a great extent the Tolstoyan doctrines. His philosophy is not a Hegelian speculation; it is the essence of a doctrine which solves immediate necessary objects—in short, it is the very essence of the Russian temperament, and I venture to predict that the future religion of Russia will be largely correlated with Tolstoyism.

Russians often are referred to as dreamers and mystics, but their dreams take shape in practical everyday life; their mysticism is not a religious one; it rather bears the stamp of long subjugation and suffering. They dislike wasting time and energy on ideas and discussions which do not solve the real human problems. After all, what better ethics can there be than the solidarity and brotherhood of mankind? Was this not the substance of all the prophecies and the very essence of Christ's teaching?

STANLEY ARNOLD.

BISHOPS ON THE WARPATH.

Sir,—Since writing last week I have been privileged to listen to a discussion on the position of the clergy in war, which has convinced me that my argument that the more "holy" the war the more proper for clergy to take part in it was wrong. The duties of the clergy, I now see, should at all times be on a different plane from those of laymen. It is because nowadays they so rarely appear to be that, like many others, I have confused the real purpose of the Church with the travesty usually offered to us. While, however, I recant my former opinion, I do not withdraw my protest against the words both of the Bishop of London and the Bishop of Chelmsford. If the Church filled as well as occupied the position proper to it, its representatives would not be taken into the scheme of war in the way they are.

May I add that it was not my intention to urge that the clergy should engage in military service. My reference to their exemption from it was in relation to, as it was provoked by, the bishops' words from London.

THE VALUE OF "FUNCTION.

Sir,—A writer fails short of his task when he fails to make himself understood by the least gifted of his readers, but to prove unable to convey his meaning to his main adversary is no less than a professional disgrace. What would become of me were a Guild of Writers in existence?

Señor de Maseu, after having followed my "brilliant" arguments on the value of liberty with growing interest, was disappointed to find that I ended
Memoranda.

From last week's New Age.

In future the Labour movement will be more exclusively in politics and less approximately in economics than ever.

The economic revolution is still to be made, though there is nobody to make it.—Notes of the Week.

A culture which is allowed essential freedom to develop will soon perish if it does not in itself contain the elements of human worth which make for immortality.

The world has many instances of "freak" religions which were persecuted, and so, by natural opposition, were perpetuated and hardened in belief.

Irishmen individually are much nobler in spirit than the political organisations they belong to.—A. E.

Unintelligent activity promotes a reaction to unintelligent leisure.

You cannot cure the prejudice. You can only cure the disease, which is atrophy of the speculative impulse.

Conclusions are safe; convictions ought to be suspect.—Kenneth Richmond.

Would it not be more profitable to search for good music, some of which may turn out to have been written by an Englishman, rather than for English composers, some of whose works may turn out to be good music?

The realists and impressionists in music held the mirror up to Nature, as a footprint holds a pistol to the traveller's head, and Nature duly yields them her outer garment.

Mysticism does not mean mistiness, but exceptional clarity of vision.—Philip Heseltine.

Not all is human that wears a human form.

Not being a man of action, Nietzsche was never compelled to make up his mind upon any point.

Nietzsche may not have influenced Germany, but there is no doubt in my mind that Germany influenced Nietzsche.

Nietzsche did no more than spell Knutir with a C, while approving of war as its method.—R. H. C.

The work of the finest artists resembles the play of children.

No technical skill can be other than good, but when it overruns the artist's needs it is only wasted.

There are no schools nowadays; there are only tendencies.

The artists' guild must start with children.—Interviews.

I am but a woman, and easily pleased!—Dikran Kouyoumdjian.

A revolution would be wrought if either all labourers were engaged by the year, or the present salariat were engaged by the week only.

Like most prophets, he saw the Golden Age where he put it.

He was a happily constituted reformer; he invented his facts, and they became facts.—Reviews.

Only by the training of those higher faculties of the mind, now held in ridicule, shall we be brought to a divine discontent with business as usual, including the present Church.—F. Osborne.

A man has only to come away from the opera with a dour brow or handkerchief, and off we run with the idea that he loves music.—R. A. M.
PRESS CUTTINGS.

The Court of Appeal (Lord Reading, L.C.J., Lord Cozens-Hardy, M.R., and Scrutton, L.J.) has just held in Norman v. Brookes (June 6) that an action for illegal assault by a soldier against his superior officer is not “frivolous or vexatious,” and cannot be summarily struck out on that ground by a Judge in Chambers. The modern rule, it is now well settled (Marks v. Fregley [1898] 2 Q.B. 288), is that any person subject to military law cannot sue or prosecute another for any act committed by the latter—even although illegal—in pursuance of his military duty. All soldiers and officers, when they enter the Army, are treated as having “contracted out” of their ordinary civil remedies against one another in matters arising out of their military status and to have accepted instead the remedy (such as it is), formerly provided by the “Articles of War” and now embodied in sections 44 and 45 of the Army Act, 1881, of “complaint” to the proper superior officer and ultimately to the Army Council. But, of course, no such “contracting out” of ordinary civil rights affects breaches not arising out of military status; as regards such breaches, a soldier can use the same remedies as any other subject, even although the defendant happens to be his superior officer. But in practice difficulty arises in deciding what exactly is the boundary-line between acts arising out of military status and acts not connected with military status. In Norman v. Brookes the plaintiff was a conscientious objector, who alleged that he had been subjected to illegal and wanton physical assaults by the defendant, who then commanded the detention barracks in which the plaintiff was undergoing sentence for refusing to obey a military order. The Appeal Court held, against the contention of the Crown, that the action must proceed to trial in the usual way, so that all the facts might be investigated in public and the legal question pronounced upon by a judge seized of the facts. The view taken by the Court in Norman’s case seems in such a case to be the liberal and constitutional one, since, even if the jurisdiction of the civil Court should in the result prove to be ousted by the Army Act, it at least affords the aggrieved conscientious objector an opportunity of drawing public attention to his treatment, an advantage in the interests of justice of which he would be completely deprived if a Judge in Chambers could rule out every such action ab initio as “frivolous and vexatious.”—The Law Journal.

To the Editor of the “Railway Review.”

Sir,—May I be allowed to draw the attention of “Review” readers to the enormous importance of item No. 2 of the E.C.’s recommendations for the Trades Union Congress agenda, as reported in your issue of the 8th inst.:

“That, in view of any proposals likely to bring about nationalisation of railways, railway employees shall press for the right of control by railwaymen in any arrangements that may be set up.

The experience gained by the employees in the Post Office and other Government Departments (and in Government-controlled establishments during the war) has shown very clearly that unbridled State control of the railways may prove to be anything but a blessing to railway employees. The growing tendency of the capitalist and exploiting class to use the State (i.e., Parliament) for its own ends can only be defeated by the workers—while building up in Parliament a real, democratic, independent Labour Party—exercising their economic power by claiming joint and equal control of the industries in which they are engaged. This applies particularly to the railways, and it is, therefore, very refreshing to find that our E.C. are fully alive to the importance of this aspect. In this respect it cannot, I think, be denied that our E.C. is ahead of the average rank-and-file member of our union, and I would, therefore, strongly urge all those who would know more of the grievances of the railway employees—so vital to the future of industrial unionism—to at once communicate with the secretary of the National Guilds League, 17, Acocks Road, London, N.W.8, the pioneers of the movement, who will gladly supply explanatory literature, or speakers, on application. A. J. Whitlock.

It is well that Mr. Wilson should emphasise that distinction alreay, for in fact of the unyielding chauvinism of the Majority Socialists it is hard enough to believe that even in Germany there is a mass of inarticulate opinion ready, at any rate to endorse the Allies’ ideals for the future, whatever it may think of the policy of Berlin in the present. Yet, if there were no such nucleus of opinion, the outlook would be hopeless. The single prospect before the world would be of a nulled and unconverted Central Europe, ringed round eternally by the vast fleets and armies of its present foes. The scourge of such a so-called peace would be hardly lighter than the tragedy of war. If that scourge is to be averted, the policy and the politicians who would impose it on the world must go. The principles of the Allies and the principles of Kaiserism cannot co-exist. That thesis needs no argument, and it is a necessary starting-point. But in itself it is not enough. The time has fully come for clear definition. Principles must be applied to facts, and the outlines of the new world sketched out for all nations to see. On that the new Russian Government has repeatedly insisted, and most rightly. It goes a step further, and again altogether, in proposing a diplomatic conference of all the Allies to examine the various treaties by which the members of the Alliance are bound. Such a conference at the present juncture would be of the highest value. It would be the first step in the process of the nucleus of opinion, the outlook would be hopeless. The single prospect before the world would be of a nulled and unconverted Central Europe, ringed round eternally by the vast fleets and armies of its present foes. The scourge of such a so-called peace would be hardly lighter than the tragedy of war. If that scourge is to be averted, the policy and the politicians who would impose it on the world must go. The principles of the Allies and the principles of Kaiserism cannot co-exist. That thesis needs no argument, and it is a necessary starting-point. But in itself it is not enough. The time has fully come for clear definition. Principles must be applied to facts, and the outlines of the new world sketched out for all nations to see. On that the new Russian Government has repeatedly insisted, and most rightly. It goes a step further, and again altogether, in proposing a diplomatic conference of all the Allies to examine the various treaties by which the members of the Alliance are bound. Such a conference at the present juncture would be of the highest value. It would be the first step in the process of

The London Unionists members’ campaign against “profiteering” and high prices has now been entered into by a small committee, consisting of Mr. Burdett-Coutts, Mr. Blair, and Mr. Brookes. Sir William Bull, who is acting as secretary, had an enormous postbag containing hundreds of letters from all parts of the country, and it produced what the committee regard as unmistakable evidence of the existence of “profiteering” on a wide scale on the part of big firms as well as small. It also revealed the existence of widespread “profiteering” to be proved up to the hilt, they are determined to press for a simple and drastic Bill to defeat it.—“Daily News.”
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