THE
NEW AGE
A WEEKLY REVIEW OF POLITICS, LITERATURE, AND ART.

No. 1301] [New Series.] Vol. XXI. No. 16. Thursday, Aug. 16, 1917. [Registered at G.P.O. as a Newspaper.] SIXPENCE

CONTENTS.

NOTES OF THE WEEK.

Whatever may be the final outcome of the Labour Conference that met on Friday last, the significance of a vote of almost four to one in favour of independent Labour action cannot be gainsaid. When we recall the fact that everything bourgeois in a country of bourgeoisie was opposed to the meeting of the International; and that in addition to real difficulties in the way, of which something must be said later, the Labour movement was itself passionately divided upon the policy, the casting of two million votes against half a million in favour of an International must appear to the penetrating observer an event of not much less significance than the Russian Revolution and the advent to the Allies of the American democracy. Had the vote been taken only a few months ago while as yet the question of the Stockholm meeting was only in the bud, the event would not have had the significance that now attaches to it after circumstances have forced the subject into the open. The publicity and the passion that have now been given to it, together with the publicity and passion that still await its continued discussion, have made and will make of what might only have been an incident an event of the greatest importance. Whether by misunderstanding or by an understanding past obvious reasoning the result has been brought about, the fact remains that the Labour movement has expressed its willingness (to say no more) to enter into diplomacy upon its own account, and, in the face of all the opposition of bourgeois sentiment, to play its own hand independently. We augur well of an act of this character. For it implies not only a criticism of a policy that has involved the nation in what appears an interminable war, but a resolution that such a policy shall not be continued or repeated without the consent of the Labour movement. Labour, in short, has announced in its vote of last Friday that it is about to enter the sphere of international diplomacy hitherto regarded as sacred to the capitalist classes.

The resignation under mysterious circumstances of Mr. Henderson from the Cabinet cannot be said to leave the Government unweakened in its hold upon Labour. The circumstances, it is true, need further explanation than is offered in the ex parte and somewhat insulting letter of Mr. Lloyd George; but on the face of them they appear highly suspicious; and they are likely to be deeply resented by the Labour movement. We were not among those who were ever in favour of the inclusion of Labour officials in the Government. The best national service that Labour could perform was, in our opinion, service outside and not inside the Government. On the other hand, when against our advice and under the pressure of the Government itself, Labour consented to join the Coalition, the least recognition of its sacrifices that could have been expected was recognition of the views and opinions held by Labour. Was Sir Edward Carson as the price of his adhesion to the Cabinet to be allowed not only to remain the official leader of the Ulster rebels against Parliament, but to be gratified in his desire to suspend the Home Rule Act (at the cost to us of infinite mischief in Ireland), and the Labour leaders as the price of their adhesion to receive nothing whatever? Was it to be made impossible for a Labour leader to run the double policy of remaining loyal to Labour while remaining loyal to the nation—at the some time that the constitution was being strained to make it possible for Sir Edward Carson and other members of the Cabinet to play their double and incompatible rôles? It looks like it. For while the Labour members of the Government were content to do nothing but act as fetchers and carriers for the Cabinet they were tolerated and even applauded in the capitalist Press; but no sooner has one of their number ventured to remind the Government of the independent existence of his party than the capitalist Press has called for and obtained his resignation. Sauce for the goose is thus shown to be emphatically not sauce for the gander. Any other party than Labour that adheres to the Cabinet is allowed to demand its price and to be paid it in full; but Labour is denied its price even when that price is a piece of national service that only the Labour party can perform. The moral, we should say, is

obvious: it is that Labour can no more trust the capitalist parties to be fair with it than democracy in general can trust in the good faith of autocracy. As certainly as autocracies and democracies are incompatible with each other in the same world, the Labour and capitalist parties are incompatible with each other in the same Government. We shall see that this is so as time goes on. Mr. Henderson, it is true, is to be followed by Mr. Barnes; and when, if ever, Mr. Barnes has had enough of obsequiousness, he, in his turn, will be followed by the Hodges, O'Gradys, Roberts' and others who are on the waiting list. But each of them successively will represent less and less of Labour, until there will come a moment when the Labour element in the Government will be able to speak for nobody. Its value will then be nil.

* * *

On the subject of the Stockholm International we wish to say that the change it is alleged has taken place in M. Kerensky's opinion leaves our view untouched. To begin with, we think we understand very well the motives of M. Kerensky's change of attitude. A Government that has become an officially Labour and Socialist Government is obviously not in the same relation to an International Conference of Labour and Socialist *parties* as Governments still officially bourgeois. The Russian delegates, in other words, unlike the delegates from other nations, would in effect be representatives of the Russian Government; and, as such, their position would be anomalous in a Conference of mere groups and parties. On the other hand, it was never our contention that the advisability of an International Conference depended wholly upon the attitude of Russia towards it. The Revolution in Russia had certainly made an addition, and a most powerful addition, to the general arguments in favour of an International: but even without that addition the reasons were, in our opinion, sufficient. To supplement, and, if possible, to abbreviate the military efforts of the Allies to reach a decision, it was not only humane, in our judgment, to leave no stone unturned that promised political and diplomatic help, but it was a duty pre-eminently devolving upon the international socialist movement by reason of its admitted failure to prevent the war. Just because international socialism had failed to prevent the war, its duty to recover itself and to help to stop the war if it could appeared to us to be obvious. The Socialists, in fact, would be less than men if they neglected an opportunity of retrieving their past failure. This general reason, we say, remains, whatever may be the changed attitude of the new Russian Government. It is as urgent at this moment as it was while Russia was demanding a Conference that a Conference should be held; and we shall not be in the least surprised to discover that, whatever his official attitude towards the Conference may be, M. Kerensky's socialist attitude is unchanged. In a word, M. Kerensky is anxious to see the International meet; but he is desirous of not appearing officially connected with it. And that is good policy.

* * *

Among the reasons put forward against the Stockholm Conference are these. It is said, in the first place, that the Labour party is only a section of the country, and that in sending representatives to an International Conference at which enemy delegates will be present, the Labour party is arrogating sovereign and national rights. In the second place, it is contended that as well as being improper in itself for British citizens to meet enemy citizens during war-time, such a meeting would be likely to injure this country in several definite ways—by tending to weaken its military activity, by appearing to condone the crimes of Germany, and by playing into the hands of the Prussian Government. But let us examine them. The sovereign power of the Government would indeed be entrenched upon if the International Conference were about to set up with the consent of the British delegates a rival authority with mandatory powers. But that is what is explicitly denied and repudiated by the delegates for whom the British Labour movement would be responsible. Nothing is more clear than that the only condition upon which the British delegates are prepared to attend the Conference is that the decisions of the Conference shall not be binding. Can anything more explicitly safeguard the sovereignty of the British Government than this voluntary and deliberate undertaking? That it is improper in the sense of being unnatural for British citizens to meet enemy citizens while the latter are still at war with us we allow; and we have every sympathy with the Seamen's and Firemen's point of view as direct and personal victims of the inhumanity of our German enemies. Moreover, if the holding of the Conference were, in our opinion, in the least degree likely to suspend or weaken the exercise of our military strength or to play ever so little into the hands of the Prussian Government, we should be among the first to oppose it and to denounce its authors as madmen without a sense of right, let alone of nationality. The very contrary, however, appears to us to be the case; for we make bold to say that the success from the Allied point of view of the proposed International Conference depends absolutely upon the successful continuance and increase of our military pressure. Words without deeds are useless in the case; and all that we are pleading for is words in addition to deeds. It must also be remembered that a war of this character cannot be judged or carried on in a spirit purely personal. If public policy is to be conducted on principles proper to personal relations, and parties in this country are to regard parties in Germany as personal as well as political enemies, the chances of peace are more remote than ever. We simply cannot permit our personal sentiments to rule absolutely our international relations; the latter must be judged by other standards than the standards of private life.

* * *

Turning from the reasons against to the reasons for the Conference the latter appear to us to be overwhelming. Since, sooner or later, this country must be at peace with Germany—a fact that at once differentiates public from private conduct—and since it is greatly to be desired that that peace, when it comes, shall be permanent, the need for the Allies to open relations with the *only* section of opinion in Germany with whom a permanent peace is thinkable is plainly urgent. With no other section of thought in Germany is it possible for the Allies to make a lasting peace than with the German Socialist section. The Prussian ruling caste, the professorial and the professional classes, are all of them autocrats and militarists dyed in the wool. A peace with them to-day would be imperilled to-morrow and break out into war the day after. Two generations of intense and isolated meditation upon power have robbed them even of the capacity of entertaining the notion of democratic liberty. The sword may be struck from their hand at this moment, but they will resume it at the dictation of their thoughts to-morrow, or upon the first opportunity. It will, therefore, be useless, we repeat, to expect to be able to make a stable peace with the present governing classes of Germany. They are the Tsardom, the Kaiserdom embodied. Our only hope is in establishing relations with the section that has not yet been hopelessly ingrained with Prussian theories; with, in short, the German Socialist and democratic parties. If by an International Conference communication can be opened between the Allies and these; if only once the Socialists of the world's free democracies can be brought face to face with the imprisoned democrats and socialists of Germany, it is not Prussia that would wel-

come the result. We are convinced that the Allies, precisely to the degree of their sincerity in affirming democracy and the love of peace, have alone anything to gain by such a Conference.

* * *

The reply of the Labour party to the questionnaire sent out by the Stockholm Committee does not appear to us to be a wholly satisfactory document. It is denounced, significantly enough, by the Majority German Socialists as equally imperialistic with the programme of the British Government; and this may afford our pacifist Socialists some measure of the implied demands of the German official Socialist party. At the same time, from our own point of view, it is too much tarred with the theories of the Fabian Society and of the U.D.C. To be explicit, we definitely object to the introduction into the Labour Manifesto of the proposals put forward by the Fabian Society and the U.D.C. for the creation of a supernational authority resting upon the basis of a League of Nations; and upon these grounds briefly. In the first place, such a League and such a supernational authority are not, in our opinion, practicable, either to be formed, or, still less, to be maintained if formed. Institutions of such a character are not to be made, they can only be born; and we do not see in the existing circumstances of the world the smallest sign that such an institution as one or the other is about to be, or has yet been, born. In the second place, the proposal is, in our judgment, not only impracticable, but superfluous, and not only superfluous, but dangerous to the proper conclusion of the present war. It is the latter, because it *assumes* that the conclusion of the present war will be such that Prussian militarism (the only militarism left alive in the European world) will remain after the war, and require a League of Nations to check it; and it is the former, because if, as we hope, Prussian militarism is destroyed, and Germany becomes democratised, a League of Nations against war will for ever prove unnecessary. What is, therefore, implied in this proposal is one or other of two distrusts: distrust of our ability to destroy, and not merely to scotch, Prussian militarism; and distrust of the essential and inevitable pacifism of democracies—both of which, we contend, are as unworthy of the Labour party as they are contrary to our expectation and our evidence. For what is it to doubt our ability to destroy Prussianism but to doubt the united powers of the democracies to preserve themselves against a militarist autocracy? And what is it to assume the need of democracies of a League of Peace but to doubt the will of democracies to peace? Our assertions are, indeed, the contrary. Not only in our view will Prussianism and must Prussianism be destroyed, extirpated; but until it is, no democracy is safe and no league of democracies can make democracy safe. Prussianism and democracy cannot any longer live together in the same world; the planet is not big enough for both of them. On the other hand, once Prussianism is destroyed, a League of Nations becomes superfluous by reason of the fact that no democracy has, ever, we believe, gone to war with another democracy, or ever will. There is a natural affinity and comradeship between them which, however it may be strained, is never broken by war. Call it, if you will, weakness; call it sentiment; call it capitalism; call it anything you please—the fact remains that democracy does not make war upon democracy. In democracy alone is peace.

* * *

Something of a set-back has been given to our hopes and efforts for the democratisation of Germany by two occurrences within the last few weeks. One is the discovery that the democratisation of Russia has not immediately resulted in efficiency, and the other is the avowal of Mr. Gerard, late American Ambassador in Berlin, that the democratisation of Germany is not to be expected under any circumstances. The first of these strikes the popular imagination in this way. How, it is asked, can we expect Germany to make a revolution in face of the fact that the revolution in Russia has been attended with such disastrous consequences? With the Russian example before their eyes, will not the Germans think twice before attempting a revolution certain, apparently, to land their nation into chaos? We do not doubt it in the very least. The immediate consequences in Russia of a revolution have, indeed, when looked at superficially, been deplorable; and they may well appear to cast a doubt upon our contention that the period of war is the period for revolution as well. But let us look at the matter a little more closely, and ask, in the first place, if Russia is happier for the change; then, if she is really not more powerful in fact; and finally, whether a revolution such as she has wrought could have been brought about by any less costly means, even in a time of profound peace. To the first question our reply is that no democrat in Russia, however he may grieve over the present situation, would wish the former régime to be restored. The pains through which the nation is now passing are growing pains, the pains of hope deferred, but not of a heart sick and in despair. "There's a kinder looseness about this yer liberty that I kinder likes," said a Southern slave who was found wandering after his liberation without visible means of subsistence; and the new liberty of Russia is a present compensation for the immediate looseness. To the second question our reply is, "Wait and see." In comparison, no doubt, with the military effectiveness of the Tsardom—of which, however, the less said the better—the military effectiveness of revolutionary Russia is disappointing to her Allies. But if the revolution was the initiation of a new principle, while little can be expected of its youth, much may be confidently expected of its maturity. We do not despair of seeing the Russian revolutionary armies during the present war fulfilling the expectations falsely raised of the armies of the Tsar. Lastly, in reply to the third question, we state it is a fact that, if there had been no revolution in Russia during the war, there would have been none after it, unless upon a condition *we cannot easily consider—namely, the total defeat of* the Allies. A victorious Tsardom would have been able to postpone a revolution indefinitely. A defeated Tsardom, while it might have provoked a revolution, would have had the help of a victorious Germany in crushing it.

* * *

Mr. Gerard, we say with all respect, is not a man whose judgment we place in the highest rank. An Ambassador who can return from four years' residence in Germany during so tragical a period of the world's history and rush into print with an account of his personal adventures has plainly not the sensibility required of a statesman diagnosing a spiritual situation. That he should be of opinion that the democratisation of Germany is impossible is, therefore, for us a piece of evidence to be set against pieces of evidence of equal but in no sense of decisive value. Yet we see that several journals whose writers were beginning to be disposed to hope and work for the democratisation of Germany have now, on the strength of Mr. Gerard's dictum, been disposed to abandon the attempt in despair. To these, however, we would address the following questions. It is not the case that the democratisation of Germany is the *only* thing that Mr. Gerard reports to be impossible. He asserts that the economic starvation of Germany by means of our blockade is impossible; and he likewise affirms that Germany has still nine million effectives in the field. The questions we would put to those who conclude from Mr. Gerard's remarks about the impossibility of democratising Germany that we should cease from

making the attempt are these: Are we, on the same evidence, to abandon both our blockade and our military efforts? Clearly the latter are as logical conclusions as the former from an assent to the authority of Mr. Gerard. In other words, we have just as much reason in his evidence for giving up the blockade and the war as for giving up the attempt to democratise Germany. All of them are, on his showing, equally hopeless; and if we are not likely to abandon the two latter on his account we ought not to abandon the former upon no better evidence. For our part, we propose to ignore all three of the conclusions to which Mr. Gerard's reports appear to lead us, and to continue in the three courses we have marked out as if all were indeed difficult, but as if all were possible.

* * *

Circumstances in Germany, moreover, begin to favour attempts to introduce democracy there as they have not during the period of the chancellorship of Herr Bethmann-Hollweg. And they call for a concentration and intensification of our efforts rather than for the slackening of them. Without professing to be military experts, we venture to say that a command that failed to observe and to profit by a thinning of the middle of an enemy's front to concentrate his forces upon it while continuing to encourage the enemy to gather to the left and to the right would be unworthy of the traditions of the battle of the Marne, where those tactics were successfully adopted. But what have we in the political disposition of Germany if not a repetition in the political sphere of the circumstances in which the French found the Germans upon the Marne? We are told that the selection of Dr. Michaelis, a bureaucratic Junker, for the post of Chancellor, and the filling of most of the Ministerial offices in Germany with Pan-German maniacs, is evidence that Germany is less revolutionary than ever. But listen to what is said in Germany, and not by one journal but by a dozen, and allow for the fact that the whole Press is muzzled, and that when it barks it means, when it can, to bite. This passage from the "Vossiche Zeitung" is typical. "The new Government," it says, "has created the bitterest disappointment in Germany, because it shows that the course is to be steered towards the Right, while the trend among the people is unmistakably towards the Left." Is it not plain what is taking place? The movement to the Right and the movement to the Left, with a consequent thinning of the Centre? We are not, of course, taking things at only their face value. A strategic movement of this dual character, even if we should take full advantage of it, cannot be expected to end the war in a week. We say, however, that what the Marne was to us militarily the developing situation in Germany may be to us politically and diplomatically. We say that it is the duty of diplomacy, with the model of the Marne before us, to repeat the tactics of the French, with the same result. We maintain that it is our business to concentrate upon the democratisation of Germany as never before; to throw all our mind into it; to call upon every man, section, party, speaker, and journal to add their weight to it; and to drive a wedge between the Right and the Left in Germany, and to destroy the former root and branch. That appears to us to be our policy; and it has the further merit of being the only policy before the country. The choice is between attempting to democratise Germany and doing nothing. But doing nothing practically means leaving everything to the army.

* * *

In the Manifesto of the Labour Party, to which we have already referred, there is a singular omission: it is that of any reference to the question of responsibility for the war. But, as we have seen, the Stockholm Conference is scarcely likely to meet without discussing the subject; and, indeed, to consult about terms of rapprochement, the settlement of the future and the ending of the present war, without first coming to a conclusion on the question of responsibility, is, to our minds, like passing sentence before blame has been apportioned. The minutiæ of the matters in debate may, and in all probability will, remain for the present generation secret and inaccessible. There are so many wheels within wheels in international affairs that no man can ever hope to understand them all. Even the details of the July 5 German Imperial Council, alleged by the "Times" with so much plausibility to have been held at Potsdam in 1914, and which, if true, would have simplified the problem of responsibility, have been denied, with so much show of conviction and from so many sources that we must abandon for the moment any confidence in them. But is it impossible on that account to arrive at a conclusion sufficiently established for practical justice to be done? We do not think it is; and, in any event, it is the business of the British Socialists, when they meet the German Socialists, to present their case and to leave the latter to disprove it. What is our case? It is, in the first place, that the Prussian system was responsible for the manufacture and storage within Germany of a vast amount of highly inflammable militarist sentiment. In the next place, that it deliberately aimed at inspiring its commerce with the notion that capitalism could be advanced by military means. Finally, it is a matter of comparative unimportance what occurred to spill the match in the magazine—whether it was by inadvertence or by design; for the fact is that the explosion was probable sooner or later in any event, even by the means of spontaneous combustion. This in broad outline is our case for the responsibility of Germany; and the reply made by "Vorwarts" that Germany only "blundered" into the war does not affect it.

* * *

Lastly, we would warn the British delegates who may attend the Conference to be prepared for a stronger defence by the German Socialists of their attitude during the war than any that has been allowed to appear in this country. From this point of view we are likely to suffer from the effects of the censorship of the best opinions more than a little. How much easier discussion would be with German Socialists if before meeting them in the flesh we had met them in the spirit and understood their case before being compelled to meet it. The impression still prevails in the Allied countries that the motive of self-defence upon which the German Socialists depend for the justification of their support of Prussia is mainly, if not wholly, the defence of German territory. And that interpretation, we must say, is popular among the German Socialists themselves. It is, however, not only insufficient in view of the military facts revealed by the war—for Germany, not a foot of whose soil is in enemy occupation after three years of war, cannot pretend that she was ever in reasonable fear of military aggression from without; it is at bottom not the real, however it may appear to be the predominant, motive in their minds. The fear of Germany, the apprehension of aggression which she undoubtedly entertained, and hence the self-defence to which even her Socialists felt themselves driven were, in spite of all appearances to the contrary, fear; and hence defence regarding her economic and not her political future. The rest of the world she may well acquit of any territorial designs at her immediate expense; it will be almost a work of supererogation to procure an acquittal upon the count. What, however, German Socialists will allege is that if the Allies were not intending territorial aggression, they were, at any rate, intending economic aggression with the design of excluding Germany

from the *future* markets of the world. Germany, in short, they will say, was defending her future. To this in Clause XVII of their Manifesto the Labour party makes no direct reply, though the subject is really involved in "Economic Relations." On the other hand, it must be allowed that the economic programme of the Labour Party is more liberal than that laid down by the Paris Conference; it is, in fact, a complete negative to all that our tariffists have proposed. But can the German Socialists take the Labour Party's word for it that the Paris Conference Resolutions will not be carried out? Can the Labour Party bind *our* economic Pan-Germans if the German Socialists undertake to put under hatches their own militarist Pan-Germans? It is a fair question, and a fair answer must be given; for our tariffists are to Germany what Germany's militarism is to us. Both must live or die together.

Towards National Guilds

Is the propaganda of National Guilds good for the State? The reply is that it is good for the State, but not for the Capitalist State. In so far, therefore, as the modern State is a Capitalist State, the propaganda of National Guilds must be subversive, and it cannot be otherwise. For this reason we cannot promise, and we do not look to see, the appearance of National Guildsmen as members of Parliament or associated with political or industrial organisations having for their object the maintenance of the Capitalist State. On the contrary, we expect to see Guildsmen forswearing a political career together with any open public honour. Nevertheless, if we are not mistaken, their work will be honoured in days to come as having made real statesmanship as distinct from capitalist statesmanship possible. A parallel may be found in contemporary political history. We have all read in the "Times" and similar journals repeated regrets that democracy has failed to make a constitution in Germany, and hopes that it may soon succeed. But democracy which alone would now save Germany must have appeared as an enemy in the German autocratic State. Was it then really a friend after all? The amusing circumstance is that the "Times"—that enemy of democracy—would undoubtedly in any struggle of democracy in Germany have taken the side of the Kaiser! We prophesy that one of these days, if Capitalist Government continues in England, even the "Times" will wish it had encouraged National Guilds. For the truth is that Capitalist Government is in the end unsatisfying even to Capitalists; and we who would subvert them are their best friends. The Guildsman is the Statesman with a very long sight!

A parallel of another kind, and one that no doubt will be used against the revolutionary, is that of subject nations in their agitation for Home Rule, comparing them with subject economic classes in the agitation of the latter for liberty. To take an example, that of India, it is pointed out that the proper means for Indians to adopt in order to obtain Indian independence is by easy stages of co-operation, joint control, and so on, to become gradually masters of their own fate. And the corresponding advice to Labour at home is to graduate their demands for self-government through an ascending series of demands for joint control. We have no wish to say anything politically dangerous; and we will refrain from attempting to prove that no subject nation has ever won its independence by easy gradual means. We will content ourselves with remarking that Labour cannot hope to effect its emancipation in co-operation of any kind with Capital. Not co-operation but opposition is the way to independence.

For the problems of Industry that are upon us now the demand is naturally for immediate remedies; and it is the business of Statesmen to find them. We, however, are of the opinion that no immediate remedies are possible, but that every immediate "remedy" must be at best only a palliative. A radical cure is what we recommend; and are we then willing to join in recommending palliatives? But if we so act, we may be called practical statesmen, but we shall not be the statesmen of the future but of the present. It is our disagreeable business to announce that we deal in remedies that are not palliatives. On the other hand, we shall not quarrel with palliatives, provided they are recognised as such.

Let us distinguish between our policy and our attitude. Our policy is positive, and consists in formulating our demands and in pressing them home. Our attitude is passive, and consists in discriminating among the demands of Capital those we will and those we will not accept. National Guildsmen have, therefore, a policy to pursue and an attitude to assume.

It is the fashion to contend that Capital is conciliatory towards Labour in the spirit of friendliness said to have been engendered by the war. How often, however, have we had to point out that Capital has long since ceased to be within the personal control of Capitalists? It is a monster which Frankenstein can no longer command; and hence must pursue its course even amid the sobs and tears of its creators. That individual capitalists here and there may be conciliatory to Labour on personal grounds is, we are glad to think, true. But they cannot but follow the drift of things, being, as they are, a few among many. We may therefore dismiss as sentimental the notion that Capital is making offers to Labour from love. What offers it makes as a whole are the result of necessity. And what is this necessity? The need for increased production at home and the consequent need for industrial peace. We are not prophets; and we are not in the counsels of Capital. We nevertheless predict that offers from Capital will multiply; and we nevertheless affirm that every one of them will contain the condition that there shall be industrial peace. For the maintenance of peace in every form Capital is prepared to pay a high price. But no price is high enough to compensate Labour for the loss of its weapon of the Strike.

It must never be forgotten that so long as Labour is a commodity Labour has no responsibility; and discharges no function. This is a hard saying, and it requires a clear mind and a fearless mind to realise it. No responsibility;—what does that imply? That Labour has no say in the *initiative* of industry. And is not this the fact? Has, indeed, Labour any more say in the activity of Capital than cattle or even inanimate things? But having no say in industry, Labour has no responsibility. Function, too, implies will—the will to give or to withhold, to do or not to do. Things or creatures that perform work, however useful, because they cannot refrain of their own free will from performing it, discharge no function. They are the material on which functional organs work, but they are not organs themselves. But is not just this the position of Labour? While Labour is unable to refrain at its own discretion from working, it cannot be said to exercise will (for where there is a will there's a won't!); and exercising no will, it performs no function. The first condition, therefore, of Labour becoming responsible and performing any function is the possession by Labour of a will and a won't of its own. Once again, it will be seen, the right to strike (that is, to will and to won't) is the only seed of liberty in the whole body of Labour.

NATIONAL GUILDSMEN.

The Instruments of Democracy.

By "Civilian."

I.

THE latest and greatest of the Reform Bills comes at a moment when democracy is more suspicious than ever before regarding the reality of its power. The House of Commons, the first instrument of democracy, has for years been declining in power, and during the war the full extent of its weakness has been revealed. For many reasons, mainly connected with the power of class and money in elections, the House of Commons has never yet been properly representative of the community as a whole, and probably its gradual loss of control is inherent in that defect. But even constituted as it is at present, it is plain that the more independent members of the House are struggling hard to regain control of the executive and administrative machine which grinds steadily on as heedless as possible of the desires and intentions of those for whom it is nominally working. It is not necessary to search far for the unhappy doings of this uncontrolled and frequently uncriticised machine. Expenditure allowed to run wild, medical board scandals, the tragedies of the Dardanelles and Mesopotamia, much of the responsibility for the terrible examples of the operations of the machine must be placed at the door of the military and civil bureaucracy. And, all the time, democracy pays.

It is not our purpose to discuss the power and position of the military side of the machine. The man in the street knows by this time enough of the ways of the War Office to make further enlightenment almost unnecessary. But what he does not know, and what many Members of Parliament do not understand as they should, is the power of the Higher Civil Service of this country. To tear away the veil which the civil bureaucracy of this country has drawn between itself and the people is the task to which the organised rank and file of the Civil Service has now set its hand. One high official, now retired, boasts to-day that a financial memorandum which he prepared postponed Old Age Pensions for years by proving that a Free Trade system could not bear the strain of the expense! Another high official is known to have declared a few years ago, apropos the M.P. who seeks to gain information or to criticise by means of questions, that "the man who asks a question can be 'downed' every time." Side by side with these personal examples may be mentioned the "Holmes Circular," under the Morant régime at the Board of Education, the notorious antipathy to any kind of progress of the Board of Agriculture and the Local Government Board, and, above all, the administration by high permanent officials of the Insurance Act, and of the War Labour legislation which touches the working classes so closely. The recent articles on labour unrest in the "Manchester Guardian" have given some very pointed and influential examples of departmental methods, and it is more than a coincidence that just at a time when dissatisfaction with domestic bureaucracy is rising steadily there should have been published the evidences of the failures of the same kind of bureaucracy in India. For it is absolutely essential that every public man and more, every citizen, should realise that there is no difference in kind in the different forms of bureaucracy now under discussion. The men who resent any breath of criticism at the War Office or in India are precisely the same kind of men who rule our great departments here, and look on every suggestion for improvement as a hidden insult to their own perfection. By joining in a well-nigh unanimous chorus of self-approval on such occasions as the recent Royal Commission on the Civil Service they have for the most part succeeded in imposing on the public.

The mention of that Royal Commission, however, brings us straightway to the central point of civil bureaucracy in this country, i.e., the Treasury. Now, there was one feature of the report of this Commission which distinguished it from all other similar reports, for while on the one hand the Commissioners endorsed the traditional opinion as to the superiority of training at the older Universities for administrative work, on the other hand they condemned utterly and decisively the record of the Treasury in its control and organisation of the Civil Service. In passing, it may be mentioned that the Treasury, the head department of the Civil Service, whose sins of omission and commission were thus displayed in detail, is staffed by those who take the highest places in the First Division examination.

The Royal Commission thus endorsed the charges which had been made against the Treasury by the chief clerical bodies of the Civil Service. But it is important to note that while the campaign for the reform of the Civil Service started—as most such campaigns do start—from a profound sense of injustice, experience and study have made the horizon wider. Equality of opportunity is a demand which may be made only secondarily in the interests of the Civil Servants themselves, primarily it must be made in the interests of the State. But now it is understood that what is at stake is no question of promotion or of wages—important as these matters are in their place and at the right season—but the whole consideration of the fitness of the Civil Service as an instrument of democracy. It is no longer tolerable that the Civil Service should have the power to thwart the intentions of democratic legislation, or that its higher members should take a malicious pride in recounting their performances in that direction. There are already ample checks in the Constitution on the imagined possibility of democratic madness, and there is no need to maintain a hidden check in an anti-democratic Higher Civil Service. What is required of the whole Civil Service—as the organised rank and file now sees it—is that it should be incorruptible, thoroughly competent, always ready, and, above all, a susceptible and sympathetic instrument in the hands of the democracy which it serves. For the imagery of the instrument and the machine as applied to bureaucracy, though customary, is not altogether correct. Machines and instruments are neither democratic nor anti-democratic, they have no will, whereas in point of fact the will of the bureaucrat invariably swings more and more strongly in the direction of anti-democracy. In the Higher Civil Service he is not even open to the check of competition and, as has been shown, he soon acquires the knack of evading Parliamentary criticism: his chief, the responsible Minister, is compelled to rely largely on his help. His subordinates can quite safely be treated in the Sir Beauchamp Duff method, which is thoroughly familiar to the Home Civil Service.

Is it surprising that the rank and file of the Civil Service, accustomed for long years to the State Socialism method which has sickened the working man in three years, is gathering its forces to uproot this system, and to effect the first great measure of reform, a complete change in control which will give it at first an equal voice in management, and, later, complete control in guild form? The unrest in the Civil Service is due at bottom to the same causes as unrest in labour outside, and the only possible remedy is the same. In the next article the attempt will be made to show that this radical change will greatly increase the efficiency of the Service, and will make it pro- instead of anti-democratic, and, moreover, it will be shown that until the change is made there is little hope of that economy which the House of Commons is now so insistently demanding.

II.

In connection with labour questions there is one matter which is hardly ever commented upon, in spite of its curiosity, and that is that the Government never

dreams of applying of its own initiative to its own labour questions the solutions which are momentarily fashionable in industry. Only within the last few years have Civil Service Associations even been recognised. Only within the last few months has a Government agreed to submit wages disputes to arbitration, and now, when the Whitley Report sets a seal on the idea of giving the worker a direct share in management, no one suggests that the Government has it in its power to experiment with the new scheme among its own workers. The reason for this strange attitude is that every development of this kind has to be forced on the highest officials of the Treasury, whose admitted principle is that in such matters the Civil Service should never lead. The extension of women's employment was denied by these arguments, which the last three years have made to look peculiarly foolish. Little wonder that under such control the Civil Service is hopelessly unprogressive, and a heart-breaking place for enthusiastic men and women in the lower grades to work in. Theirs is, indeed, a brazen prison.

It is contended that the Government should take the lead in the path of change which is clearly indicated. What is needed is, in the first place, a representative Board of Control as independent of the Treasury as any other Department. Its function would be, briefly, the efficient organisation of the whole Service, using the words in their widest sense. Aided by a staff of informed and active inspectors, the central Board would be able to supervise promotion generally, to cut out all forms of waste, to insist on the introduction of labour-saving devices, to make a scientific comparison of office methods with the object of stirring up conservative departments, to facilitate transfers in the wider interests of the Service, to deal in the first place with questions of wages and the conditions of labour, to set the uniform standards which are now for the most part absent, to take responsibility for the organisations and staffing of new departments, in short, to undertake the hundred-and-one tasks which no one at present even attempts. It is impossible to give detailed examples of what wants doing, but it may be recalled that by persistent cross-examination of important witnesses Professor Graham Wallas found that it is nobody's responsibility to press the use of labour-saving devices. Even to-day the shorthand typist is still almost unknown! And no one could estimate the economy that would result from improved systems of paper-keeping, based on an inspection and selection of the most up-to-date methods. At least one of the most important of the new departments is very badly handicapped in all its work by the sheer incompetency of its system of paper-keeping. Business men who have lent their services to Government departments, and who have been amazed at the mere volume of the work, will realise how essential it is that this fundamental business should be put on a proper basis. No one can doubt, too, that all the methods of promotion need to be re-organised. In the Higher Division, and to a less extent in the lower grades, promotion is almost automatic. The worst results follow. Every man plays for safety all the time. Abnormal promotions are usually gained by methods which do not attract the man of ordinary decency. The case is similar with discipline. Slackers are found in the Civil Service as elsewhere. But no man likes to take the responsibility of making reports which should result in the slacker's dismissal. He, therefore, continues year after year to draw his pay and rob the State.

The need for all these reforms is admitted by every thoughtful worker among the rank and file of the Service, and it is satisfactory to hear that there are among the younger men in the First Division many who hold the same view. If it had had the will, the Treasury could at any time have initiated these reforms. But apart from its unwillingness there is the fact that the Treasury's proper business is finance, on the big scale. Much of the existing muddle is due to the fact that the Treasury tinkers with the organisation of the Service, which is really quite outside its proper sphere. The proper function of the Treasury is to watch national expenditure under the general control of the House of Commons. If all the detail work of organisation and administration which it now nibbles at were taken away and handed over to a Board of Control, the Treasury would then be able to devote its whole time and thought to the supervision of Estimates, and especially to the doings of the great Spending Departments. As great economy debates have shown, the greatest dissatisfaction prevails among Members of Parliament at the unsupervised rise in expenditure. If the organisation of the new Departments had been in the hands of a competent, independent and representative Board of Control, whose business it was to organise, it is absolutely certain that large sums would have been saved, while the Treasury would have been left free to do its own work and to check the outgoings of the War Office, the Admiralty, and other Departments in that systematic and thorough manner which under present conditions is impossible. More direct control of expenditure by a Committee of M.P.'s would be valuable, but it will not obviate the need for a reform of the instrument.

Aided by a strong Advisory Council of the kind suggested in the Whitley Report, the Board of Control would transform the Service, but as a part of the scheme of reorganisation something more is needed. To complete the scheme it is essential that the Staff should be given a direct share in Departmental management. Under the general supervision of the Board of Control a representative Staff Committee should certainly have a voice in promotion and discipline. Perhaps most important of all, it should have the opportunity of giving to fresh methods and ideas that impartial consideration and criticism which, in the nature of things, a superior finds it so hard to give. Under this system it will be possible to give the humblest member of the Service an influence in the direction of his work and conditions. Who can estimate the possibilities latent in such a change?

These are the reforms demanded by the rank and file of the Service. They are not Utopian. There are no obstacles in the way except conservatism of spirit and the unwillingness of those who set love of their own power before the welfare of the State. There is no question of the Government having to educate the public before it can make a decision. The necessity of some change is written large over all the events of the war. The direction of the change is as plainly indicated in the ambitions of all sections of organised Labour. Is it, then, too much to hope that the Government will act speedily, will take a step which will give great satisfaction to its servants, and will be watched with interest everywhere, and, finally, will give proof of its intention to provide democracy with a fit instrument for the vast tasks of demobilisation and reconstruction which are even now confronting it?

Labour has been strangely slow to appreciate the importance of this question of the organisation and personnel of the Civil Service. Yet there are few which concern it more deeply. If the leaders of organised Labour can spare the time to think out some of the mysteries of their baffled aims, they will find themselves regularly brought up against the power which has been discussed in these two articles. Once the truth is realised, the pressure of organised Labour can put things right, in spite of the many obstacles in the way of reform which will be raised by the vested interests. The internal movement deserves to be supported by all Labour groups outside, and the union of the two forces will secure a great victory for democracy.

Personal v. Political Liberty.

By Ramiro de Maeztu.

THE catastrophe of the Russian armies in Galicia and in Bukovina has stirred in a few alert minds a sudden revision of their dearest political ideas. What has happened in Russia? Everybody knows that while Brusiloff was advancing in Southern Galicia, a few regiments recruited mainly in Petrograd, and especially the 607th Regiment, which were covering Tarnopol, betrayed their trust, and deliberately abandoned their positions. A wide gap was opened; the enemy rushed into it; and the whole southern front of the Russian army was compelled to withdraw. It has been a case of treason, like that of Dumouriez when he surrendered Verdun in 1792, and it is likely to provoke in Russia as in Revolutionary France the re-establishment of some system of iron discipline. There will shortly be in Russia either reaction or a Committee of Public Safety, if the latter, indeed, has not already been constituted by the new Kerensky Cabinet.

What would happen among the soldiers of other armies if they were allowed to be influenced by the same propaganda that has destroyed the spirit of sacrifice among some of the Petrograd troops? This is the question that has crossed the minds of many Englishmen who still preserve a profound respect for the principles of liberty and personality. The writer of the leading article in the "Times Literary Supplement" (August 2) made a curious confession :—

"We have not gagged our Press because we disliked our freedom, nor penalised conscience because we believed in persecution and felt no shame in oppression, but because to this extent the Prussian has triumphed. There was no other way; we had to stoop to conquer, and to borrow his weapons in order to beat him."

The complaint has little foundation in fact. The British Press is *not* gagged. What strikes the foreigner most in England is the freedom of the British Press during a period when the nation is engaged in a life and death struggle, although, it is true, that steps have been taken to prevent the publication of military information, and the use of the Press as an instrument of sedition. Nor is conscience persecuted in England. England is the only belligerent country that has granted exemption from military service on conscientious grounds. What, then, is proved by the passage quoted? Simply that the writer finds himself in love with the principle of unlimited liberty, a thing incompatible with the demands of war. But may not this love of liberty have grown out of a false concept of political liberty?

That there is a fundamental confusion on the subject of liberty even in the clearest minds of England is evident from the fact that even Mr. Belloc, in explaining the indiscipline of certain Russian regiments has written words like these ("Land and Water," August 2) :—

Now it is the character of every democratic revolution to relax discipline at its outset. This is inevitable because no man can wholly dissociate personal from political freedom, and because to most men freedom means individual freedom almost alone. Freedom is obedience to a self-made law. Any nation or community, hitherto unfree and attempting freedom, must destroy the old and hitherto existing form of authority. But the disappearance of the known and accustomed authority leaves the individual free to react for the moment in his own interests alone and to forget the common cause.

But is it true that it is impossible to dissociate political from personal liberty? Let us see. Political liberty is that which a man receives from the "polis," that is to say, from the city or the nation. Political liberty is synonymous with citizenship. A "free man," according to the dictionaries, "is one who enjoys the full privileges or immunities of citizenship." This is also what "libertas" meant among the Romans, and what "eleutheria" signified among the Greeks. This is the European and classical concept of liberty, and up to two hundred years ago humanity had known no other. No other was needed : for it is the only concept of liberty that can be conceived and desired by any civilised man who has a clear idea of what civilisation means (civitas, city). In this concept of liberty the rights of the freeman arise from the city, from the commonwealth, from the republic, from the public thing, but not from man himself, or from his personality. The public thing is the source of rights, because it is also the source of duties; and the city grants the privileges of citizenship to the man who possesses the necessary conditions for the discharge of the duties imposed by citizenship. First, is the fulfilment, or the likelihood of fulfilment, of the duties of citizenship; and from these duties are derived the rights. Liberty consists in endowing man with those privileges and immunities which are required to enable him to fulfil his duties adequately.

Liberalism in this noble and classical sense is the generous and Christian ideal which aims at extending to all men the privileges of citizenship; and this naturally presupposes that men shall fulfil the duties of citizenship. The rights of citizenship are purely instrumental and functional. No function, no rights. If the duties of citizenship are not fulfilled, the privileges of citizenship granted by the city disappear ipso facto. In other words, liberty is not granted to man as man, but to man as citizen, and only in so far as he is faithful to his city.

Personal liberty, on the other hand, arises from the person. This idea of personal liberty is neither European nor classical, but exclusively German. It was invented by Leibnitz, a German who founded it upon his false optimistic belief that eternal reason is eternally alight in the reason of every individual. Rousseau in his turn invented the rights of the natural man, thus transplanting into France the idea of Leibnitz. The name of Leibnitz is the first quoted by Rousseau in his poem, "La Verger des Charmettes," in which he describes the reading of his youth :

Tantot avec Leibnitz, Malebranche et Newton
Je monte ma raison sur un sublime ton.

Stuart Mill took it from another German, Von Humboldt, when he introduced it into England. This idea of personal liberty has inspired all the German writers of the 18th century, that is to say, all the German classics from Lessing to Goethe; and it was only when Napoleon invaded Germany that the idea of personal liberty was replaced by that of national liberty, or "German" liberty. Both liberties have an individual or trans-individual origin. Personal liberty has its source in the excellence of the human person, which was the dogma of 18th century Germans. "German" liberty is based on the excellence of the German race, which is the dogma of the Germans of the 19th century.

Modern Germans have never grasped the objective concept of liberty as other Europeans understand it.

Modern Germans have never conceived the public thing as the exclusive source of citizenship and therefore of liberty. And the influence of German thought has been so immense during the last century that even a mind so clear and so European as that of Mr. Belloc does not believe that it is possible to dissociate "German" from European liberty. Mr. Belloc is a very busy man. A great pity! For if he could devote some time to investigating the history of ideas, I doubt if another man could be found more apt than Mr. Belloc to cleanse European thought of the German heresy.

The Examination System.

OUTSIDE educational circles the examination system is universally regarded with a certain contempt and irritation. Yet hitherto criticism has tended to be purely destructive, there has been a lack of constructive thinking, and practically no public discussion of the question. Consequently, there is little prospect that the authorities will for many years to come be induced by public pressure to consider the possibility of any change or improvement. Of their own accord they are unlikely to make any move. A feeling of awe and respect for the infallible, autocratic, objective judgment of examinations (not of examiners) has settled down on them with the unnoticed weight of an unquestioned assumption. They are so profoundly impressed by the success of their system in avoiding the abuses of the old method of appointment by nomination that it will never occur to them that there might be some more satisfactory alternative.

And even the critics of examinations evince a decided diffidence when it is a question of taking any action. After all, we have got a system which does work fairly well: it has stood the test of time, and has the backing of experience—and nothing is ever ideal!

We are more sanguine of the possibility of improvement, and, at the same time, we take a more serious view of the vices and shortcomings of the present system. It is not so much that it falls short of an ideal, as that the ideal itself is unsound.

An examination is a particular method of estimating capacity either of a theoretical or a practical kind. This method has two outstanding characteristics. 1. The time and the place are imposed on the examinee, and the time is very limited. 2. The action of the examinee is more or less anticipated in the sense that the problems which are set him are not of his own contriving.

As far as possible examinations are held on the subject in regard to which it is desired to test proficiency: the alleged aim is to keep as close to life as possible, reproducing it in miniature.

Now it has never been denied that this system is, on the whole, admirable for testing knowledge, that is to say, capacity for reproducing what others have produced, for understanding and remembering what others have discovered and invented. Indeed, it is chiefly criticised for this very reason: it is a test of knowledge, and of nothing else. And its critics claim that there are other qualifications which are equally, if not more important, and can be more or less dissociated from mere knowledge. For instance, there is the field of practice, of action and enterprise, and there is the faculty of creation, of invention, which may require a deeper knowledge than that possessed by any pedant, but does not necessarily require that particular knowledge which the examiner may attempt to thrust upon it.

If there is any justification for these criticisms the flaw in the examination system must be either the result of bad administration and organisation, or of an inherent and ineradicable defect. If the former is the case, the system itself emerges still intact; it merely needs re-organising: if the latter, it stands indicted.

Many of its advocates admit that it does not touch the field of practice. But they contend that it could not do so: that it would be impossible to find out beforehand whether a medical student will prove a good doctor, a scholar, a good teacher, a selected Civil Servant, a good administrator. It is only possible to guarantee knowledge and ready understanding. But, they point out, this does not mean that the system is wrong, only that it is not absolutely comprehensive. It obtains one essential qualification, and although it may choose people who subsequently turn out unsuccessful, it does not reject those who might have been successful, and that is the main point.

This, however, is exactly the charge which is brought against the system, that it often suppresses the right man. Supposing, it is urged, business men were appointed by examination, it is more than probable that a great many who in reality have a "flare" for business would never pass: efficiency in examination does not necessarily mean efficiency in actual life.

We agree with this view, but we do not find the reason in the opposition between knowledge and practice. It would be equally possible to apply the system to action as well as to knowledge, so that proficiency could be guaranteed in the kinds of action covered by the examination. The reason is rather to be found in the opposition between the foreseen and the unforeseen, repetition and novelty, a static and a dynamic existence.

The examination system takes no account of the continual introduction of new circumstances in which old knowledge is of little avail, unless it is vitalised by resource and originality. And it is here that the prize-winner in examinations often proves a failure, he is an expert in imitating, reproducing and not in creating.

The objection as to practice can, therefore, be resolved into the objection that examinations provide no criterion of originality. And this would seem to be due to an inherent defect in the system and not to maladministration. Attempts, of course, are made to satisfy the exigency for a certain perspicacity and ingenuity. Well do we know the puzzles and traps which the self-satisfied examiners prepare. But such trickery is inadequate in face of the seriousness of life. Its results may be brilliant: they do not go deep.

Educational authorities have hitherto fought shy of the arts: they do not select poets, painters and musicians by examination. Originality is here so clearly the one essential qualification. But for this reason the vice of the examination system is seen in strong outlines if we suppose for a moment that it were applied to the arts. The purpose of such examinations would be to discover promising painters, poets, etc. In pursuance of the system, all the candidates would be called together at 9.30 on a Monday (say in August: a furiously hot day), would sit in a crowded room and paint pictures of given objects, write poems, etc., on given subjects, and then deliver within three hours the results to the impartial examiners (chosen by the same system) who had never seen any of the spontaneous work of the candidates—no, it would be worse than that; most of the work would be reproduction from memory (no chance of "cribbing") in a condensed and composite form of some pictures of old masters, and of a congeries of classic poems.

It has been pointed out that it is the alleged aim of examinations to reproduce reality in miniature. But the reality which is actually reproduced is dead: it is the past. The unique and original present does not develop within a narrow time-limit around an externally imposed subject. The militarism of the examination system has only two alternatives before it when confronted with the freedom and spontaneity of life: it must either crush and distort that life or abdicate.

But in favour of what? Consider the arts again. How do we discover promising poets, painters, etc.? Is it by studying the set pieces in the art schools, the prize poems of the Universities? No: the artists do their own kind of work at their own time: nothing is imposed from without, and their work is finally exhibited.

And in actual life this is how the genuine scientist, historian, thinker, is discovered and judged. Theses are submitted spontaneously to the world, and nobody asks or cares whether the authors passed high in some series of secret examinations.

It is not suggested that the present system should be abolished or materially altered, but that it should be reinforced by two additional tests. 1. Each candidate should be allowed to submit a thesis, choosing his own subject, and more importance should be attached to this thesis than to the whole of the examination. 2. Some account should be taken of work done by the candidate during his period of study.

The only alteration effected in examinations would be that they would gradually become more rigidly and admittedly mechanical. And simplicity, sincerity, and straightforwardness would be sought instead of acrobatic brilliancy. And, on the other side, the retention of the examination would provide an additional check against that spurious form of originality which believes that it can flourish in vacuo, and is as absurd as the current view that the person who excels in elusive imitation is the most likely to display enterprise and resourcefulness in face of contemporary problems.

A. H. HANNAY.

Real Value in Reconstruction.

IT is now officially announced that a Ministry of Reconstruction is about to be constituted. Had there been no war, such a Ministry would still have been imperative; although, doubtless, our pastors and masters would have denied themselves the word "reconstruction," and we should have had some harmless term like "reconciliation." The war has brushed aside the blooms of Fleet Street cliché, proving in the process that nothing less than reconstruction will be sufficient. But we can read the word in two senses: do we mean the rehabilitation of the old, or do we mean the deliberate scrapping of the old that the new may be built upon the old site? There is a suspicion that the former is intended; but the development of events will, let us hope, compel the root and branch procedure.

We shall very speedily discover the intentions of the new Ministry by applying a simple test, namely, is it determined to inquire into real value, or is it acquiescent in the old inflated values? It will find itself invested if not infested by the commercial and professional classes. Before it even thinks of rebuilding, will it have the courage to issue a writ of quo warranto upon these classes? Will it say to them: "Gentlemen, new occasions demand new principles. You did remarkably well under the old dispensation, but what can you bring to the new market? Kindly justify your existence or retire." In other words, have the commercial and professional people, in pre-war days, successfully foisted upon the community a series of inflated values, or have they received merely a fair day's pay for a fair day's work? If Dr. Addison means business, he must not only apply his stethoscope but prepare to amputate.

It is surely obvious that if we reconstruct in obedience to old principles, accepting as real a gradus of class values that are either fictitious or inflated, reconstruction becomes a work of supererogation, a reversion to the status quo ante bellum, and, in consequence, a victory for our Junkers and Krupps. The Ministry of Reconstruction must, in fact, start afresh or degenerate into an inexperienced, and, therefore, incompetent, administrator of the existing system.

We may be sure that the possessing and professional classes will claim that their economic services must be set at the old valuation. I listened recently to a lecture by Mrs. Sidney Webb on the problem of the relation of the professional classes to National Guilds. During the war she has been much in touch with professionals, mainly doctors and lawyers, I gathered, and has been greatly impressed with their strength and influence in public affairs. And she asked the National Guildsmen present what they were going to do about it. The answer was so simple that I am not surprised it had not occurred to Mrs. Webb. Before coming to terms with them, we will examine their economic or social value as distinct from their commercial or class value. Lawyers, doctors, architects, civil engineers—we do not care what they earn, we do not value their work by their incomes—every modern income is, of course, a clumsy, inequitable and anti-social form of remuneration—but only by the intrinsic value of their function in relation to a thousand changed values revealed by the economic searchlights of war. The professional classes, with the possible exception of doctors, are cheap to-day compared with the sailor, the agricultural labour and the mass of labour that either makes munitions or discharges them. Respectability is at a discount. I cannot compute the number of social and economic conventions that have gone into the melting-pot. Out of it will emerge, not only new functions, but new valuations of old functions. The new Ministry of Reconstruction must take careful stock of these changes, or go the way of Mr. Neville Chamberlain, who, to his undoing, accepted his father's old valuation of tub-thumping.

Now suppose every pay-roll, every cost-sheet, every cash-book, and every ledger were destroyed to-morrow. In many ways it would be inconvenient. There would doubtless be much misapplied energy, much duplication of labour-force. But the bakers would go on baking bread, the farmers would continue the methods of cultivation taught by tradition, the tailors would still cut their cloth to the old shapes, the milliners and dressmakers would still pay regard to the interests of the fancy hosiers, railway trains would start with their old distressing punctuality, the clocks would still keep time. But we should soon decide that, although the industrial momentum would continue, some kind of industrial general staff is preferable. We should at the same time discover that all the claims of the administrative classes were subject to considerable revision. We should be agreeably astonished at the number we could dismiss and send into the ranks of the actual producers. We should, in fact, get down to real value.

It is only on some such assumption that the Ministry of Reconstruction can ascertain those new social values, now of vital consequence to our immediate future. It must take nothing for granted; every grade of society must go through the mill. We must all be born again; Carlyle's picture in "Sartor Resartus" must become a reality.

Nor must the new Ministry content itself with a re-valuation of personal services. Capital also makes its claim, and that claim, too, must be subjected to thorough investigation. Factories and steamships, railways and houses, land and mines—they must all be tested, not by their previous commercial dividends, but by the willingness of enfranchised Labour, no longer valued as a commodity, to put value into these dead things and so give them economic life. We must remember that the capitalist makes a double claim upon the community: he demands a salary for his services and a dividend upon his investment—an investment based upon a commercial and not upon an intrinsic valuation. At the present moment he puts a money valuation upon his dead material of £40,000,000,000. But he includes in that modest figure (he might for all practical purposes add a nought or two) the commodity value of labour. A time is coming—wait till the soldiers return—when the workers will disregard the existing social contract and subtract the commodity value from the capital valuation. I don't envy the auditors, whose own professional value incidentally will be revised, when they report to the shareholders what they conceive to be the real value of their clients' property minus their former control of the labour commodity. In those days shareholders' meetings will be about as sparkling as this article!

Now that I have exposed the implications of a new valuation of industry, I affirm that the task is altogether too great for Dr. Addison. We must expect something much more modest. S. G. H.

Readers and Writers.

RETURNING to the subject of prose, I may be allowed this week the luxury of a more particular analysis than has hitherto been possible. My example must be brief, to fit my space; and on that account I shall ask my readers to add to it their own illustrations. Here is the foot; the Hercules must be constructed from it. The passage I propose to employ as my vile body for experimentation is taken from De Quincey's "Suspiria"—from De Quincey, who, more deliberately than any other writer in English, cultivated prose as other writers have cultivated poetry. It has the merit—in my judgment—of having, moreover, served as a text for other analyses of prose-style than mine, which follows. Saintsbury says of the passage that it is "a perfect type in miniature of rhythmed prose"; and to this I shall add that its qualities of excellence are not exhausted in its rhythm. But here it is:—

"And her eyes if they were ever seen would be neither sweet nor subtle; no man could read their story; they would be found filled with perishing dreams and with wrecks of forgotten delirium."

* * *

It is impossible, of course, to separate actually the various qualities (or, as I called them, instruments in the orchestra) that make up a piece of fine prose; but as the ear can isolate, even in an orchestra, one instrument after another, and attend to it while still remaining aware of the whole of which each instrument is a part, so it is possible, I think, imaginatively to isolate and to attend to every quality in prose. With this end in view, I would ask my readers to look at the quoted passage from De Quincey and to oblige me by sharing in a brief analysis of it. And the first quality to which attention may be drawn is the quality of vowel-sound. Vowels, I need not remind the most elementary students of the subject, play a very large part in the magical effect of sound in general. They are more primitive than consonants, and probably express, or at least, reveal, a deeper layer of consciousness. One object, therefore (whether deliberate or instructive) of every writer is to select such vowel sounds as will induce in his reader the mood appropriate to the nature of his subject and favourable to its reception. In verse it is done in the main by assonances and by regular patterns of vowel-sounds; but in prose, as I have explained before, the rule is that there should be no apparent rule; in short, that there should be, above all, variety in harmony. Setting out now the vowel sequence in the above passage, we see it as follows:—

á é ī í ā é éé ē ōō ē īé ē ó úé; ō á ōō ē āī óí; ā ōō é ou í í éíí ē á í é ó óóé éííú

Observe, first of all, the variety of vowel-sounds here present. Few, in fact, are missing. Next note that though not regularly recurrent, each, with one exception, occurs more than once. Finally it will be observed that the tendency is from long to short, from suspense of sound to activity. It is as if in the first part of the sentence the mind were being deliberately kept up; and, in the second, as if it were being rolled rapidly down.

* * *

The next quality is that of the consonant-sounds; and the scheme of the passage is as follows:—

nd r z f th wr vr sn wd b nthr swt nr stl; n mn cd rd thr str; th wd b fnd fld wth prshng drms nd wth rks v frgtn dlrm.

Here, again, is a most interesting combination of sounds, the outstanding characteristic of which is, again, variety in harmony. As in the vowel sequence there is, at the same time, a progression. The tendency in the earlier parts of the passage is in the direction of softness: it is as if the mind were walking on the tip of the lips fearful of what it was about to discover; the consonants are light and soft-spoken. Towards the end, however, not only do the words themselves become longer, but the consonants grow deeper and heavier, culminating in the gutturals of "wrecks" and "forgotten."

* * *

Now, look at the passage as a piece of rhythm—with all sound and sense for the moment submerged in the movement. It can be indicated in this way:—

la la lá | la la la lá | la lá | la la lá | la lá | la lá la || lá lá | la lá | la lá la || la la la lá | lá | la lá la la | lá | la la lá | la la lá la | la lá la-la ||

Hours might profitably be spent upon the rhythm here revealed; but my purpose is not to exhaust the subject but to open it. Note, then, first the variety of the rhythms employed: they vary from rhythms of one beat to rhythms of four; and only a few of them occur more than once, but these very significantly. They are the opening and the closing rhythms respectively. The triple foot, la la lá, occurs three times—each time as an opening; and the triple foot, la lá la, likewise occurs three times, and each time as a close. If you will repeat these rhythms you will *hear* that the first as naturally opens as the second naturally closes the mind. Having such a rhythm as la la lá, you cannot imagine that the subject is done with; and having such a rhythm as la lá la, you cannot imagine there is any more to be said. They are head and tail, and nobody can make them change places without destroying the life of the passage.

* * *

Consider, now, the variety of pitch, as I should call it, subject to musical correction. Having read the passage several times to be able to listen to oneself reading it, you will observe that the voice drops steadily and progressively through the three phrases. The first phrase, beginning with "And her eyes," and ending with "subtle," is comparatively high: it is in the mood of expectancy, of wonder, of suspended yet inquiring attention. The second phrase is lower; it adds to the mystery without resolving it; it intensifies the mood of quiet tragedy. The third phrase is lowest of all, and by the time the voice has reached the word "delirium," the pitch is at the nethermost end of sound. This "fall" is in complete harmony with the progression already noted of vowels and consonants. They conspire together to produce the single effect of suspense followed by anxiety and resolved in horror. The passage simply cannot be read in any other way, or to produce another effect. Such was the effect intended, and such is the effect that is produced.

* * *

Other "instruments" could be singled out and listened to, but I will close this slight analysis with a note on the "meaning" of the passage. There is a perfectly logical order of feeling discernible in it: a progress of the heart as well as of the head. In the opening phrase the mind is, as have said, in a state of inquiring suspense. Regarding the object before it, and guessing, as it were, at its nature, the mind reports first a negative conclusion. Such eyes, it says, would, if I could only examine them, prove to be neither sweet nor subtle. In the second phrase the mind comes to a further conclusion, to the conclusion that the eyes are mysterious beyond its comprehension. Not only are they neither sweet nor subtle, but they are not to be described in intelligible terms. Hence the sympathetic reader is being prepared for the description that afterwards appears in the third phrase. In this phrase the mind resolves its doubt concerning the intelligibility of "her eyes," and concludes that they

can only be described in terms of dreams and delirium. The process, you will see, has been orderly. First the mind suggests, afterwards to reject, the intelligent hypothesis that the eyes may be either sweet or subtle. Next, it despairs of intelligible comprehension, and declares that they are not to be described or understood by human intelligence. Finally, it does describe them, but in the language of dream and of non-human consciousness. And this logic, I have pointed out, proceeds step by step with the development of the sounds, both vowel and consonant, as well as with the order of the rhythms. Each instrument, in short, has a single aim, but an aim that is likewise common.

R. H. C.

Studies in Contemporary Mentality.

By Ezra Pound.

I.—"THE HIBBERT."

UNANIMISM would counsel me to regard "The Hibbert" as a personality or "un dieu"; introspection permits me only the feeling that it is a vague tract, a nebulous aggregate stretching in no well-defined dimension "somewhere" between Mr. Balfour's lighter moments and the high seriousness of the Countess of Warwick. The name has been familiar to me for some years. Since my arrival in the Metropolis I have been accustomed, among what Mr. H—— calls "those few overcultured people," to hear the phrase "an article in 'The Hibbert.'" I had never read "The Hibbert"; I had never opened "The Hibbert" until about a year ago when I was asked to review a single number of it in a bundle of review-books for the "International Journal of Ethics." Vaguely I imagined "The Hibbert" going its way in Mayfair, lying upon tables in political country houses, proceeding from "libraries" to the humbler houses of the Kensingtons West and South-West and thence into the provinces. Never, to my recollection, was the "article in 'The Hibbert'" baptized. It was "an article in 'The Hibbert'"; it had no name and no author.

"The Hibbert" is "a Quarterly Review of Religion, Theology, and Philosophy." My earliest distinct and, I venture to say, durable, if not permanent, impression of it is of the Countess of Warwick discoursing on the joys of maternity: abundant breasts, of rather the Viennese pattern, the pressing of small reddish hands, a facile and boundless fruitfulness. The memory of her enthusiasm has led me again to "The Hibbert" as a starting-point for this research. "Of that Pierian spring I would again . . . ." I rise disappointed. The pasture in the Hibbertian Helicon is less rich than I had supposed.

One gentleman recommends that the local post-office should bear the national coat of arms duly and properly blazoned, in order that the divorce between art and life be somewhat healed, and the wounds to sensibility, caused by our being familiar with the coat of arms only in vilely engraved advertisements, be filled with improving balsam. (Current number.)

The Dean of St. Paul's, a master of technique, opens his broad-minded—I am not sure that for ecclesiastics the word should not be spelled without the hyphen, thus, broadminded article: "The recrudescence of superstition in England was plain to all observers many years before the war." The reader is at once intrigued to know how the Dean of St. Paul's is going to justify his own job and existence. It is, however, only an aniseed-bag, a rhetorical device, a wagging of the legs to draw antelope. We go on to "the absorption of society in gain and pleasure" and an attack on clairvoyants and mediums, whose existence "proves that the Christian hope of immortality burns very dimly among us." (I have not deciphered the function of the sectarian adjective in this sentence, but the reader can seek at the source.)

Secondly, he, the Dean, says: "the clerical demagogue showed more interest in the unemployed than in the unconverted." Whether this "interest" was platonic or watchful he does not state. He proceeds until he reaches contact with the recent democratisation of Heaven. I am there on a firmer footing; I have perused (I think "peruse" is the verb one applies in such cases), perused a recent theological work which deplores the excessive use of "monarchical metaphor" in descriptions of deity. Let me return to Dean Inge. He does not believe that Eternity is an Eternal Now. He considers that "A Christian must feel that the absence of any clear revelation about a *future* (italics his, not mine) state is an indication that we are not meant to make it a principal subject of our thoughts."

The bulk of this number is concerned with "Survival" and "Immortality," whereanent Laurent Tailhade years since on Stanislas de Guaita (not in "The Hibbert"): "Les gens tiennent à conserver leur *moi*, en raison directe de son insignifiance. Un fait bien digne de remarque, c'est l'acharnement à maintenir sans fin leur vie intellectuelle de ceux qui n'ont jamais vécu par le cerveau." I am convinced that many good Hibbertians have read "Raymond."

The Rev. Canon Rawnsley says: "The increase of juvenile delinquents demands the serious attention of all the churches." He endorses some people who "agree with the Leeds commission in deploring the passion for the kinema show among juveniles."

And yet, "and yet," despite their peculiar dialect, the perusal of several numbers of the magazine leaves one with the impression that for both the lay and reverend members of its contributariat the prevailing opinion is that "the Church" is definitely worn out, ready only for the scrap heap, BUT that *the* question is: Here are a lot of fat jobs, or at least "comfortable livings." Leisure is excellent, we must maintain as many people of leisure as possible. A gentleman (of sorts) in every village. The kindly and tired black back of the elderly cleric must not totally disappear from the islands in the street crossings. We are all very tired. New blood is wanted, and sought, *me hercule!* sought, in far distant Montana, whence an "English Professor," or Professor of English, assures them that he is "convinced that the average college man is giving far more thought to the question of religion than the average non-college man of the same age." "Of college girls" he "can not say so much." The undergraduate seems inclined to regard the Scriptures as fairy tales, but "let no one think religion is a dead issue in American colleges." (Now we know where it has gone to. It has not, like the "English Review," sought asylum in the genteel parlours of Edinburgh; it has nestled into the American colleges.) So much for the Quarterly Review of Religion. The Hibbertian Theology I am but ill fitted to cope with.

I find a thoughtful article by A. D. McLaren on German Hate. Mr. Edward M. Chapman, of New London, Conn., U.S.A., indulges the national passion—I mean the lust for quotation. He heaps up his Pelions on his Ossas. "War," says he, in his opening,—

"'"War," says Emerson, "quoting Heraclitus"'" . . .

No, I am not quite through with "The Hibbert's" religion and vocabulary. The Rt. Rev. J. W. Diggle, D.D., says: "In its widest connotation the term sacrament is immeasurably vast; for it includes all cognizable signs of the presence and attributes of the Invisible God." In his two opening paragraphs (about two-thirds of a page) I find the following symptoms: "scrolls of the ages"; "stability of righteousness"; "providential dealings"; "unseen Hand"; "all these—the starry heavens, the rainbow . . . the feeding of sparrows, the moral constitution of the world"; "the

certificates of His presence with them"; "His faithful soldiers."

But let us proceed to "education" and the prominent Mr. Begbie. "The task of the schoolmaster is therefore to quicken the intelligence of children while at the same time he develops the fundamental qualities of their English character." (Drake? Hawkins? or Mr. Begbie?)

"Now there are three things which the State demands directly or indirectly in its citizens. It demands that they shall be moral, intelligent and healthy." "No parent ought to be allowed to interfere with a system which is a State system of education."

He sets forth the "ineradicable individualism"; although great intelligence "is not the shining quality" of the English, yet the "germ of it" is to survive the non-by-parent-interfered-with cram-gewissenschaft of the State, whereto the "apathy of the public" is at present the gravest danger or obstacle. It is, in his ideal England, "for the Board of Education to prevent" millions of people from living as if there were "no Wordsworth . . . no Shelley . . . no Dickens," millions who now (in the unregenerate now) eat shrimps "out of paper bags at Blackpool, Yarmouth, and Skegness," despite the "very gracious, tolerant and attractive aristocracy of intelligence" which ornaments this collection of islands, as we know them.

Despite Mr. Begbie's effort to compensate me for the absence of new anti-Malthusian dithyrambics from the Countess, it is only Mr. Crozier (page 572) who presents me with the quintessence of Hibbertism, and rewards my morning of patience.

"With Mr. Wells' new book on Religion—'God the Invisible King'—flaming like a comet in the sky," begins Mr. John Beattie Crozier, who next sets forth some "thoughts that have taken definite form" in his mind on Practical Religion. He asks what "a given human individual" (male, evidently) is to "do in the matter of religion," and decides that it should not be a straight line but a "rising and falling curve rather like the sun in the heavens." "As an infant he will start as a mere blank point or zero emerging from Eternity," as a boy, "an animal mainly thinking of his food." (Shakespeare's mighty line hovers behind Mr. C.) In early life as Matthew Arnold's "barbarian" he "plays the game."

"*Later still, let us say as a public school boy (who* has always been my ideal for this time of life), let him still 'play the game,' but under stricter control, with religion still a dribblet, but combined with the beginning of real education and culture," "inflexible personal honour." "As a young man" (and so he plays his part) "he is now to put on all his 'feathers' and seek to gain the favourable glances of the fair sex, which he can not do with all his mere knowledge and rough physical prowess" (Kama Sutra, Mr. C.?) "unless he adds to them gentleness and grace of manners and of form and even of personal adornment" as a "stepping stone to the ideal." (Kama Sutra or Mrs. Hodgson Burnett? We must remember the specification about the rising and falling curve, like the sun in, etc. . . .)

Then Mr. C. prescribes a transition stage in which "the society of a g. and v. woman must be his tutor." His religion the "decent," the "right thing." "It must be that of the 'gentleman' and 'man of honour' in Captain Hawtrey's sense of the term." "But if at this stage he could add to this the attitude of mind of a really Christian 'converted man,'" etc., "that indeed, in my judgment, would be well-nigh perfection itself!"

The exclamation point is Mr. Crozier's. He then goes on to Phaeton, the Kaiser, renunciation, but despite his Phaetons, and their possible, profound, arcane connection with the flaming comets and sun-symbols of his outset, "The Hibbert" is not so entertaining as the Countess had led me in hope to suppose.

We Moderns.

By Edward Moore.

FELLOWSHIP AND LOVE.—Fellowship is of two kinds; that which is inspired by Sympathy, and that which is an expression of Love. Men unite for the mere satisfaction which union brings, or for that which is found in the struggle for more remote things—an aspiration or a vision. This latter thing, impractical and paradoxical, which lends Man what nobility he has—it was Love that gave it to him. Fellowship is the sublime attempt to complete the figure of Man. My friend is he who possesses the qualities which I lack and most need: in that sense, he creates me. Fellowship should enrich *all* who partake of it, make their highest qualities productive, and throw bridges over the chasms of their defects. But the association of men for mere enjoyment is not worthy the name of Friendship. Sympathy is its parent.

THE PARADOX.—It is possible to live nobly without Happiness, but not without Love. Love, however, confers the highest happiness. Is it because Love is indifferent to Happiness that Happiness flutters around it, and caresses it with its wings?

MORAL INDIGNATION.—We should altogether eschew moral censoriousness in our contemplation of Life, for it is merely destructive. To destroy that which we cannot re-create in a better form is a crime. Only Love should condemn, for only Love can create. To bring the good into existence, or preface the way of those who can create the good—that should be our only form of condemnation. In what consists the passion of the moral fanatic? In respect for the law, that it should not be violated. So he would extirpate whatever does not conform, even though thus he should destroy all life, and have no power to create it anew. No wonder he is gloomy: the vulture is not a bird of cheerful mien.

MORALITY AND LOVE.—Into what a dilemma falls the poor lover of Life who goes to make the choice of morality! He sees that both great types of morality, the humanitarian and the military, the Hedonistic and the Spartan, lead in the end to Nihilism, the one by liquefying, the other by hardening. The former becomes too sensitive to endure Life; the latter, too insensible to feel it. Yet they were created to serve Life; but they soon forgot the purpose for which they were formed; they exalted themselves as something higher than Life; they become "absolute," and a stumbling block to existence. And this was because they were not founded in the beginning upon the very principle of Life, which is Love, but upon accidentals. The conflict between Morality and Love has accordingly been a conflict between the forces of Death and of Life: for "works" without Love is dead. Morality should be but the discipline which Love imposes upon itself in order to create. It should crown all the virtues which oppose a gallant and affirmative countenance to suffering and change, such as heroism, fortitude, joy, temperance. This morality is the antithesis of the humanitarian morality sprung from Sympathy.

PARADISE REGAINED.—If Life is but an expression of creative Love, then a morality founded upon Love must be the only true morality. And, moreover, in it ethics and the instincts are reconciled; innocence is grasped.

LOVE AND KNOWLEDGE.—If in all Life there is change, creation, Becoming, and if in our lives we know these things only in the interpretation of them which we call Love, must not Love be a necessary part of our knowledge of Life? Observation, investigation and the weighing of results may tell us much *about* Life, and show it to us in many aspects, but it does not give us immediate knowledge. Is it possible to know Life? If Life be the expression of Love——!

Upon that "if" depends everything. For if it is justified, then we have within us the clue to the riddle of existence. Perhaps here we discern the faint struggling for birth of that undiscovered faculty of the mind of which men speak. The comprehension of Life through Love! The profoundest of intuitions? The maddest of dreams?

PROVERB AND COMMENTARY.—Love is blind, but it is with excess of light.

BAD THOUGHTS.—She was as perfect as a drop of dew or a beam of light; a pure thought of God, delicate, spontaneous and finished. There was nothing misshapen in body or soul; Love did well to create such a being. But the others, the crooked, blind and defiled! Are these the bad thoughts of God? From whence do they come? Whither do they go? Conceived in darkness, born for destruction?

LOVE AND SYMPATHY. We must not think of Love as a mere concept. For it is something more real than Life itself: the very Life of Life, the very soul of Becoming. It is a force both spiritual and physical, but transcending the distinction of spiritual and physical. We must not conceive Love as a thing akin to Sympathy. It is not humanitarian or even human; it is a force as unsullied by humanity as the mountain winds or the tides of the ocean. Nevertheless, it is within Man, just as it is within the stars and seas; a great creative, destructive, transforming and purifying force; beyond Good and Evil as the dew and the lightning are. This is the power that is known by Man in his moments of love. He is then free to create and enjoy, as if he were re-born, with a will new, joyful and innocent. But seldom does he attain this knowledge: his moments of exultation are brief. Yet Love has not on that account lost any of its potence. Man may decay and become corrupt; but Love remains unalterable, for ever pure, incapable of corruption.

LOVE AND THE SENSES.—When one loves, the distinction between soul and body is passed. In Love alone is the dream of Goethe, Heine and the moderns realised: here the reconciliation of the spirit and the senses is celebrated in perfect innocence. For Love irradiates and makes fragrant the body in which it dwells, and raises it aloft to sit by its brother the soul.

LOVE AND INNOCENCE.—Life takes us back to its bosom when we love. The heavens, the earth and the race of men no longer appear things external and hostile, against which we must arm ourselves. We return from our exile in personality; our thought sweeps to the farthest horizons, and plunges into the deepest gulfs of existence, at home in all places. The "external" is no longer external: we contemplate it from the inside, we gaze through its eyes. For the very principle of Life, of which all living things are the expression, has been apprehended by us. Our personality has been emancipated. This feeling of universal comprehension is called Innocence.

LOVE AND THE FALL.—Has the fable of the Fall still another interpretation for us? Was the Fall of Man the fall from Love? When the feeling of universal comprehension was lost, personality in the individualistic sense arose. And Sin was the child of this Individualism. To the first man bereft of Love, the earth assumed a terrible mien; nature glared at him with a million baleful eyes: he became an outcast in his home. No longer knowing the earth or other men he experienced terror, hatred and despair. To protect himself against existence, he created Love's substitute, morality. And with morality arose sin and perished innocence.

LOVE AND ITS OBJECT.—Nietzsche's psychology was wrong when he spoke of Love as a narrowly egoistic thing isolating two people and making them indifferent to everyone else. There is too much of the philosopher and too little of the psychologist in this observation. For mankind cannot be loved, Life cannot be loved, until One has been loved. Only lovers can generate such wealth of life that it overflows, enriching their friends, their enemies, all the world. To love one is to love all.

FREEDOM IN LOVE.—In true love there is a feeling of entire freedom. Is it because the lovers have by a divine chance found their true path, have become a pulse in the very heart of Life? If Love is the principle of Life, then in Love alone is perfect freedom. Ethics and instinct become one. This is the road that leads beyond good and evil: Man must learn to love.

LOVE AND THE SENSUALISTS.—On those who affirm Life as innocent and holy, there is an obligation laid. Their lives must be innocent: Life must be to them a sustained act of worship. How many of them have been lacking just here? Heine failed, in spite of his real nobility. Goethe, however, attained unity and sincerity; and Nietzsche was a figure of beautiful integrity and innocence. They were neither of them mere "writers." Nor must we be: there is upon us the compulsion to prove that a life of innocence is possible. And as a first step, we must separate ourselves from those who, before they have sought innocence, praise the senses. For they confuse and defile everything.

FREE WILL.—Only those who have knowledge of Becoming can know what the freedom of the will is. Freedom—that is to will Becoming with all its suffering, voluntarily to go on the way which Fate and the highest Life direct us. Slavery—that is to deny Becoming, to cling to the static, and to be dragged along the stream of change. To be dragged, not to remain stationary; for men by taking thought cannot gain immunity from change. Their will and their desires avail them nothing. For the stream of Becoming is unchangeable in its power. It is Man that changes. When he affirms Becoming, he is enlarged; when he denies it, he is straitened.

TRAGEDY, LIFE AND LOVE.—In the highest Life two qualities are always to be found together, exuberance and suffering. Life is founded on this paradox which is fundamental, for in the emotion of Love we are most conscious of it. Love is the most joyful and most suffering thing: its plenitude of joy is so great that it can endure gladly the worst griefs. And tragedy is the truest expression in art of Life and of Love; for its characteristic, too, is a Joy triumphing over Fate.

THE WANDERER.

I sought God's Spirit where
Beneath the gas-jet's dismal yellow flare
The village worshippers sit row on row
And turn their heads and stare.
The organ rumbles low:
The measure of the well-known hymn is slow.
There have I often prayed for help—and there
I found it, long ago.

Thither I now repair
After these years of wandering, to share
The spirit of that place with those I know
And love. The people there
No changed demeanour show
Save for the touch the hands of time bestow;
And yet for me, within that House of prayer
God's Spirit will not flow.

I greet the open air.
I kiss the Sun; I run; nor do I care
Whither the road leads or which way I go.
Yet sacred, everywhere
I feel the sunshine's glow
And suddenly I realise and know
That through God's earth His Spirit is laid bare
To those who find it so.

L. N.

Views and Reviews.

A VINDICATION.

SOME weeks ago, I wrote an article on recruiting in French Canada, the chief object of which was to draw attention to what I called "a danger to the Empire." That danger was, as I showed, a determination on the part of a section of English-speaking Ontaria to be unjust to the French-Canadians, to deny them their guaranteed legal rights, to defame them as unpatriotic citizens, and to threaten them with political extinction. In support of that opinion, I may quote the statement made by Archbishop Bruschesi, and reported in the "Times" of August 11, 1917: "We have reached an exceedingly grave position. Divisions between the provinces and between the nationalities have been accentuated. We are nearing racial and religious war. Incontestable rights have been violated and laws passed of which even those who passed them seem to be afraid. Let us work for a good understanding. There was talk some time ago of a Bonne Entente. It was a right and Christian sentiment. But it is gone." It is, therefore, with some pleasure that I turn to a letter published in THE NEW AGE of August 2, and signed (Pte.) A. H. Bowell, Canadian Field Artillery, and which tells me that I "know absolutely nothing of what I am writing about," and that one of my statements, to which I shall refer later, "is an absolute lie," and Mr. Bowell defies anyone to contradict him.

The exact point on which Mr. Bowell falls foul of me relates to the French-Canadian schools. I remarked that the French-Canadians had been guaranteed their religion and their language in several Acts, including the British North America Act, 1867; but that their language rights had been filched from them in Ontaria, and, as Mr. Bowell puts it, I had "the nerve to say that, if a French-Canadian teacher in Ontario teaches the French language in a French-Canadian school, he is liable to a fine of £100, or six months' imprisonment." Mr. Bowell asserts, on the contrary, that "French is taught exclusively in the French-Canadian schools of Ontario, as well as Quebec"; and he "knows what he is talking about," because he has "been through Quebec and Ontario quite extensively." Far be it from me to imitate him, and talk of "an absolute lie," more particularly when Archbishop Bruschesi, who also knows something of these matters, says that "laws are passed of which even those who passed them seem to be afraid." But that "incontestable rights have been violated," not all the denials of all the Mr. Bowells in Canada can alter.

I have before me as I write a document issued by the Ontario Department of Education in August, 1913; its number is "Instructions 17," and its title "English-French Public and Separate Schools." Far from French being taught exclusively in these schools, as Mr. Bowell alleges, these instructions provide that "where necessary—in the case of French-speaking pupils—French may be used as the language of instruction and communication; but such use of French shall not be continued beyond Form I, excepting that, on the approval of the Chief Inspector, it may also be used as the language of instruction and communication in the case of pupils beyond Form I, who are unable to speak and understand the English language." As long ago, then, as 1913, the Ontario Department of Education did not agree with Mr. Bowell that French should be taught exclusively in these schools; it provided that it should only be taught provisionally, and that English should be made the language of instruction and communication. For these instructions further command, "in the case of French-speaking pupils who are unable to speak and understand the English language well enough for the purposes of instruction and communication," that "as soon as the pupil enters the school he shall begin the study and the use of the English language," and, further, "as soon as the pupil has acquired sufficient facility in the use of the English language he shall take up in that language the course of study as prescribed for Public and Separate Schools."

It is not here a question of educational ideals; it is a question of rights guaranteed by Acts of Parliament being violated against the wish of those who possess the rights. It is easy for Mr. Bowell to tell an English public that "if the French-Canadians had the power, nothing but the French language would be spoken in any part of Canada"; but the fact remains that it is the English Department of Education in Ontario which has decreed that French shall not be used as the language of instruction and communication in its schools, although there may be schools, as in the "Green Valley" case, in which 49 out of 66 scholars were French.

I know that Mr. Bowell will not develop the casuistical argument that my statement is "an absolute lie" because it is so well supported by evidence, if I tell him that it was Cardinal Newman who invented the argument, "as if evidence were the test of truth!" Mr. Bowell's horror of "illiterate priests," as he calls them, will save him from adopting their arguments; and meanwhile I will quote some more evidence. What is called the Green Valley case was tried in the Supreme Court of Ontario, High Court Division, before Mr. Justice Masten, on January 12, 1916. I have only the space to quote the judgment, which is, after all, the most important part in this connection:

"1. This Court doth declare that the Defendants Mederic Poirier and John Menard and each of them have been guilty of a contempt of Court and of a breach of the order and injunction of this Honourable Court dated the 8th day of May, 1914, by continuing to employ while trustee of the Roman Catholic Separate School for School Section Number 14 for the Township of Lancaster Florence Quesnel as teacher of such school, she being a person not properly qualified under the Regulations of the Department of Education for the Province of Ontario, and for using or allowing the use of the French language as the language of instruction and communication (in the teaching of catechism) in the said school while the same was not permissible under the said Regulations."

The Supreme Court of Ontario does not agree with Mr. Bowell any more than the Department of Education did; apparently, extensive travel through Canadian provinces does not qualify anyone to speak with authority concerning the educational and legal systems. Here the Court not only declares that the use of the French is against the Regulations, but it inflicts the penalty in these words:

"2. And this Court Doth Further Order that the said Defendants Mederic Poirier and John Menard respectively be punished for such Contempt of Court and breach of the order of the 8th day of May, 1914, by the imposition of a fine to the amount of five hundred dollars respectively to be paid by them to the Sheriff of the United Counties of Stormont, Dundas, and Glengarry, and that in default thereof the said Sheriff of the United Counties of Stormont, Dundas, and Glengarry do levy the said sum of five hundred dollars upon the goods and chattels and lands of the said Mederic Poirier and John Menard respectively within the bailiwick and do remit the same to the Accountant of this Honourable Court."

It was against this decision that an appeal was made to the Privy Council; the appeal failed, and this decision is, therefore, the law of Ontario. It is in the face of facts like these, well known to everyone in Canada, that Mr. Bowell writes to an English journal and labels as "an absolute lie" the statement that the French-Canadians have been deprived of their guaranteed language rights, and are threatened with

the loss of their guaranteed separate schools in Ontario. I repeat what I said in my former article, that this campaign not only of calumny but of actual injury against the French-Canadians, these actual deprivations of guaranteed rights and threats of further deprivation, these attacks, wanton and mendacious, on the patriotism, culture, and religion of the French in Canada, constitute a danger to the Empire that even the "Times" correspondent is beginning to recognise His dispatch of July 27 appeared in the "Times" of August 10, and in it he declared that "it is not desirable that Quebec and 'the foreign elements' should be consolidated under common leadership within a federal political organisation. Unwise courses at the moment may have political effects for a generation. We should create a grave national problem if all 'the foreign elements' are forced into an alliance with Quebec." If the racial and religious war of which Archbishop Bruschesi speaks does occur (although, God forbid!) it will be a natural consequence of the extensive campaign of threats, slander, and deprivation of rights that has been waged against French-Canada for years.

A. E. R.

Reviews.

Tales of the Revolution. By Michael Artzibashef. (Secker. 5s. net.)

What Artzibashef will make of the Revolution that has just occurred, we can only surmise; in these stories of the previous, unsuccessful Revolution, all his brutality, his delight in squalor, his rank pessimism, find expression. The hopelessness of his people becomes accepted as a creed; they are certain that whatever happens will be bad for them. Sheviriof, in the first story, asserts the doctrine of original sin; "man is perverse by nature"; and confesses that he hates mankind. He denies that his misanthropy is the result of bitterness, he asserts, on the other hand, that it derives from experience of the truth that "all human desires are but the instincts of a wild beast." Anarchist as he is, he has the philosophy of a Christian Father, with only a very slight hope of redemption by suffering for a few people. Yet his contempt for those who suffer without avenging their suffering, for example, the unemployed, is really devilish in its intensity; ideologue as he is, life is for him a mere proposition in logic, and he despises those who spoil his syllogism by adjusting themselves to the tyranny of facts. If one accepts the doctrine that all human desires are the instincts of a wild beast, the logical conclusion is to fight tooth and nail, to kill lest you be killed. The story ranges through a number of squalid scenes in a Russian lodging-house, until at last the man-hunt of Sheviriof begins. Unlike Zola, who described a man-hunt in the Bois de Boulogne in his "Paris," Artzibashef expresses no pity for the victim. Sheviriof's reasoning is as logical as that of any paranoiac; and when, at last, he bursts into a theatre, and shoots indiscriminately at the audience in the stalls, he has concluded his demonstration with a Q.E.D. The story is not pleasant, but it is a profoundly true study of a man driven mad by lack of hope, and finding his only intellectual exercise in the rationalising of his instinctive prompting to murder. "The Blood-Stain" is the story of a revolutionary defence of a railway-station against a body of troops, concluding with the execution of the station-master. It is characteristically Russian in its contrast between the man's rapidity and efficiency of action and his belated consciousness of it and its consequences. He acted in a dream, and awoke entirely to reality only when he saw the muzzles of the rifles pointing towards him. "Morning Shadows" contains all Artzibashef's stock-in-trade of realism, seduction, suicide, and an attempted assassination bungled by a frightened woman shooting a detective about five seconds too soon. In "Pasha Tumanoff," a schoolboy shoots his headmaster because the master will not give the boy his "remove" after he has failed in his examination; and "The Doctor" lets the Chief Constable die because he remembers the atrocities committed by the Chief Constable in a pogrom. Artzibashef in this mood is not cheerful company; over the whole volume there broods a desolate spirit justifying itself by the deviltries committed in the name of Society. The book is Nietzschean in its ruthlessness, in its demonstration of Nietzsche's argument: "Alas, reason, earnestness, the mastery over the emotions, the entire dreary affair called reflection, all these privileges and pageants of man, how dearly have they ultimately been paid for! how much blood and horror is at the bottom of all 'good things!'" But Artzibashef, in the very act of denying that things could ever be better, overlooks the reasonable basis of hope; the sensitiveness to suffering that drives all these people to revolt, murder, suicide, or madness, hopeless and helpless as it seems to be, is itself the guarantee that wanton cruelty will not always be tolerated. His cynicism is really sentiment that could find no other expression, and now that the nightmare of repression has vanished, we may hope that Artzibashef will overhaul his philosophy, and simply walk out of his vicious circle towards a new horizon. Man may be unutterably wicked, but not irretrievably damned; and if Artzibashef will write some tales of the Revolution of 1917, he will probably discover that some human impulses are not the instincts of a wild beast.

Labour in Chains: The Peril of Industrial Conscription. By Philip Snowden, M.P. (The National Labour Press. 1d.)

Mr. Philip Snowden argues in this pamphlet that the National Service movement is, and has been from the beginning, a conspiracy to destroy the power of Trade Unionism and to overthrow Democracy. He traces the history of the movement from the Munitions Act, through the National Registration Act and the Military Service Acts, to the National Service scheme of Mr. Neville Chamberlain, which is launched with a threat of compulsion. He quotes a speech of Mr. Lloyd George as far back as June, 1915, in which Mr. Lloyd George declared himself in favour of industrial conscription, and supported his advocacy of it by a reference to France. That Mr. Lloyd George is now Prime Minister, and therefore able, and apparently willing, to satisfy his "long-cherished desire," is the fact that convinces Mr. Snowden that "the long conspiracy to establish Industrial Conscription is about to reach the final and successful stage." Mr. Snowden tries, not too successfully, to establish a difference between Socialist and any other National Service; and concludes, quite illogically, that "the most effective way to work against Conscription in all its forms and to defeat the manifold attacks upon industrial and civil liberty is to work to bring an immediate Peace." In other words, Mr. Snowden alleges that Labour is in chains, and yet is free to control the issues of the European war. An immediate peace, we need hardly say, would not remove the peril of industrial conscription; we are not going to fall back into our pre-war state immediately the peace treaty is signed. The peril of industrial conscription does not arise from politics, but from economics, and it cannot be defeated in the political field. The peril of industrial conscription can only be avoided by Labour's learning to control and employ its own energies in the national service; and it cannot learn that if its organisations are stampeded into a political campaign to "stop the war." This talk of "plots" and "conspiracies" is simply useless melodrama; after all, a "plot" is only a plan, a conspiracy is only a "breathing together," and in this case the agreement has been so publicly avowed that the word conspiracy, with its sense of

secret agreement, is quite wrongly used. Labour will remain "in chains" so long as it does not exercise control over its own activities; and whether the chains are called "wagery," or National Service, or Industrial Conscription does not matter. Stop the war at once, and Labour's chains will not be removed; and the utter inconsequence of Mr. Snowden's conclusions must be obvious to every reader of his pamphlet.

The British Navy at War. By Professor Macneile Dixon. (Heinemann. 1s. net.)

Professor Dixon writes with much enthusiasm a general survey of the work done by the Navy since war was declared. He has spared no pains to make the scheme of the various battles that have occurred intelligible to the ordinary reader; maps and charts abound, but his own descriptions are so lucid that the maps are really superfluous. He devotes a chapter to the work of our submarines, and another to the work of the merchant service; and is engaged throughout the pamphlet rather in explanation of naval work than in the conveyance of information. He deals with summary, and uses detail only to illustrate general arguments. In an appendix, he reproduces the badges of rank in the Royal Navy, and in another appendix, details the German colonial possessions surrendered since the war began. There are many photographs of our admirals and our ships; nothing that would make the pamphlet acceptable to the public has been forgotten. Professor Dixon has a gift of lively narration which makes his tribute to the "silent service" the more agreeable; and we hope that the pamphlet will succeed in compelling the gentlemen of England to "think upon the dangers of the seas," and the success of the Navy in surmounting them.

Pastiche.

THE WRITING ON THE WALL.

A derelict you would call him,
  Something sunk and low,
Something to be avoided,
  Something that's right below.

He'd fill you more with loathing
  Than pity, I would guess,
His dirty, ragged clothing,
  His utter wretchedness.

Close by the Thames Embankment
  He crawled like wounded fly;
Or mayhap more like spider
  That crawls away to die.

Hungry his face, how hungry!
  His eyes swam sorrow's sea,
His hands hung grey and nerveless
  In unmatched misery.

He crawled 'neath glowing archway,
  Alive with posters' hue,
And slowly scanned their message
  With lustless eyes of blue.

What message was he reading—
  This man half-dead, unfed?
'Twas a message to the people,
  "EAT LESS BREAD."

EVAN MORGAN.

MY LOVE HE IS A PROFITEER.

Is there no hand to help the weak?
  Is Justice deaf as well as blind?
Why use your strength to basely wreak
  Your vengeance on the good and kind?
I sing of him I hold so dear,
That King of Men, my Profiteer!

He gives you all you eat and drink,
  The clothes you wear, your homes as well;
But him you scorn, nor stop to think
  How well he's answered to the Call
To National Service. Showed he fear?
Not he, my own brave Profiteer!

Whilst others' lives conscripted they
  By thousands, millions: what said he?
"Let others fight for paltry pay;
  "My place *is* here—*they'll* fight for me.
My chance has come, my course is clear."
He was a humble profiteer.

A patriot is the one that makes
  His hay when sun is fierce and strong,
So can one blame him if he takes
  His chance when here? Can such be wrong?
To fight and die makes not a peer;
'Tis best to be a profiteer.

Uplifting he in all his aims—
  Up high the prices raises he—
He tribute from all sources claims:
  Munitions, pills and shoes and tea.
And if it pays to shed a tear,
He won't refrain, my profiteer!

He's always first in all good deeds,
  His charity's beyond compute,
His heart for our dear soldiers bleeds—
  A sign he's not a heartless brute.
He smiles each day at his cashier;
Such smiles become a profiteer.

With friends at Court, in Church, on Bench
  (The Lawyers are his own till death),
Though curses come from home and trench,
  He smiles to think they waste their breath.
To crush the worker is his sphere—
Fit work, beloved profiteer.

If war should cease, what can he do,
  This man who makes his little bit?
Why, go and join that happy crew
  That with the mightiest ones dare sit!
At all that's honest you may sneer,
Except my own, my profiteer!

To make one's bit whilst others serve,
  And die to make the whole world free,
Shows business instinct, vim and verve,
  That you, base creature, fain would flee.
You are not "It"; you're not a seer
Like mine own War-Time Profiteer.

V. A. PURCELL.

FROM A TEACHER'S DESK.

If this unlovely chair from which I reign
  Were decked with richest ivory and gold,
  Gorgeous as some great Sultan's throne of old,
And I a despot absolute, with train
To whom my will alone dealt bliss or bane,
  I might not then a wider sceptre hold;
  For life and death are 'neath my sway enrolled,
Life above life, and Death as deep again!

Wherefore an endless vigil must I keep,
  Lest an ancestral vice, through act of mine,
Arise from out his centuries of sleep;
  Lest seedling virtues thirst and droop and pine;
And I unwittingly give Evil breath,
Or in my ignorance doom Good to death.

S. M. RICH.

VANITAS VANITATUM.

Devoid of hope, yet hoping spite of fear;
Dreading life's end, yet wishing it were near;
Striving for love, though knowing love is vain;
Seeking for joy through devious paths of pain;
Yearning for peace, though peace can ne'er be won;
Pursuing shadows till our life is done.
Vanitas vanitatum.

P. ALLOTT.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

FRENCH CANADA.

Sir,—The letter appearing in your issue of the 2nd instant, from Private A. H. Bowell, of the Canadian Field Artillery, B.E.F., France, supplies one more proof of the success obtained by the campaign of misrepresentations of French-Canadians organised by the Francophobe Press of Canada.

Private Bowell is fully convinced that the French-Canadians of Ontario and Manitoba have nothing to complain of. How would he explain the attempts being made at the present time, in Ottawa, to send to jail the President of the School Commission, Mr. S. M. Genest, for having dared to pay the salaries of Ottawa French-Canadian teachers who use French in teaching French-Canadian boys and girls in French-Canadian schools supported entirely by French-Canadian money? But he may not be aware of this episode of the political activities of his friends against us in Ontario.

He may likewise be unaware that two French-Canadian School Commissioners of Green Valley were traduced before the Courts for having permitted a French-Canadian teacher to use the French language for ten minutes a day in teaching their catechism to little French-Canadian boys and girls who understood no other language. They were condemned to $500 fine, with the alternative of having their goods and chattels sold by auction or making a stay in jail. That school was frequented by 51 children, 46 of whom were French-Canadians. Is not that proscription of the French language?

At this very moment the French-Canadians of Windsor, Ontario, are petitioning the Minister of Education to permit the use of French in teaching the French-Canadian boys and girls in a new school, frequented almost entirely by French-Canadian children, and the Minister of Education refuses permission to do so.

As to the number of French-Canadians having enlisted, Private Bowell accepts as true the 14,000 given out by Ottawa in a verbal answer to a question in the House of Commons. Yet "La Presse," of Montreal, after that answer, gave a list of the French-Canadian regiments in Quebec alone, with the number of soldiers in each, and the total exceeds the 14,000 given out for the whole of Canada.

Private Bowell reiterates as a fact the vile calumny, invented by the Ontario Press and cabled all over the Empire, that troop trains were stoned when passing through Quebec. I have before me as I write the reports of two commissions of inquiry, composed of British-Canadian officers, which have investigated these charges. Their conclusions are that not only did not the French-Canadians do anything of the sort, but that it was the troops themselves, mostly from Ontario, who assaulted French-Canadians who happened to be at some railway stations where those trains did stop. And the Commissions lay the blame for such conduct upon the Press guilty of the fabrications against us, which Private Bowell and thousands like him accept as gospel truth.

I was overlooking one point in Private Bowell's letter which he makes against us. He asserts that French-Canadians would, if they could, have nothing but French taught in Canada. How does he explain, then, the fact that practically every French-Canadian in business, the professions, or politics, can speak both languages fluently, whilst there are so few British-Canadians who understand a word of French? To my personal knowledge, English is taught in every school in Quebec, bar, perhaps, some rural schools frequented by the children of farmers. But in every town and city and village, English is taught in Quebec. His assertion is but the echo of another widely spread falsehood invented by the Francophobes of Canada.

If Private Bowell, whose sincerity I admit, but whose ignorance of the true facts of the situation in Canada is great, would kindly look me up whenever he comes through London, I would show him an array of official documents which would leave no doubt whatever in his mind that the political leaders of the British-Canadians have deliberately set about to inflame feelings against us by wilful misrepresentations and deliberate falsehoods, and, furthermore, that French is proscribed in Ontario and Manitoba with as much bitterness, if not more, than it has been in Alsace-Lorraine these last forty years. Private Bowell and his friends do not realise that French culture is threatened in Canada as seriously as it is in Europe.

ALEX. CLÉMENT.

79, Kensington Gardens Square, W.2.

* * *

QUAKERISM.

Sir,—Your review in last week's issue of "What is Quakerism?" is interesting in the fact that it is necessarily empiric, and from the standpoint of the Quaker belief courts reply. I have not read Mr. Grubb's book, but if its tendency is to give an impression as shown by your reviewer, it is not a full expression of the "special beliefs and practices of the Society of Friends."

It is not possible for the layman to realise the practical meaning of that central principle, the Inward Light, in the development of the Quaker, individually or through heredity, but its force can be recognised in the conduct of the Society of Friends as a whole. The test in this Society as applied to continued membership is "Conduct," for its beliefs and practices are pre-eminently practical, and have been recognised as such by the community at large.

Your reviewer complains that Quakerism has "sedulously cultivated only one of the activities, the moral activity, of the Spirit." Let us note from a practical standpoint the diverse results of this moral activity. The probity of the Quaker is such that in the matter of oaths the law has been altered to suit his religious beliefs. The financial world has noted that in the Society of Friends the standard of health is so high that a "Quaker life" is taken into consideration in the sale of reversions. With regard to education, the Inspector of Schools in Boston and New York has stated that the finest educational centres for the instruction of youth belong to the Friends; and when it is realised that the aim of the Quaker with regard to the young is an all-round development, mental, moral and physical, the above statement from a reliable source is worthy of note. Through this "moral activity of the Spirit" the status of the woman has for generations been placed on an acknowledged equality with man. She is given, as he is, full opportunity for the training and use of her capabilities, and a life of financial independence is within her grasp. She inherits with her brothers, and has never suffered from a nervous suspicion that she may be an inferior creation, but develops on the lines of an "equality of difference," secure in this goodly heritage of justice.

The Quakers have removed poverty; have contrived a more equal distribution of property; and have secured greater happiness in marriage through freedom in choice. Divorce is unknown in the Society of Friends, for the fine flavour of romance is to the Quaker, and he would not exchange it for heterogenous experience.

The "moral activity of the Spirit" is also vindicated in the Quaker who is voluntarily fighting in the trenches that his word may not be broken to the smaller nation, and in the Quaker who will not take the life of a fellow-creature on the grounds of his religious belief, but is "prepared to be shot" in the interests of law and order as forced upon us by the present cataclysm of a European War.

Your reviewer also states, and somewhat strongly, that as a result of this "sedulous cultivation" of one activity Quakerism has given nothing to art or to speculative thought. It is true that Wedgewood is not a Rembrandt, but he has taken his place with other Quakers as a creator of beauty in material things. With regard to speculative thought, the Quaker does not adapt his mind to this method of thinking. He has not found his solutions though a questioning attitude, but on the surer ground of pragmatism. In contemplative thought he has writings of great beauty.

The argument of your reviewer as to the "failure of Quakerism to convert the world" is ingenious, but not convincing; but no Quaker will quarrel with him when he places the Inward Light as the "Essence of Religion." For this Light is to the Quaker the necessary element in moving to right action, and he believes that this right action cannot be sustained in the individual or in heredity without the refreshment and direction of the Inward Light. The coldness of mere ethical teaching as shown in our Ethical Churches does not commend itself to the wisdom of the Quaker. With him life is too full in its emotional centres—for there are spiritual as well as physical emotions, and that Inward Light, that elixir vitæ

of the spirit which touches the intelligence and draws from it its finer qualities, has no place in mere ethical teaching which leaves us gaunt and restive, with a tendency to combative argument or to speculative thought.

What your reviewer has missed in his short review of Quakerism are the practical results of the "moral activity of the Spirit." That these are results which procure happiness for the individual and for the community is due to achievement requiring "diversities of Gifts but the same Spirit."

I ask him to note this. FRANCES WHITING.

* * *

Sir,—Will you allow me a word of protest against your review of my book on Quakerism?—not because it appears lacking in justice to the author, which is a small matter, but because it gives a very misleading idea of the subject of the book. Your reviewer assumes, in his lengthy remarks on "quaking," that the name "Quaker" was adopted by the Friends as expressive of their faith. It is well known that it was given them by their adversaries, and that they spoke of themselves as "the people in scorn called Quakers." But the most serious error into which your reviewer has fallen is revealed in the sentence, "We cannot live even on Divine essences which others have extracted for us; and that simple fact is the explanation of the failure of Quakerism to convert the world." Whatever the failures of Quakerism may have been, and I have not tried to extenuate them, their source was certainly not the endeavour to live on "essences" which others had extracted. The whole meaning of Quakerism was, and is, the call to live, *not* on that which others have found, but on that which we, individually and collectively, can find for ourselves. I had hoped that this was made sufficiently clear in the book; but there is probably a simple explanation of the fact that your reviewer has not discovered it. EDWARD GRUBB.

* * *

WAR AS REVOLUTION.

Sir,—To-day we have a great wringing of hands and a loud crying of voices that ask: "How was it possible for the conditions that prevail in Europe to-day to have occurred in our time and in our present stage of civilisation?"

Only those who are culpably ignorant, only those who have not read Ruskin and Aristotle on Interest, need be in any darkness or any despair respecting the great world-war which is an epochal episode and carries a messianic message.

The mathematicians have told us that if a penny had been loaned out at interest in the year A.D. 1, it would to-day amount to a sum represented by a mass of gold twenty-five thousand million times the size of the earth. Only by revolution and repudiation can the ravages of this monster be arrested. The present war is Nature's attempt to check the attempts of the Interest-monger to put a mortgage on the earth to the last period of time.

Far from being a wanton waste of life and wealth, far from betokening the benightedness of Mediævalism, far from preluding a period of utter financial depletion among the peoples of the earth, this Armageddon is a veritable bow of promise to Humanity—the only one that has ever flashed its myriad hopeful hues above the drab level of economic serfdom since Commercialism first bore sway.

This war must not cease too soon: it must not cease until it has piled up debts so huge that the interest can never be paid; when the absurdity of Interest will surely be apparent even to our most learned professors and our most distinguished statesmen.

The grave danger to Humanity is not that the war will not cease, but that it will cease *too soon*, before the sum total of the debt through it incurred shall have become repudiable by its enormity. MARY MONICO.

* * *

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF IDIOMS.

Sir,—Reading "R. H. C." on "idiomatic psychology," I was reminded of the actual facts of the "idioms of fear" as evidenced in this most terrifying war. Let me, however, quote in confirmation of my own personal observations from the Chadwick Lecture on "Mental Hygiene and Shell Shock During and After the War," by Major F. W. Mott, R.A.M.C. (T.F.):—

"When we come to consider the principal objective signs and subjective symptoms of shell shock, we shall see that they very largely correspond with those of paralytic fear. We speak of being paralysed with fear—of giving way of the knees, of trembling, or quaking with fear, of being dumb with fear. All these popular expressions regarding the influence of the emotion of fear on the human body are based upon actual experience, for paralysis, tremors, giving way of the legs, mutism, and cold blue hands are among the most constant signs of soldiers suffering with shell shock."

Flanders. MORGAN TUD.

Memoranda.

(*From last week's* NEW AGE).

What blindness it requires to continue to deny in the face of the Excess Profits Tax the existence of profiteering.

The profiteer profits and the State shares his profits with him; but in the meantime it is the public that pays.

Lord Rhondda calls himself an individualist, and nevertheless holds a public office.

Everything, it appears, may undergo transformation, but the wage-system and the profiteering dependent upon it must stand amid the flood like the Rock of Ages.

Labour Exchanges are a kind of bureaucratic hiring-fair of Labour.

By rushing to the support of the tottering edifice of private industry, the State has actually prolonged the life of private industry beyond its legitimate span.

If Labour Exchanges are a source of irritation to-day, they will be a source of revolution to-morrow.

Until the Labour Exchanges begin to disappear, the prejudice upon which they depend may be regarded as untouched.

The working classes are getting into debt together with the State at the same moment that the capitalists are getting into credit.

It is not the nation but Labour that will be in danger after the war.

Militarism, while it has been a weapon of capitalistic competition, has been also a hindrance to it.—"Notes of the Week."

Its Parliamentary connection is at present a great obstacle to the Church.

The Guild plan gives more opportunity of effective action to the genuinely Christian spirit than any other proposal I have seen.—"Interviews."

A man believes in liberty if he is prepared to concede it to people who disagree with him under conditions which permit them and not him to carry their views into effect.—O. LATHAM.

The rules of verse are as clearly formulated as the Ten Commandments; anybody can tell when they have been broken. But prose has its rules in the heart and mind, and not upon tablets; and only the penetrating critic can discover whether they have been broken or kept.

Nobody would maintain that the rule of democracy is no more than the absence of the rules of aristocracy.

Verse has its rules of rhythm, and they are metrical; prose has its rules of rhythm, only they are not metrical.

It is more difficult for one man to produce the effect of an orchestra than for one man to produce the effect of a solo.—R. H. C.

Curiously unfair is the way of age to take for granted that every impulse of youth to mental adventure is dictated by no thought, or at best by shallow thought.

Youth is like an oyster, difficult to open and impossible to close.

I prefer myself as I was to what I may sometime be.

It is difficult to be an infant prodigy without becoming a dotard.—DIKRAN KOUYOUMDJIAN.

It is probable that the most effective measure for the protection of Public Health would be the substitution of electric lighting and heating for our present methods.—A. E. R.

PRESS CUTTINGS.

It is significant that both James Connolly and "Æ." should have at once responded to the new evangel of economic freedom whose prophets have been at work for some years past in the weekly pages of the London NEW AGE. The principle of National Guilds, whose hypothesis is the abolition of wagery, has slowly permeated the world of labour, until now even the Fabian and the Northcliffe press have had to recognise the advent of a new era in economic thinking. The word "profiteer," coined by the National Guildsmen, is now used, and misused, with a freedom which testifies at least to the spread of the vocabulary and ideas of the most efficiently boycotted journal in London. THE NEW AGE may now be mentioned without bringing a blush to the cheek of the Fabian young person. Not that Dublin can be accused of having participated in the conspiracy of silence. For a city devoted to "John Bull" and the "Daily Mail" we have always possessed a proportionately large number of NEW AGE readers, and, what is more important, the social criticism of that journal has strongly influenced both the executed leader of the urban workers and the living champion of our rural society.—"New Ireland."

Who were the Industrial Unrest Commissioners responsible for the South Wales district report? The query is on everyone's lips who has read this remarkable document. When I read that industry should be given "a large measure of constitutional government in place of what in theory was an autocratic and absolutist system," and that, coupled with compulsory trade unionism, employers, if disaster is to be averted, must meet the men in their demand for a share in the control of industry, I rubbed my eyes and looked to see if I were reading the editorial notes of THE NEW AGE.

On looking up the newspaper files I found that the Commissioners for Wales were Mr. Lleufer Thomas, Mr. Thomas Evans, and Mr. Vernon Hartshorn. Mr. Hartshorn's name will be the only one known widely hereabouts. He is one of the South Wales miners' leaders who has always been recognised for progressive thought. The report suggests that Hartshorn has completely converted his employer confrère on the Commission.—"The Bulletin."

"Some curious things are being reported with regard to land values as a result of the war, and the change in the position of farmers due to the special position which they have been given under the Corn Production Bill and other measures," says the London correspondent of the 'Liverpool Post.' "There has appeared, it seems, a race of middlemen, speculators, or profiteers—whatever we may call them—in connection with land transference, with the result that prices have appreciated, and that land is being treated by financiers very much as meat is treated by the Smithfield speculators. 'There have been cases reported of estates changing hands more than once in a few weeks, each time at a profit, and buying estates has become an amusement of a certain type of financier." In Birmingham the publicans, it is definitely alleged, are charging 5d., and even 6d., per pint for "Government beer," which it was understood was to be retailed at 4d. per pint. There seems no limit to the mushroom-like growth of profiteers in every trade, and what the ultimate result will be no one can contemplate with equanimity. It is simply, and needlessly, adding oil to the already smouldering embers of discontent.—"Railway Review."

PROFITEERING.

To the Editor of the "Times."

Sir,—May I remind your readers that this novel name for buying and re-selling at prices detrimental to the public describes practices formerly known as forestalling, ingrossing, and regrating, made punishable by several statutes, which were repealed by 12 George III, chapter 71? It would seem, however, that, apart from Acts of Parliament, these practices are crimes at Common Law, and that the offences consist in unjustifiably enhancing prices to the injury of the public. (See Rex v. Waddington, 1 East, 143, etc.) Forestalling is a general word signifying any manœuvre or artifice intended unduly to enhance prices (3 Coke's Institutes, 195). Ingrossing was the word in use to signify what is now meant by cornering—i.e., the buying of a considerable quantity of a commodity, sufficient injuriously to affect prices; while regrating is the offence of buying and selling a commodity, specially foodstuffs, in the same market. I think this is called "scalping" in America. It is this latter practice, indulged in by traders whose only intention is to snatch a quick profit, which seems chiefly suspected of causing prices to rise to unjustifiable heights in some commodities, while it may very well be that scarcity has encouraged the ingrossers or cornerers. Although prosecutions for these offences have fallen into disuse, the offences still surely remain crimes, and, if so, it would seem that our Law Officers might well consider the revival of this class of prosecution. B.

We have received so many inquiries regarding literature on the National Guilds that we have been compelled, from sheer physical exhaustion, to give up the attempt to answer each correspondent individually, and we hope you may do us the favour of inserting the following, and that our unanswered friends will accept the assurance that only lack of time prevents our making their acquaintance in correspondence. Some day we hope to meet them, if not at a Guild Congress, at least at an N.U.C. Conference. The essential book for study of National Guilds is, of course, that entitled "National Guilds: An Enquiry into the Wage System and the Way Out," edited by A. R. Orage, and published by Bell and Sons at 5s. The following will also be found of great interest and use to those desirous of going fully into the question: "The World of Labour," by G. D. H. Cole (Bell and Sons, 3s.); "Principles of Social Reconstruction," by Bertrand Russell (Allen and Unwin, 6s.); "Liberty, Authority, and Function," Ramiro de Maeztu (Allen and Unwin, 4s. 6d.). We can also recommend the pamphlets of the National Guilds League for their sanity of thought and clarity of expression. These are issued at 1d. each, and can be had from any group secretary, or from the Victoria House Printing Co., Ltd. The monthly "Guildsman," issued by the Glasgow Group of the League, is easily, we should say, the best of provincial Labour papers. Then, as to weeklies, which examine passing events from a National Guilds standpoint, there are the well-known "Herald" at 1d., and THE NEW AGE at 6d. (38, Cursitor Street, E.C.4), regarding the latter of which any praise or commendation on our part would be mere impertinence. We simply recommend it as being absolutely essential to any serious student of sociology or economics.

EDWARD MOORE.
R. E. SCOULLER.

Perhaps we might be permitted to add that the acting secretary of the National Guilds League is Mrs. M. Ewer, 17, Acacia Road, London, N.W., who, we have no doubt, will be willing to give any information regarding that body.—"The Clerk."

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

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

All communications relative to THE NEW AGE *should be addressed to* THE NEW AGE, 38, *Cursitor Street, E.C.* (4).

Published by the Proprietors, THE NEW AGE PRESS (A. R. ORAGE), 38, Cursitor Street, E.C.4, and Printed for them by BONNER & CO., The Chancery Lane Press, 1, 2, and 3, Rolls Passage, E.C.4.