As Herr von Kuhlmann's psychological diplomacy unfolds we see that it has two objects. One is to prove to the world the unity of the German Government and people—and thereby to maintain that unity in fact. The other is to create divisions among the Allies. As regards the first of these objects, it may be said that there are several elements in each of the Allied countries (except, perhaps, America) which are favourable to Herr von Kuhlmann's purposes. Nothing would suit our own "Morning Posters," for example, than a forcible demonstration in Germany or anywhere else of the triumph of democracy. On the other hand, is Germany itself Herr von Kuhlmann, it is now clear, must be prepared to encounter an opposition propaganda designed to undo faster than he can do the work he has set himself. Without attaching too much importance either to the alleged mutiny in the German Navy, or even to the avowed need of "intellectual and moral pabulum" at the front, we may still be certain that opinion in Germany is moving steadily towards the Left. The Minority Socialists before very long will in all probability become the Majority Socialists; the present Chancellor, a compromise between the patriotic Germans and the no-Annexationists, will before very long give place to a declared no-Annexationist; the Junkers will shortly find themselves without the enthusiastic audiences they have hitherto been able to command. The movement Leftwards, in short, though slow is sure; and at the present rate of progress we could count with confidence upon the democratisation of Germany from within before the end of the next ten years. It is, however, all too slow. We cannot wait ten years until it pleases the German people to throw off a yoke degrading to themselves and a hateful danger to the rest of the world. Surely there must be means apart from the military means by which the process can be hastened, and public opinion in Germany brought more rapidly to the boiling point. The discovery and employment of these are, in fact, the proper counterstrokes to Herr von Kuhlmann's psychological diplomacy and we only wish that there were as many people in this country to demand "psychological" reprisals and counter-offensives as have declared themselves in favour of reprisals of a grosser kind. The psychological insight of Herr von Kuhlmann does not, however, penetrate very deeply. In purely political matters, such, for instance, as the divisions of caste-opinions in this country, he is easily at home. We are only waiting for him to play a certain card to prove him a master. But in matter of a higher kind of politics, national and international politics, he is as thick-fingered as any of his predecessors. What could be more ill-judged, for example, than his attempt to isolate France from the Allies by means of his "No, never," to the demanded retrocession of Alsace-Lorraine? It proves him to be under the impression that the question of Alsace is purely political and one for the ordinary conventions of diplomatic give and take. That a nation may have received a spiritual injury as well as a material injury, and that while the latter may be "arranged," the former can only be "atoned," he is apparently unable to conceive. Yet this is the real truth about Alsace-Lorraine. Alsace-Lorraine is not a mere province torn from France in 1871 and now demanded back; it is a Prussian crime for which the world, as well as France, demands an atoning act. No "arrangement" of it is possible without violating the moral law; and the voluntary offer to restore Alsace-Lorraine to France is the most complete sign that Germany can make that she has learned the lesson of the war. For France to demand anything more, however, than the retrocession of Alsace-Lorraine would be, in our opinion, to add revenge to justice. We have in mind at this moment the demand put forward in the "Times" for the retrocession not only of Alsace-Lorraine but of the Rhine provinces taken from France by the Treaty of Vienna in 1815. These demands, says the "Times," are "representative of the public opinion of practically the whole of France." We do not believe it; we know, in fact, that they are actually repudiated by the largest French political party. But even if they were unanimously approved by the public opinion of France we should still be opposed to them, and upon the same ground that every far-sighted German opposed the general demand in Germany in 1871 for the seizure of Alsace-Lorraine. Why, indeed, we should oppose the re-
versal of 1815 while demanding the reversal of 1871, we cannot rationally say. There is no magic in the dates. Common sense, however, assures us that as right as France is to insist upon the retrocession of Alsace-Lorraine, so wrong would it be to insist upon the retrocession of the Rhine provinces. And we are sure that the world is of this opinion.

It was before M. Ribot's speech on Saturday that both Mr. Asquith and Mr. Lloyd George replied to the "No, never!" speech of Herr von Kuhlmann. For this prematurity their declarations had to pay in lucidity and definiteness. The Press in general in this country is so incapable of reading a text and judging it objectively that often enough the Press comments upon a speech are in plain garage of the text of the morning columns. This was certainly the case with the comments and texts of the speeches of Mr. Asquith and Mr. Lloyd George. In commenting upon these speeches, both the "Times" and the "Daily News" to take the extremes of journalistic opinion remarked upon the cleverness with which Herr von Kuhlmann's resolution had been repudiated. Nothing could be wanting in the text, it was implied, to complete reassertion of the will of the speakers to continue the war until Herr von Kuhlmann's negative had been withdrawn. But on turning to the text itself, the careful reader would have discovered what in the circumstances was only to be expected in the courtesies of Allied inter-diplomacy; that is to say, not an anticipation of the opinion of M. Ribot, who alone has the right to reply first to the challenge of Herr von Kuhlmann, but a conditional negative to Germany and a positive promise to France. Look at the terms of Mr. Lloyd George's speech in particular, for these were quoted three times in the same issue of the "Times." "We shall stand by France until she has redeemed her oppressed children from the degradation of a foreign yoke." Taken in the context, no doubt, these words are wanting in the text, it was implied, to complete the pretensions of Alsace-Lorraine, and as applying to Alsace-Lorraine, and as applying to Alsace-Lorraine they have, we are sure, been generally read. But read them again and see if they are not applicable to the territories of France now in enemy occupation, and to those alien if need be. We do not, of course, say that they were meant to exclude Alsace-Lorraine. As we have pointed out, etiquette alone would have required the speaker to wait upon France in the matter of a direct reply to Germany upon the subject of Alsace-Lorraine. And that answer has now come in the form of the speech of M. Ribot, who, on Saturday, declared that France and the Allies would never rest until Alsace-Lorraine had been restored. And we are remarking is the incapacity of our Press to read the text of our own politicians with subtlety.

An offence of quite another kind is the suppression of opinions which the public is not entitled to hear but expected to know. And such an offence was committed by the "Times" last week. In his speech on Wednesday Mr. Churchill referred to the democratization of Germany; and, amongst other things, all of the same tendency, he said, that "great as no longer possible in the modern world," in other words, that the Hohenzollerns must submit to Parliament. The "Daily News" reported this part of Mr. Churchill's speech equally with the rest; but the "Times," though devoting more space to the speech than the "Daily News," omitted from the summary even so much as a mention of the demagogic remarks to which we have referred. This is the sort of thing that makes "revolutions" more bitter than they need be. For we have evidence here of a deliberate and underground anti-democratic propaganda, the chief effect of which is to engender in democratic minds distrust, and, finally, disgust. The offence is all the greater for the pretensions of the "Times" to impartiality in its news if not in its views. It will be remembered, perhaps, that in justification of its maintenance of its pre-war size the "Times" pleaded that it alone published important speeches in full or in fair summary. If, however, having obtained its end by this plea, the "Times" is now employing its licence to suppress or distort democratic propaganda, we can only remark that the "Daily Mail" can do these things better on less paper.

A journalistic "Opposition" is as necessary in these days of government by newspaper as ever was a Parliamentary "Opposition"; and, no doubt, in time, such an Opposition will be organised. In the meanwhile, however, it falls upon independent members like ourselves to carry on as best we can the work of criticism even at the risk of appearing to say nothing else. This must be our apology, for referring to still another matter upon which part of our Press has deliberately misled public opinion during the last week. Reporting the result of the Bordeaux Conference of French Socialists which completed its sittings on Tuesday, the "Times" headed its account with the caption: "Big vote for support of the Government." The suggestion is literally true, but in spirit it is wholly false; for the fact is that by as large a vote as the Conference supported the Government the Conference also supported the Stockholm Conference together with demands upon the Government for the issue of passports. The support of the Government, in other words, is not absolute as the "Times" suggests, but conditional; and conditional, moreover, upon the Government's acceptance of a proposal which both the French Government and the "Times" (or British Government) have declined to meet. What the actual value is of a big vote of support for the French Government, when made conditional upon a course that Government has declined to take, we leave our readers to estimate. It is certainly misleading public opinion in this country to suggest that its value is what the "Times" makes it appear. And this will become apparent when the demand is once more raised, this time in agreement between the French and British Socialists, that democratic diplomacy shall begin at Stockholm before it is nipped in the bud at Berne.

World-famine is a big word, and the world has heard the cry of wolf so often that the nations can be forgiven for continuing to eat their bread in incredulity. Nevertheless, exactly as it is the fact that Araggeddon, the much-talked-of, the much-feared of the world's imminent end, the reluctantly appearing, the incredible Flood, has actually occurred, is now occurring, and continues in spite of us, so it may be the fact that the same generation that has seen the world's worst war will encounter the wolf of the world-famine. We are not alarmists, nor have we any fear that the world must of necessity starve even its poorest populations. The problem is not in its most difficult form the problem of production, but the problem of distribution. So unlikely, however, is distribution to be organised properly, and so certainly will bad distribution react upon production, that "Socialist" regulations have been advocated by the many, is now occurring, and continues in spite of us, so it may be the fact that the same generation that has seen the wolf of the world-war will encounter the wolf of the world-famine. We are not alarmists, nor have we any fear that the world must of necessity starve even its poorest populations. The problem is not in its most difficult form the problem of production, but the problem of distribution. So unlikely, however, is distribution to be organised properly, and so certainly will bad distribution react upon production, that "Socialist" regulations have been advocated by the many, is now occurring, and continues in spite of us, so it may be the fact that the same generation that has seen the wolf of the world-war will encounter the wolf of the world-famine. We are not alarmists, nor have we any fear that the world must of necessity starve even its poorest populations.
We need more than a Defence of the World Act in every nation—that will certainly be necessary in every belligerent country for at least a year after the war—we need a Defence of the World Act, designed to control world-production and to control world-distribution in the name of and with the authority of humanity. The strongest case for the abandonment of war is that of saying how small and ruinous are likely to prove the political opinions of most of our present statesmen. Emphatically, patriotism will not be enough after the war.

Sir Auckland Geddes has made a good start with his task of utilising labour-power by acting upon the advice given to, but rejected by, his predecessor, Mr. Neville Chamberlain: he has enlisted the co-operative support of the federated employers and workers in every trade. The chief difficulty, however, remains: it is that of transferring labour from luxury to necessity, without employing State-compulsion. Frankly, we do not believe that the difficulty can be got over. Appeals are useless. Sir Auckland Geddes denounces "the class of person who employs a mass of domestics, chauffeurs, and gardeners," and warns them that "the country cannot afford this waste of human power," and that "it has got to stop." Yes, but how is Sir Auckland Geddes going to carry out his threat if he is without doubt a powerful body? It is not likely on a mere appeal to surrender the parasites it has come to depend upon; the domestics, chauffeurs, gardeners, and the rest are not likely to transfer themselves from easy and well-paid security to difficult and less highly-paid insecurity, even though it be in national service; and, finally, industrial compulsion, the compulsion of labour, has been made impossible by the attitude of Labour itself. The problem, as we say, would therefore appear to be insoluble. But is that really the conclusion to which we must come—is there no other? The answer is that there is another solution, and a possible, if not an actually easy one: if you cannot apply compulsion to luxurious labour, you can, at any rate, apply compulsion to the source whence luxurious labour derives its wages. If you cannot conscript Labour, you can conscript Wealth.

By the way, we hope that Sir Auckland Geddes is not going to indulge very often in the swollen oratory with which the Prussian Press has made us familiar. This is what he said at Nottingham last week: "Before the next twelve moons have passed away, many a German city, many a German hamlet, will have heard the song of our aircraft, and have listened covering for the bomb-bursts that will mark their flight." This flight of romanticism, with Umslopogaas, the great Zulu chief, of whose exploits in oratory Sir Rider Haggard is the faithful chronicler.

The "Times" must be disappointed to discover that the most considerable rise to its last in "The Ferment of Revolution" is Mr. Frederic Harrison. We do not wish to appear ungrateful, since we are not, but is it not about time that Mr. Frederic Harrison ceased to pose as a critic of Socialism and an exponent of Trade Unionism on the strength of his association with the movement fifty years ago? Neither movement to-day is what it was half a century ago; nor can parallels be easily drawn. Arguing from analogy Mr. Harrison therefore falls into some pathetic errors, errors that have, in fact, little relation even to the mistakes of to-day. For instance, while claiming himself to be a Socialist, he disavows the movement that "masquerades" as Socialism and is at bottom "revolutionary Communism." Why, so do we, and so do all the Socialists of to-day. Mr. Harrison is merely contemplating with shadows, revenants of 1870. Again, he says that the aim of these modern Socialists is "to abolish Capital, their weapon to paralyse Industry, and the result to plunge society into confusion." Apart from the scarcely horrible character of these threats—for whose flesh will creep in the midst of the present war at the prospect of social confusion?—the intention to abolish Capital has never existed in any Socialist's mind outside of Mr. Harrison's imagination. The slight confusion with which he links the existence of Capitalists with capital, the former of which Socialism desires to abolish with the same sincerity that it desires, on the contrary, to preserve and increase the latter.

The writer of the Articles himself returns to the charge in the correspondence columns of the "Times" and this time with such ill-concealed prejudice that his case for State action must be pronounced finally lost. "Whereas," he says, "the employees have submitted to the restrictions placed upon them by the national authority, many sections of Labour have successfully rebelled against it." The picture is of a patriotic and law-abiding capitalist class cheerfully acquiescing in national legislation to their disadvantage in contrast with the companies picture of an unpatriciate proletariate rejecting forcibly its share of the national burden. Such a pair of pictures, it is scarcely necessary to say, is as purely imaginative as the pair of nations which the same artist has already drawn for us. Cubism is photography by the side of them. The facts are very well known. The case that will have to be referred to is men (including, by the way, in a constitutional form, the protests of sailors and soldiers, whose pay has "bad" to be raised by 50 millions a year and is still below their just demands) if it he true, we say, that workman's protests against the acts of the national authority have been made after these acts have become Acts, it is only because the protests of the capitalist class have been made before they were Acts. Only such acts, in short, as have passed the preliminary tests of Capital have ever been all; and it is thus the Capitalist class has been spared the appearance, though it has not spared the nation the reality, of opposing the national authority. The evidence of this is too abundant to be missed by anybody not incorrigibly prejudiced. The "Times," itself has borne witness to the frequency with which proposals for national legislation have been frustrated and defeated by "powerful interests" before even they had made their appearance in public. 

Mr. Christopher Turnor, the well-known agricultural writer, is also, it appears, a man of some independence of judgment. Writing in correction of the revolutionary surmises of the "Times," he says that "industry is still feudal," and that we must bring its organisation up to democratic date. In the first place, he says, Labour must have a greater share in the profits of industry; and, in the second place, Labour must have a stronger voice in the control of industry. We wonder to what extent Mr. Turnor and others of the same sympathy realise what we (and now they themselves) mean by the control of industry. Mr. Turnor goes on to say that this must be "not a make-believe control, but a real and actual participation in the control of everything that affects the conditions and well-being of the worker." Very well, let us take him at his brave words. The governing factor of industry is Capital, for industry is only Capital energised by Labour. The control of everything that affects the conditions and well-being of the worker is, therefore, dependent upon the control exercised by Labour over Capital. Are Mr. Turnor and his friends prepared to demand for Labour participation in the control of Capital? To put it more explicitly, are they prepared to demand for Trade Union participation in the functions of owning industrial capital? Short of this, control is a mere phrase signifying nothing.
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Foreign Affairs.
By S. Verdad.

So these neutral countries have their uses. Just a short visit, I suppose—it is a mere barbaric Hun may speak to our idea of the enlightened.

By all means, my dear Otto. But I notice that some, at least, of your people have tried to do something towards removing the stigma. If only the attempt had been a little more successful our respective fellow-countrymen might have been on visiting terms again by Christmas.

If you mean that a few of our sailors have had their heads turned by the Russian revolution, as our Naval Minister frankly admitted, I can understand you without sympathising with your point of view. Even if I suggest that the circumstance was exaggerated for the sake of political table-turning in the Reichstag, I cannot but think that the mere attempt at a rising is enough to bring sorrow to the soul of a true German.

Surely you are looking at it from the wrong point of view. I don't ask you to become international all of a sudden; but can you really believe that is one of the favourite words of your leader-writers—from a congeries of small States into fellow-countrymen might have been on visiting terms again by Christmas.

Sudden; but can you really believe that the miniature menace Prussian "system" must be destroyed. Well, that system has turned Germany from a congeries—I believe that is one of the favourite words of your leader-writers—from a congeries of small States into a united Empire; an Empire which is strong enough to withstand three-fourths of the world in arms. We will never give up our Hohenzollerns; and when you go back to London you can say so.

Have you ever reminded yourself why precisely it was that Bismarck wanted to turn your States into a united Empire? And not only Bismarck, but Moltke and the old Kaiser, and everybody else at that time. By two wars, you Germans had vanquished Austria, and made her a more or less obedient satellite of Prussia. You were still faced with the Imperialistic aims of Napoleon III; for the man undoubtedly was a menace to European peace. There was also the Russian danger, or, at any rate, its potentiality. Both these dangers, if you had anything really to fear from them, have disappeared now, and they had vanished even before the war, when Russia was all but a military clique—

Why, what do you call it? That, S. V., is just the whole point. Believe me when I say that even now, even now when I realise how we were deceived by our rulers, and how much unspeakable misery was brought about again by Christmas.

In that they are only taking up their stand in the front line and killed (was that a Government precaution, I wonder?) we need hardly talk about the rest of the world. As it was, you had a very fair part of the world ranged against you within the first twelve months of war. And when I look at your allies now I can only say that you have friends but no friend.

I fail to see what that has to do with it. Germany is an independent nation; she has brought more than her proportion of enlightenment to the world; her imperial system of administration, which makes so many of you see red, has not prevented her people from developing their inventiveness, learning, and scholarship in all branches of the arts and sciences. What then is the objection to this system of ours; why can it be called in question. Let me ask you in the first place: Do you admit that the main distinction between the German form of government and government by the rest of the world is that in Germany the Kaiser is still autocratic—his Ministers are responsible to him alone, and he and his caste of political popes can do practically what they like? That, in other words, the Imperial Parliament is still powerless; that its votes do not matter, and that its opinions may be neglected?

Certainly; that is the essence of the Constitution. The people are not troubled with responsibility, because they do not want it.

Well, that is precisely why the rest of the world cannot stand your constitution. The human race must move in such a way that its leading races cannot be too far separated from one another in matters of
I am inclined to sympathise with your arguments, in view of what I have heard since I crossed the frontier; but the people are still devoted to their military leaders.

They will not be so greatly devoted to them by and by. Just look at the Independent Socialists, and wait till Liebknecht is free again! And remember that in any case the world is determined to extract this Prussian thorn from its political flesh, so the sooner you can induce your countrymen to follow the Independent Socialists' lead the better.

Well, I shall try some electioneering on my own when I go back to Berlin. All right; good-bye and good luck, and bear in mind that the Junker's bark is worse than his bite.

Guilds and their Critics.

I.—GUILD PROFITERTING.

A reader, Mr. A. K. Bulley, writes this letter to the Editor:

"I have been a subscriber to The New Age from the first; but I cannot recollect seeing any examination of what appears to me the two main objections to the Guild theory. These are: (1) That the Guilds will be profittering societies, armed with economic power, and having interests opposed both to the interests of the labouring classes and to those of the governing members of the community—the old, the young and the house-keeping women; (2) that the theory is based on the control of industry by the producers. That this principle has been widely ridiculed (see Fabian Research Committee's publication on the matter), and for two main causes has regularly failed. These two causes are (a) that the workers develop a vested interest in the tools and processes to which they are accustomed and are unwilling to change; and (b) that when the manager is appointed by the worker he gets more interference than is compatible with management. The upshot of these two forces is relative inefficiency, which in due course has led to failure. I have heard the Secretary of the National Guilds League sing a paean in praise of inefficiency. But in practice it must certainly mean longer hours or shorter holidays or a lower standard of comfort. Faced with this issue, it therefore seems to me that providing—an all-important consideration—the well-being of the producers can be otherwise secured, the community is likely to select the rival principle, the control of industry by the consumers, in the shape of the State, the municipality, or the co-op. Very likely, however, there is some reply on this matter of which I am ignorant, and which other readers besides myself would be glad to hear."

Mr. Bulley assumes that the fundamental Guild theory is the control of industry by the producers, and upon that assumption he bases his argument. The underlying theory of Guild doctrine is the rejection of the commodity theory of labour. Mr. Bulley may reply that, even so, he is substantially right, because the refusal to treat labour as a commodity involves the control of industry by the producer. Before we can discuss that point it is imperative that we should reach an agreed definition of "producer." We are all of us apt to use the word loosely. We think of the producer as one who is exclusively engaged upon a productive process—coal-mining, iron and steel work from the ore to the finished article, textiles, and so on. I have never heard of a railwayman, or a sartan, or a clerk, or a trust journalist described as a "producer." If Mr. Bulley has in mind the narrow meaning here indicated—producer as distinct from worker—then I can only reply that there is nothing in Guild theory to warrant the assumption that industry should be controlled by the "producer." If, however, he gives the
word a wider connotation, meaning a man or woman for whose work there is a social demand, then it is difficult to follow his argument, for we are faced with a community of workers, including "house-keeping women," and the distinction between producers and consumers loses its significance. I am not certain if Mr. Bulley does not accept the broad interpretation, for he seems to limit the non-producers to the old and young and the house-wives. I cannot believe that any body of economically emancipated workers, constituting the whole nation, would for a single day contemplate the social abstraction (of such as these). If it were so, no economic rearrangement would mend matters, for their political power would malignly assert itself in correlation with their economic power. Our attitude towards our families (for that is what it comes to) is fundamentally ethical and social, and not economic. Who, then, are the other non-producers? If there is none, then our problem must ultimately be confined to a possible corporate struggle between the Guilds. If, however, Mr. Bulley postulates a body of workers who are nevertheless non-producers, and in consequence economic victims of the Guilds, then he has misconceived the economic effect of the rejection of the commodity theory.

As we are not now concerned with non-workers, whatever investigators may traverse, we may perhaps arrive at the distinction between producers and non-producers by defining the former as those for whose products there is an effective economic demand, and the latter for whose services there is a social demand. (Incidentally we may remark that if labour be really a commodity, the economic demand is primarily for the labour and not its product, whereas if it be essentially a living and human thing, the demand for it ceases to be economic and becomes social. Nor must we confound commercial with economic demand. To admit commercial demand into our argument is fatal to the theory of qualitative production, which must ultimately be a vital issue in Guild policy.) I am not prepared to define here economic and social demand—that in its turn depends upon our future appreciation of function—but broadly stated, economic demand may be restricted to wealth production and social demand to wealth distribution. Thus, all those who are engaged on the production of commodities (properly so-called), in every stage, from the raw material to the finished and delivered, may be said to be producers. But there is a large army of workers whose services are demanded in social life—writers, artists, preachers, actors, professional footballers, dog-fanciers, billiard-markers. There is a social demand for all these, not strictly economic, yet having an economic bearing. They may be all defined as "non-producers." I apprehend that Mr. Bulley fears that these non-producers' interests are "opposed" to the producers'; that whereas the former are not susceptible to Guild organisation, the latter are, and, in consequence, would have the non-producers at their mercy.

Even if they were so, the non-producers would be no worse off than they are to-day. One and all, their occupations may be described as appetitive; in their several ways and varying degrees they minister to the spiritual, intellectual, and carnal appetites. That is to say, they are primarily concerned with the expenditure of life-energy. As under the wage-system the proletariat has little, if any, surplus energy after the purchase of his labour commodity, the appetitive occupations are necessarily restricted in their development by their subservience to the present possessing classes. But the object of economic emancipation being to release life-energy that we may live on a higher spiritual and intellectual plane, it follows that the demand for appetitive provision increases to a degree not now realisable. The problem would then revolve round the several functional values of these appetitive occupations and not their remuneration.

A concrete case may help us. Let us assume a church whose congregation is almost entirely proletarian. The priest or pastor does not depend upon such a church for his livelihood, but upon the rich men in his congregation or from the church organisation, which finally depends upon the rich members of that particular religious connection. If, however, this proletarian congregation should increase its economic power (secured by the labour monopoly) it no longer lives or thinks on the subsistence level, becomes master in its own spiritual house, releases its priest or preacher from dependence upon rich men, and so unbinds the religious spirit now admitted in bondage. The same liberating spirit would operate amongst authors, journalists, artists, and others. Not to idealise the picture, we may agree that the more carnal appetites would equally seek satisfaction. But we are not concerned with the ethical aspect; the point now to be noticed is that the non-producers, as defined here, would be of greater social consideration than is their case to-day.

It is inconceivable to me that increased social consideration should result in less remuneration or in greater reliance on economic considerations. If the wages of the workers would indeed be a delusion if it did not result in an intensification of life-energy, with a corresponding improvement in the status of all who minister to it. But these appetitive occupations hardly come into contact with the Guilds as such. They meet the demands of the Guildsmen purely in their personal and social relations. There is, however, yet another category of non-producers, namely, all those whose activities are covered by what will probably be known as the Civil Guilds—teachers, doctors, administrators, and the like. One problem would no longer exist if we could deal with these when we consider that part of Mr. Bulley's letter which refers to the State and the municipality.

II.

If, as I hope, we have now got the non-producer into focus, the way is clear to explore the possibility of the Guilds degenerating into "profiteering societies." And, if the foregoing analysis be approximately correct, it follows that the profiteering must be by Guilds at the expense of Guilds. Mr. Bulley further assumes that the several Guilds will have "interests opposed to the other Guilds." If this be so, then our search for economic harmony is a failure; the Guild snark remains a boojum.

I am anxious to set at the substance of Mr. Bulley's letter, and that leads me to think twice what he really means by "profiteering." He doubtless knows that the word springs from Guild sources—the Editor of The New Age, in fact—and was meant to differentiate Guild from capitalist practice. We know that the capitalists (who grab a good thing when they see it) captured the word, and tortured it to their own purposes. Its original meaning was that in Guild philosophy production for profit is anti-social. I think it probable that Mr. Bulley has unthinkingly applied the word in its vulgar meaning, and that what he means is that Guilds having opposed interests, will apply their economic power to forward their own particular corporate interests. If I am right, then the inference is that Mr. Bulley visualises the Guilds as soulless industrial bodies, and reads into their methods the industrial bodies, and reads into their methods the...
ganisation of the Guilds. But profit is only possible by the power to buy labour as a commodity, and to sell the product at a surplus value. If, however, labour has only absorbed that surplus value, there remains no possible margin for profit. And this applies as much to the Guilds as to the capitalists—you cannot absorb your profits and still retain them. It therefore follows that when Mr. Bulley writes of "profiteering societies" (and assuming that he understands the fundamental argument), he really means the exaction by Guild economic power of higher pay relative to the weaker Guilds. If this be all he means, he is forcing an open door. I do not doubt that, in the first instance, those Guilds dominated by the old craft unionists will secure advantages in pay—pay, not wages, please observe. But neither do I doubt that the tendency, observable even under wagery, of all pay to approximate will be irresistible. In this connection two comments may be made. "Skilled" wages to-day are not reached by purely economic valuation, but rather by their approach to labour monopoly through the unions. Secondly, we have as yet no criterion to indicate how a general labour monopoly will operate. But the essential necessities of the war are such factors as the economic value, notably, the economic value of the labour of agriculturalists, seamen, and transport workers. A new tradition in regard to pay is rapidly being created; its influence will be felt long after the war has ended. Unless I am mistaken it will expedite the movement towards a common standard of pay.

It is possible that Mr. Bulley has it in mind that the Guilds will only exchange their products after receiving a surplus value. To what end? Provision would properly be made for the next year's requirements in machinery, building, or what not, but this would be done, not by reserve funds, but by agreements and contracts with the producing Guilds concerned. To what end then? Since the Guilds are not only the owners of their labour monopoly, their assets being vested in the State (or in the Guild Congress, if a certain school prevail), no motive is disclosed for exacting any surplus beyond a cost price agreed upon by the Guilds, and, if necessary, arbitrated by the Guild Congress. We must remember that these Guilds are public bodies, and not close corporations; that upon which the public bodies would represent the other Guilds, just as to-day interlocked public companies exchange directors.

Even if any Guild were so stupid as to play dog in the manger there would remain some tolerably strong deterrents. First, we have the Guild Congress, whose authority on many directions may be absolute. It could, if necessary, order a boycott of the offending Guild; it could make representations to the State as trustee, and in which is vested the charter. But we must predicate some common sense and some statesmanship. Men would not become the leaders of such gigantic organisations unless they possessed, if not statesmanship, at least tact, discretion, and knowledge.

Nor can I perceive any divergence of purpose, any "opposed" interests, between the Guilds. If I make cotton goods I want machinery, coal, buildings, labour. The existing "opposition" between me and the producers of these commodities (including labour) is that they want as much out of me as they can exact, whilst I want their commodities at bottom prices. But government of giants may be accomplished, and I know that these commodities are at my disposal at cost price, in what other way are our interests opposed? The fundamental change envisaged in the Guilds is the withdrawal of labour as a commodity, its recognition as a function, and its consequent economic power.

It would seem then that Mr. Bulley's objections to Guild theory melt away under examination. We find that the non-producers, far from being prejudiced by Guild organisation, benefit by it both socially and materially. We find that, even if the non-producers did suffer, it would not be due to the Guilds as such, but to purely social causes. We fail to discover any economic discord between the Guilds and, in consequence, any sufficient motive for "profiteering," whether we interpret the word as profit-mongering or more generally as the selfish corporate exercise of economic power.

We have yet to consider the alleged inefficiency of producers, the "rival principle" of Collectivism, the function of the State generally and particularly whether it can claim in any pertinent sense to represent the consumer.

S. G. H.

"Go to the Orient, thou Statesman."

From time to time there has appeared in the home papers, and even in the Indian papers edited and written by Englishmen, a spirit of complaint about India and the War. It has been said that India is not taking her proper share of the responsibilities of the War. The Government of India, as representative of or responsible for India, has been sharply sentenced out for blame, not only for defective practice, but for a defective appreciation of patriotic necessities. Of course, much has been said in the opposite sense. The loyalty and sacrifice of India have been heartily recognised, and the peculiar difficulties of the Government of India, little known to the British or even Anglo-Indian public, have been suggested as evidence of the Government's ability to overcome obstacles, to affect positive achievement, or at least to maintain equilibrium amidst many cross-currents.

Nevertheless, little or nothing has been said that indicates what is the true relation of the great body of the inhabitants of India, not only to the present war, but to war in general. For the real India as such is something very different from the Government of India, and is something, moreover, quite different from the Indians of the so-called Nationalist leaders and educated spokesmen of the people. Whatever the future may hold in store, it may be stated at present that the Government of India in no way represents India as the British Government represents Britain, that the Government of India in no way represents India as the nationalistic leaders of Ireland represent Ireland, that the educated spokesmen of India in no way represent India as the journalists and university professors of England represent England. India, however, is influenced by the English still stands for a peculiar attitude to war and government, an attitude so different from that of the European that it scarcely enters into his mind as a possible conception. India is not yet Europeanised. She is still essentially Oriental. She adopts to this war and war in general the attitude of what, in spite of Japan, may be called Oriental civilisation. It is at least the attitude of the two great civilisations of the East, that of India and that of China. The attitude of these two civilisations has been in the past, nor is at the present, precisely the same, but the resemblances are great, and differentiate it definitely from the Western attitude as now seen, though something of the Oriental attitude was witnessed in mediaeval Europe, when the concept of a united Christian Europe ruled the thoughts and governed the actions of the majority of the inhabitants.

Here it may be said, for fear of misconception, that the modern conscientious objector and pacifist of the West are not related to the Oriental attitude. Their counterpart is not to be found in the East. Nowhere in the Orient or Oriental literature, as far as the writer is aware, can any idea be found that the attitude is necessarily wrong. The attitude of the Orient is not idealistic and romantic, nor is it moral or political.
a single word of description has to be chosen, the word 
social would be the most applicable of Occidental 
words, which at their best are ill-suited for classifying 
Oriental matters.

A story will serve to illustrate this attitude. Shortly 
after the Chino-Japanese War of 1894-5, the writer 
was in conversation with a leading Chinese merchant 
on the Shameleon, the island of the European colony, 
adjacent to the great town of Canton. In the course 
of the conversation the writer mentioned the recent 
contest, and referred to it as the war of China against 
Japan. " I would suggest that the war is not well 
named," the Chinaman replied. " It would be better 
to say the war between the Government of Pekin and 
the Japanese. China does not fight wars. She did 
not fight this war. Indeed, most of China heard and 
thought little about it. " War, it seemed, the Chinese 
held to be a matter for the Government, and not an 
affair of the nation. The statement was made to the 
writer during his early acquaintance with the East, and 
his attitude, at the time, was only a part of the essentially 
courteous, but nevertheless nebulous, answers at 
which the Chinaman is an adept. The apparent ab-
sense of patriotism was stated as a natural doctrine, 
but how the doctrine arose and its consequences were 
not made clear.

In Professor Douglas's " China " the same trait 
of the Chinese is noted in the preface. The author 
is speaking of the accuracy of the Chinese historians, 
who composed the chronicles of the times, not long 
after the events had happened, with an entire absence of 
ex parte bias. " Happily, Chinese historians, like the 
rest of their countrymen, are so entirely devoid of 
patriotism that they have no inducement to pervert 
peaceable facts, or to trim their sails to the necessities of party 
feeling." So absence of patriotism is the explain-
ation of the conviction of the Chinese that war is a 
business of government and not an affair of the nation. 
Such would be the induction, if one were misled by 
that abundant cause of misconception, the use of an 
Occidental word to describe an Oriental mood. The 
Chinese, says Professor Douglas, are entirely devoid 
of patriotism, and patriotism is defined in the dictio-
ary as love of one's country; therefore the Chinese 
are entirely devoid of the love of their country. But 
this is not the case; it is quite untrue. The Chinaman 
is passionately attached to his country, so that he 
hates to leave it, and, if he dies abroad, his corpse 
were shipped back to be buried in the blessed soil of 
his native land. Professor Douglas himself declares that 
no one is more tenacious than he in preserving the 
customs, ceremonies, etiquette, and moral conduct of the Orientals. 

The indifference to war of the Chinese people is 
therefore not a question of absence of patriotism, of 

passive resistance, of the obsession of the mind by 
an idea of the wrongness of war, against which the 
ininst of patriotism cannot prevail. Indeed, active 
resistance to gross interference and war upon their 
own ground would be, is part and parcel of the 
Chinese faith, which have been taught by their Confu-
cian philosophers that it is their duty to rebel against 
and destroy rulers, who persistently act in an evil way 
towards their subjects. How much more, therefore, 
would the Chinese, it is said, consider their 
resistance to foreign Power which strove to upset or alter in any 
way their social structure, their village communities, 
the etiquette which guides with greatminuteness their 
conduct to one another, the methods of their agriculture, 
culture and great silk industry, the working of their 
guilds, their methods of choosing the literati who rule 
over them, or any of the fabric of their lives, which has 
been that of their fathers' and their ancestors' 
lives back to a period before Christ longer than that 
which has followed after.

Indeed, so far from not being patriotic, in love of 
hearth and home, in love of everything peculiarly 
Chinese, the Chinese people have been and are intense 
patriots, so intense that no government, whether 
native or that of foreign conqueror, has ever dared to 
exploit them and reduce them to the 
advantage of one class, the ruling class. 
The conception of a Government representing 
the interests is wholly foreign to the Chinese. No 
interest has ever yet held a tittle of the power 
which the Chinese people themselves, as a great guild 
to protect their customs, hold. No mandarin, how-
ever powerful, can insult or ignore their customs and 
ceremonies without the inevitable retribution of the 
execution. Not even the Emperor is exempt from 
their judgment. Not only have they the right 
to expel him for grave offences, but all his de-
linquencies are reported in the ' Peking Gazettes ' for 
the people throughout the empire to read. He lives, 
it has been phrased, in a perpetual day of judgment. 
If disasters happen, if disorders arise, if famine, pesti-
ence, or flood affect the people, it is the Emperor, 
the head of the Government and his Ministers who 
are to blame, and who receive punishment and have 
to do penance, accounts of which only appear in the 
"Peking Gazette." In no country, indeed, is the 
Government so completely for the people, a Govern-
ment, with the exception of the Royal House, of men 
chosen from the people of all ranks and grades, and 
chosen for the people, as a necessity of the nation and 
and a possession of the people. However corrupt the 
literati or mandarins may be, though bribery be rife, 
yet the fundamental fact remains that they have to 
preserve that which the people revere and value, 
and none of them, however corrupt, slothful, or powerful, 
can permit the disturbance of some time-honoured 
custom without the inevitable retribution.

The result of this social strength of the people is 
that the Government as such is, when compared to the 
Governments of the Western World, not only 
without the power, but also to be constantly reshaping and reforming, in 
the hope of establishing for the time being such 
compromises in the relations of man to man, workmen to employers, 
people to priests, priests to rulers, external 
and internal trade, in order to make some sort of smooth 
working possible. Not so the East. The 
Chinese Government has no such duties. Its 
duty is to protect something very definite, with 
the shape and stability of centuries, and, so 
long as it is able to do this, it is of no great moment 
to the Chinese whether the Government be nominally 
Manchu, Imperial, or Republican. In substance, in 
the literati, it remains Chinese. It is the duty of a 
Western Government to be constant, 
and destroy rulers, who persistently act in an evil way 
towards their subjects. How much more, therefore, 
would the Chinese, it is said, consider their 
resistance to foreign Power which strove to upset or alter in any
Whatever it does, whenever it acts, the whole nation Western Government is constantly doing, indeed, that turned upon it; all men are ever ready to petition it as it decrees, so is the national life shaped and altered. changing it in the interest of one or other section of or to influence it by more occult or violent means for which the government of China dare not do—namely, affect him. All are worked into moods of enthusiasm or to achieve the general adjustment, which results in a state of equilibrium.

A quarrel, therefore, of the Chinese Government with any other Government or with any pretentious rebel, such as Tienwang, the leader of the Taiping rebellion, does not radically affect the Chinese people. It is but a struggle between those who desire the privileges of power, but who, having gained the mastery, will nevertheless not dare to tamper with the customs of the people. It is possible, for instance, that, had there been no interested European Powers, the result of the war of 1894-5 would have led to a Manchu change for a Japanese dynasty. It is doubtful whether such a change would have led to any disturbance on the part of the people if the Japanese dynasty had realised the temper of the people. The Government of China is, in short, somewhat in the position of the British police. The police have no power to alter things. It is their duty to preserve things as decreed by a higher power. And in China that higher power is constituted by the mass of the people. The system is, in fact, democratic in a sense in which it is difficult for a European to appreciate. It was knowledge of this that led the Chinese merchant on the Shameen to speak of the war of 1894-5 as one between the Peking Government and the Japanese.

China has been chosen as the chief example of the attitude of Oriental civilisation to war, for of this it offers the most specific instance. But India, though ruled by the British, and now producing a number of people educated in European knowledge and adopting European habits, is still fundamentally Oriental. In an interesting book entitled "Ancient and Medieval Architecture of India" Mr. Hevell has shown how the village community, always the foundation of Indo-Aryan civilisation, has in actual fact been reproduced in the Indian temples and their gardens. The building and arrangement of an Indian village, its principle streets, its bull, gate, meeting-place and shrine are essentially the same as the architecture and setting of Indian temples. The Indian village was agricultural, communist, patriarchal, self-governing. As such the Indian village community not only still exists in the stone and gardens of Indian temples, but still lives as the vital and unchanged reality of India. Agricultural village-communism is the true India. It has exhibited through the centuries a stability comparable to that of the Chinese system. It also has not been untouched by the rulers of India, its stability has been too firmly established for them to tamper seriously with it, and the effort to do so of that conglomerate zealot Aurungzib, brought about the disruption of the Moghal Empire. "It is interesting in reviewing the past history of India," writes Professor Rapson in his valuable book entitled "Ancient India," "to trace a remarkable continuity of policy on the part of the rulers of whatever nationality who have succeeded in welding together this great congeries of widely differing races and tongues. The main principles of government have remained unaltered throughout the ages. Such as they were under the Maurya Empire, they were inherited by the Muhammadan rulers and by their successors the British. These principles are based on the recognition of a social system which depends ultimately on a self-organised village community." With this rigid conservatism, the Indian people have been almost as little subject to their rulers as have the Chinese. When the government is a thing apart, and the power that appertains to government something which does not concern them, though an aim and object for the ambitious. Struggles for the possession of this power were natural amongst Kshatriyas or men of the warrior and royal caste, but the people themselves were not to be disturbed, or ever called upon to fight. Indeed, the contrast might have been realised visibly when, while a battle was raging between rival Kshatriyas, the peasants near by could have been seen pursuing their agricultural labours, little concerned as to which of the two parties, as victors would be their superior lords. "'In all periods of history,' wrote Professor Rapson, "local governments in India have gone on almost unchanged in spite of conquest after conquest. It was always regarded as a legitimate part of the ambition of every king to aim at the position of a chakravartin or supreme monarch.' If his neighbours agreed, so much the better; but, if they resisted his pretensions, the question was decided by a pitched battle. In either case, the government was usually not affected. The same prince continued to rule, and the nature of his rule did not depend on his position as szezaran or vassal king.' War, in fact, scarcely changed the form of the government of the Indians any more than was the government of the Chinese by the literati changed by a new dynasty or the assumption of power by a foreign dynasty such as that of the Manchus.

In these circumstances, it would not be surprising to hear an Indian making a parallel remark to that of the Cantonese merchant, who spoke of the war of 1894-5 as that between the Peking Government and the Japanese. By chance, but a few days ago, the following story was published from the diary of the Bishop of Madras, in the C.M.S. Gazette. "A few months ago," the Bishop wrote, "a villager in a Tamil village about fifty miles south of Madras remarked to the deputy-magistrate, who is an Indian, 'What sort of people are these new rulers? Are they better or worse than the old ones?' How do you like them?' On enquiry it transpired that the Germans had taken possession of India during the raid of the "Emden," and were now governing the country. This was a matter of almost complete indifference to the villagers. They only felt a sort of mild curiosity to know what kind of people these new German rulers were.'

Such then is the relation of India to the war, India as embodied in her teeming peasantry. Without due consideration of this attitude, it is not just to say that India is not taking her fair share of the war's burdens. The India, which is interested in the war, is a very small section of the community, consisting of Indian princes, always concerned with a question of supreme rule, the Indian army, the Anglo-Indians, and those who have adopted European ways that afford the link between India and Europe. Considering their limited numbers, and the fact that, with the exception of the case of the Anglo-Indians, the war is one fought for the aims of a people of alien blood, the loyalty and zeal that has been displayed by India has been a matter of gratification and profound admiration. How far and how well India has been aided by the Government of India, no one has yet had the proper means to judge. But as regards the bulk of the people of India, it is not within the power of the Government to alter the custom and thought rooted in the centuries and to make them patriotic in the sense in which the word is used in Western lands.
The Functional Principle.

By Ramin de Magra.

I OWE to M. Duguit the notion of objective rights, or the functional principle, which implies for every man and for every obligation of fulfilling a certain mission and the power of realising the acts required in the fulfilment of it. I have tried to popularise this theory of rights, the only acceptable one to me, in the formula: No function, no rights. I shall enumerate later some of the important consequences derivable from this formula, if it were accepted as the basis of rights. But before coming to that, I must deal with a doubt that must have arisen in the minds of readers who are familiar with the question. Of what rights is M. Duguit speaking? Of actual rights, such as the positive laws guarantee—or of the laws that ought to exist? In other words, is M. Duguit's theory an explanation of positive law, or an essay on "natural" or normative law?

This is the problem of method, the essential problem in all moral and political science. We may safely say that when the war began this problem had been solved in neither economics nor politics. And M. Duguit has not attempted to solve it. The essential "moments" of his doctrine, which can be formulated as the rule of objective rights born of social solidarity, are the following: All individuals are obliged, because they are social beings obeying the social rule. The social rule is founded in the fact of social solidarity. Solidarity is only the interdependence which unites, by the community of necessity and the division of labour, the members of humanity, and especially those of the same social group. This rule of interdependence is a fact, and if it did not need to be formulated. It is a rule of law and not of morals, because it only refers to those external acts that have a social value. "This law is not natural law—absolute, true, of a geometrical truth—it is not an ideal, but a fact."

The objective rule of M. Duguit is not an ideal, but a fact. This objective rule must not be confused with the positive actual laws, which in M. Duguit's theory are only the expression, the formulation, or the truth—it is not an ideal, but a fact. Let us give another example. M. Duguit says rightly that the social rule does not imply the subjective right of the rulers to impose their will upon the ruled, but "it only implies that those individuals who hold the power may organise a social reaction against those individuals who break the rule." Very well, but what if the individuals who hold the power are also those who break the rule? M. Duguit may say that in this event right has been violated. Ah, but it ought not to be violated. The objective rule ought not to be violated, but it sometimes is. Therefore it is a normative and not a positive rule.

M. Duguit says in another place: "Nobody has in the social world any other power but that of realising the task the social rule imposes upon him." The assertion would be true if M. Duguit had said, "Nobody ought to have, etc," for the man who owns £100,000 may spend them in vices that are not imposed on him by the social rule. M. Duguit owes this error to his positivist philosophy. When Auguste Comte said: "Nobody possesses any other right than that of always fulfilling his duty," he fell into the same mistake. The assertion would have been true, as a norm, had it been formulated in these other words: "Nobody ought to have any other right than that of always fulfilling his duty."
To begin with, we must strictly separate the theoretical consideration of moral and political facts from their normative or ideal contemplation; and realise also that this strict separation does not lie in the thing, but only in our method of dealing with it. The purely theoretical method takes a fact, for instance, the State, and asks what is the State, in what is the State identical with other social institutions and in what is it different? The normative method must base itself on a theoretical, because we shall not be able to sketch an ideal State if we know beforehand what the State is. But as soon as we begin to consider the being of the actual State, we find that it is at one and the same time a regulative institution of social life, a duality of rulers and ruled, and a more or less absolute sovereignty. That is to say, in considering the essence of the fact of the State, we find in it at one and the same time something that is and something that ought to be, in so far as it is merely a programme of life; a being as a unity of power, and an ought-to-be as an institution of social future life. All moral and political objects are mixed facts, the actuality of which is due precisely to a conjunction of the realities that ought to be with the realities that are.

For instance, no law is so bad that it can be defined merely as a command, for all laws are preconceptions of a universal character, which compel those who promulgate them; this would not happen if laws were merely commands. But neither are there any laws in existence which are pure regulations of social solidarity, for in all the facts of social life is no more symptomatic. We know that the family

Studies in Contemporary Mentality.

By Ezra Pound.

IX—FURTHER HEART THROBS.

Intimate and touching as "mother's" talk may have seemed, we have not yet exhausted the possibilities of the magazine. "Hitch your waggon to a star" is enjoined only by one advertisement; other objects please hitch to the competitions. "Daphne" is pleased, "very pleased with the result of the 'Heading Competition.'" "Cherrie Potts very much wants to find a girl about her own age to correspond with. She is 15, fond of painting, photography, and reading." Various correspondents recommend books by Gene Stratton Porter, William J. Locke, and other authors. All this under the agit of "Daphne." "The League of Young British Citizens" (Patron-in-Chief, Princess Patricia of Connaught) draws the pageant to its close. The editor takes this in hand as "Alison" has departed. "Daphne" ends by assuring her readers that she will always be pleased to hear from them, and then the editor turns to the tale: "My Dear Daphne,—I have a surprise for you, and an unpleasant one! Our good friend 'Alison,' etc., is torn from them. She shrinks from farewells; the companions should fed and say "a great big thank you to Alison for all she has done for us." The editor, now that Alison has gone, has been "pondering deeply over the future of the League." "Years ago, in times of national crisis, 'The Quiver,' was ever at the front with good works." Miss Woolf rendered invaluable service about the Deep Sea Fisherman, married, and went to Ceylon. She is now stepping into the breach left by Alison, but competitions will be left entirely to Daphne. The companions are, however, to write to Mrs. L., née Woolf, and wish her well. Then follow letters from an implied censor, "a gallant sailor boy," Lieutenant —, and from William —, who is very glad that Lena, Violet, David, and Philip are doing well, living a beautiful life, etc. Another "companion" is congratulated on Higher Grade School examination, and assured of continued successor.

These things appear slight enough, but they must not pass by us unheeded. The well-connected family with the large scrap-book on its drawing-room table is no more symptomatic. We know that the family photograph album bound in red leather (and, a grade higher, in black leather) no longer, at least we presume that it no longer, abounds in Mayfair; but the scrap-book, the scrap-book with illustrations from the "Sketch" and the "Tatler," showing the distinguished family in all its splendours, seats, and positions, is extant, if it have not replaced its precursor.

The year of "mother's" daughters to escape the gapped linotype repeats itself in the year of the suburb for companionship; hence Leagues of Companions: hence almshcresses among church congregations; the difference being that Mayfair is nearer the top, and passably conscious of itself, its possibilities, the number of meetable persons, and the derivative advantage per person.

The theoretic sociologist is prone to pass over these things; the politician, or practising sociologist, is aware of them, perhaps without much formulation; the anthropologist will attempt to envisage them calmly, as he would envisage the customs of exogamy among more primitive tribes; to him it is little matter whether the female young are taken to the centre of Africa, to reserved places where they dance for hours on end until their muscles are abnormally strengthened; whether they patrol the paseo at Arles; whether they be taken to dances indoors, more or less tribally organised; whether they are "waited for" after church; or, whether they are left, where the tribal organisation is deficient, to family or individual efforts, more or less systematic, more or less veiled. It is his business to classify, to make, if he can, "hearts and tail of it." As the anthropologist starts without a sense of "ought" he has one more chance, or several more chances, of making head or "tail of it", than has the theoretist who wants to fit mankind or "future society" to a model.

All we can postulate is that in certain strata the desire for encounter is sufficient to make these numerous correspondence columns, "leagues," etc., lucrative to their managers. I have not sufficient data at hand to determine much else concerning the correspondents. I do not know whether they, as a mass, read, like "mother's" offspring, Shaw and Nietzsche. But I have spent enough time on these suburbs for the present.

In the hope of getting below the Shaw-Nietzsche zone I purchased the "Family Herald." This paper I had often heard mentioned. Whenever a stylist wishes to damn a contemporary, especially a contemporary novelist, he suggests that said novelist is specifically fit to write for the "Family Herald." The phrase is as familiar as are the terms "Strachey," and "Spectator." The "Family Herald," No. 3881, Vol. CXIX, price One Penny, is not at first sight distinct from various other penny weeklies on the bookshelves. Why its name is more familiar, why it is the accepted or disapproved of individual interest. The editor, now that Alison has gone, has been "pondering deeply over the future of the League."
“The Household Magazine of Useful Information and Entertainment.”

First item. Story, 9 cols. Far from the worst I have seen, and mildly suggestive of Longfellow with his fancy lightly turned amorous.

Second item. Story, beginning with statement that “The two roses . . . were having one of their tiffs.” This is a little confusing, but I take it to be a sort of horticultural allegorical prelude to the love-interest and separation.

This is a little confusing, but I take it to be Joan Lady So-and-so, relatives of the late Earl, etc.

Curiosity, into inspecting the nature of its neighbours.

Hypocrisy; it is giving away with an ultimate editorial in any British periodical. There is no remainder of col. Varieties, the lovely day that follows.

The “Household Magazine of Useful Information and Entertainment.” is a letting out the big cat. It is giving away the gigantic or established show, when the show is an element. The “joke,” the “humorous anecdote,” is the kind of popular education that a more sensitive, more intelligent capital would have been disseminating about a foreign country that is good to disseminate. It is giving away with an ultimate more or less fortuitous power to further or hinder good writing, definitely uses that position for the degradation of letters. This insult is deliberate and impersonal. I have never written a novel. I am therefore a fit person to deliver it. “Punch,” originally a broken-nosed, broken-backed cuckold, is strangely overblown; has strangely puffed himself up into a symbol of national magnitude. We see him heraldic in Tabard, leading in a new dynasty upon horseback. I pass over the poor devils who have to be “funny” or “witty.”

Sir Owen Seaman is presumably neither a yahoo nor a mattoid; there is some moral tinge in his status. The law being what it is, perhaps we had better allow the poor Seaman to find and apply to himself the word “clever” for one who having a certain position, carrying with it a more or less fortuitous power to further or hinder good writing, definitely uses that position for the degradation of letters. This insult is deliberate and impersonal. I have never written a novel. I am therefore a fit person to deliver it. “Punch,” originally a broken-nosed, broken-backed cuckold, is strangely overblown; has strangely puffed himself up into a symbol of national magnitude. We see him heraldic in Tabard, leading in a new dynasty upon horseback. I pass over the poor devils who have to be “funny” or “witty.”

Sir Owen Seaman is presumably neither a yahoo nor a mattoid; there is some moral tinge in his status. The law being what it is, perhaps we had better allow the poor Seaman to find and apply to himself the word “clever” for one who having a certain position, carrying with it a more or less fortuitous power to further or hinder good writing, definitely uses that position for the degradation of letters. This insult is deliberate and impersonal. I have never written a novel. I am therefore a fit person to deliver it. “Punch,” originally a broken-nosed, broken-backed cuckold, is strangely overblown; has strangely puffed himself up into a symbol of national magnitude. We see him heraldic in Tabard, leading in a new dynasty upon horseback. I pass over the poor devils who have to be “funny” or “witty.”
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Sir Owen Seaman is presumably neither a yahoo nor a mattoid; there is some moral tinge in his status. The law being what it is, perhaps we had better allow the poor Seaman to find and apply to himself the word “clever” for one who having a certain position, carrying with it a more or less fortuitous power to further or hinder good writing, definitely uses that position for the degradation of letters. This insult is deliberate and impersonal. I have never written a novel. I am therefore a fit person to deliver it. “Punch,” originally a broken-nosed, broken-backed cuckold, is strangely overblown; has strangely puffed himself up into a symbol of national magnitude. We see him heraldic in Tabard, leading in a new dynasty upon horseback. I pass over the poor devils who have to be “funny” or “witty.”
In the official definition as quoted by one of my correspondents, it is implied that Reason, the particular mental faculty, in the first place aims at establishing belief on the basis of veritable evidence, and, in the second place, denies that there can be any other method of arriving at a valid belief. My quarrel with this attitude of mind, you will remember, was upon this ground: that the definition appeared to me to be right in what it affirmed, namely, in declaring that valid beliefs can be arrived at by reason as defined; but wrong in what it denied, namely, in denying that by any other means than reason as thus defined we can arrive at valid beliefs. As I took occasion, by implication or explicitly, to affirm, on the contrary, that several other, and, perhaps, many other, mental faculties and processes than reason as officially defined are quite as competent as reason alone to arrive at valid beliefs, and are, in fact, necessary to the validity of the conclusions of reason itself. Now let me turn to Mr. Robertson. I must admit that Mr. Robertson is very loyal to the definition of reason as promulgated by the Association of which he is the foremost member. Reason, he says, is based (and I presume he means exclusively based) on observation and deduction; and only those beliefs can be regarded as valid and rationally true that can be shown to be the results of this double process. Very good, we must admire the loyalty of Mr. Robertson; but about his consistency there is something more to be said. For having first defined Reason as consisting in the double process of observation and deduction, and in that alone, conformably with the text of the Rationalist Association, he then goes on to throw this definition clear overboard in his contention that reason is not simply this particular mental faculty, but the totality of judgment. "It is," he says, "with the total mind that we arrive at truth." The inconsistency, I think, is clear. If reason as defined is the only means of arriving at valid belief, rationalism is justified of its offspring in the form of the Rationalist formulae. But if, on the other hand, it is not reason as defined alone, but by the totality of the judgment and with the total mind that we must arrive at truth, Rationalism fails to be the last word even of reason. Other faculties than reason are here in question in the phrase "the total mind"; and since, upon Mr. Robertson's admission, they are no less necessary than reason and defined, the claim of reason to supremacy can no longer be upheld.

It is impossible, of course, that so sincere and clear a mind as Mr. Robertson's can have failed to see, even if it have failed to realise, the contradiction into which it has fallen. In a sound mind a contradiction is felt as a pain, more or less acute as the contradiction concerns matters more or less momentous. And, surely enough, elsewhere in his book, Mr. Robertson endeavours, after having all the rest reduced to one among the faculties of the total mind, to set it up again in accordance with the claims of the official definition. If reason, he argues, is not the sole means of arriving at valid belief—the totality of judgment including the totality of the faculties of the mind being necessary to this end—reason is, at any rate, the final criterion of validity; in fact, if not the despot of the mind's faculties, it is their final judge. To this attempt at a counter-revolution, however, we must oppose, in the first place, the fact of the contradiction in the face of Mr. Robertson's admission that to a valid belief a totality of judgment is necessary. Not reason, which is merely one of the mental processes, can be the ultimate authority, but all the processes must combine in a single and final act. And, in the second place, we must dispute the criterion of coherency with which he identifies reason for the purpose of establishing its claim to judicial if no longer to regal supremacy. For what is this coherency of which he writes that it is the criterion of reasoning, if not the coherency of the reports of all the faculties, and not of the report of reason as defined only? No other kind of coherency is, indeed, possible at present, outside mathematics, and even of this coherency there is little, if any, in all our knowledge. Experience, in short, gives us one channel and a reductio ad absurdum after another.

What it all amounts to is, therefore, something like this. Coherency being the state of well-being of the mind, the mind is naturally disposed to try to attain to it. Coherency consists in the harmony of the reports of all the mental faculties, of which reason as defined is one. The effort of the mind is, therefore, quite properly dedicated to harmonising the report of reason with the reports of the rest of the faculties. So far so good. Unfortunately, however, this effort is as painful as it is slow, for as far as reason based on observation and deduction can at present go, its conclusions are irreconcilable with the reports delivered to the mind by the other faculties. What is then to be done? The reasonable thing is to have patience, to deny none of the reports of the other faculties, because, as yet, they do not harmonise with the report of reason as defined, and to suspend final judgment until complete harmony has been established, until, in short, the brain and the heart are of one mind. That I contend, is the reasonable thing to do; and the name of this attitude of mind is in my vocabulary common sense. But the rationalistic thing to do, on the other hand, is something different—hence my quarrel with Rationalism. For Rationalism, demanding like Reasonableness, to have coherency or a harmony of reports in the mind, is not satisfied, like common sense, to wait until it can be brought about, but peremptorily calls upon the rest of the faculties to submit to reason as defined under penalty of being dismissed as false news-bearers. Rationalism thus arises from an impatience with reason, provided by the slowness with which reason arrives at harmony with the perceptions of the other faculties. And its revenge upon itself is to declare that the rest of the faculties are liars or dreamers. This, I think, is evident from the narrow negation upon which Rational-
As You Were.

She wasn't thinking about anything in particular. No sooner had one thought come into her mind that it was chased away by another; and so they kept coming from nowhere and disappearing into nothing, which is usually the fate of thoughts we make no attempt to put into words. Not, however, that Mrs. Raymond wanted to think. To be able not to think is a respectable accomplishment, and at least as useful as a little. Mrs. Raymond was quite content to sit gracefully by the fire with her mind cosily reclining among the pleasant reflections of a comfortably upholstered past. She was gently flicking over the nicely-illustrated pages of her life. They were satisfactory pictures that she saw beautifully coloured or too high a degree of a kind—nothing cubist or the least degree French—just judicious, well-bred scenes, showing tennis parties and dances, and now and again a dinner and a theatre up in town, and at last a wedding in a grand and stately church. It was all to her husband's credit that even after sitting opposite to him at breakfast for four years Mrs. Raymond still thought this the prettiest scene in her life's album. The prettiest, but not quite the happiest, for the happiest hour of her life had a very different setting. She recalled it now, lingering luxuriously over every detail. It had happened in the heyday of their honeymoon. It had begun so. The prettiness of Mrs. Raymond was composed of that which rises like hot air when a dinner they had had. How she had cried over him, and what a delicious feeling of ministration. She longed to forgive him for that moment she knew he would behave now as he had then; but he was naturally undemonstrative as becomes a strong, silent man, and doubtless nothing less than a repetition of the thrills of ministration would knock back that look into his eyes and that tone into his voice.

However, she didn't want to complain. No one could say their marriage had not been a success. Their house was double the size of the one they had first lived in. They had a parlour-maid and a boy in advance of every house in their road. Mrs. Raymond's dinners and frocks never fell below the standard at which a man may safely bring home a fortuitous friend. Of course they had had their quarrels. Jack was a dear, but it took an evening's silence to get that Indian rug for the hall, and her fox furs had meant refusing food for a day. But, of course, no man was perfect, and certainly no angel could have given in so meekly as he did over the matter of their little trip to Algiers. No, she didn't want to grumble. But she could not restrain a sigh for the happiest hour of her life. If only Jack could look like that again. She would give anything to hear that tone in his voice. She wanted to repeat those exquisite little thrills of ministration. She longed to forgive him again. Well, why not?—she asked herself suddenly; and there was a sparkle in her eyes at the plan in her mind. If Jack would not be nice without being frightened, she must frighten him, that was all. And what fun it would be. She would do it at that evening. That very evening she would see that look in his eyes again.

The prettiness of Mrs. Raymond was composed of a complexion which she could always rely upon as it was the best that money could buy. To-night, however, she added the charm of a few extra curls pinned in to fall daintily as hyacinth flowers about the napé of her neck. When her husband came in she was designedly sitting at the piano, singing softly as a summer breeze, and though she had heard him cross the hall and come into the room, she gave a little squeak of alarm when he struck the music-stool. "Oh, Jack," she cried, "how you frightened me! Why didn't you speak or something?" "But wouldn't that have frightened you?" asked her husband. "Besides, I thought you saw me in the glass." "Of course I didn't," she said. "I do think it was horrid of you. And you might at least say you're sorry." "Of course I'm sorry," was the reply. "Well," she said, "you might behave as though you were. You look as if I had annoyed you—when it is I who ought to be cross if anyone." "Well my dear, aren't you?" asked her husband.

Mrs. Raymond tightened the corners of her mouth and outwardly gave every sign of settling down for a wet evening. Inwardly, however, she was still singing. Things could not have gone better. Nothing had really happened, yet suddenly everything was wrong. Yes, she had seen this film before.

R. H. C.
She sat on at the piano searching among the music as though she were looking for the one sheep that was lost, and the longer she kept silent the more restless because her husband as she could hear by his embarrassed looks at the fire. It was exactly as if he had behaved four years ago. He was due to say something almost immediately now; and even as she made the reflection she heard the familiar words: “What is wrong, dear? Surely you’re a little strange this evening, aren’t you?” Mrs. Raymond wanted to laugh aloud. She had felt herself saying “strong” with him. She knew so well he was going to use just that word. But her reply was brief and expressive. It consisted of running a little tick in her breath and letting it out again, as though she never ceased looking through her music for nothing. There was another pause, and now Mrs. Raymond exchanged her music-stool for a chair in which she leaned back with her fingers drumming on the edge of the arms. Then her husband spoke, seriously rather than severely.

“Rut,” she answered, “don’t you speak if there isn’t; but I knew there was something the moment I came into the room. Of course I can’t make you talk, but I do think you should tell me what it is.” “I’m sure I don’t know what you mean,” said Mrs. Raymond, with her eyes somewhere on the skirting-board. “It’s nothing to do with me. It’s not my fault.” “But, my dear, what have I done?” asked her husband. “I told you I was sorry that I frightened you. What more can I say? I’m trying to talk now, but you won’t even look at me. What is it? I haven’t refused you anything, have I? Is it a new frock, or a carpet, or a holiday, or what? ‘Oh, don’t be so silly, Jack.’ ‘Well, for Heaven’s sake out with it, then. I want to get to the bottom of it all. It’s too mysterious for anything. We’ve never had this before.’”

“Oh, haven’t we?” said Mrs. Raymond, as coldly as her joy would allow. The picture was filling in rapidly. Her husband crossed over to the window and stood with his back to her, looking out as intently as though he were expecting a letter. Such had been the scene four years ago. Mrs. Raymond found her heart thudding with excitement that increased with every obstacle left behind. She could scarcely endure the suspense of waiting for the remaining wickets to fall. But she remembered that on the happiest evening of her life there had been a final silence of at least ten minutes before she had taken the first steps to the door, and she was not going to imperil success by any slapdash impetuously. She was so afraid that Jack would spoil everything by speaking prematurely, which would mean beginning the silence all over again, and she couldn’t bear the thought of further delay.

Mrs. Raymond glanced covertly at the watch on her wrist. It was time. She sprang up. She couldn’t stand it any longer, she said. The silence was breaking her heart. What was it all about? Why didn’t he speak? If that was the way he treated her, plainly he no longer loved her. She would go home that moment, she threatened. She wasn’t going to stay with a man who hated her. And she got as far as the door.

What would have happened if her husband hadn’t rushed across the room, calling to her to stop, begging her to forgive him, catching her in his arms, carrying her back towards the fire? If she had happened if these things had not been. Mrs. Raymond had never stopped to think. Certainly it would have been too humiliating if she had had to wait at the door for him. And yet what else could she have done? But thank goodness he had not kept her a second. Ah, she knew Jack: she knew he wasn’t taking any risks. He knew when he was well-off. He knew he couldn’t do without her. But it was dear of him all the same; and everything was going without a hitch. Again she heard his voice, the pleading, broken note in it. Again she felt the weight of his head on her shapely shoulder. Again she felt the little thrust of patronage. The picture was nearly complete. But she must see his face. She must see the pleading, broken look on it. Gently she raised the bowed head.


H. M. T.

**Views and Reviews.**

**ANOTHER PACIFIST PROPOSAL.**

If the advantage of an extreme proposal is that it makes all other proposals seem moderate, Mr. Jacobs certainly enjoys that advantage; for his pamphlet* appears after we have been bombarded with proposals for the federation of Europe, for the construction of a complete legal and judicial system of Europe, for complete disarmament, for the abolition of what is called secret diplomacy, and so on. In such a setting, a proposal that asks us to abolish nothing, that proposes no new organ, that derogates none of the sovereign power of independent States, seems to be a model of sweet reasonableness. States do make treaties with each other, and, among other purposes, for the purpose of defending each other’s territory against invasion. If two or more States can thus guarantee each other against the aggression of the rest, why should not all the States guarantee each other against the aggression of any of them? Would not a simple one-clause treaty, binding all the States to use all their powers against whichever one should invade the territory of another, be easily negotiable, and would it not make war practically impossible? For no one country could calmly contemplate fighting all the rest, and suffering all the disabilities that would arise from the fact that there would be no neutral States. If, therefore, all the States pledge themselves to attack the one which hits first, there will be no first hit; and the dispute will therefore be open to more or less amicable settlement.

If any signatory refused to honour the treaty when the occasion arose, that signatory would not be able to invoke its protection if ever it should be attacked; and if all, or most, of the signatories refused to honour the treaty, they would be in no worse case than they are now. The mere fact that such a treaty were signed, though, would suffice to restrain the aggressive motion of any of the signatories’ forces; and would therefore produce that feeling of confidence in all which is the surest guarantee that peace will be maintained.

The proposal seems simple; all that it asks is for a guarantee that existing territorial boundaries shall be respected, without prejudice to their alteration by any means other than war. The only crime that it creates is invasion, and the punishment for that will be the automatic declaration of war by the rest of the signatories, with its concomitant economic boycott and ostracism of the offending party. Nothing could be simpler. But like most simple proposals, it assumes far too much. It assumes, in the first place, that there is a general agreement among States that war must be prevented, and that they are willing to pledge themselves to use all their resources without regard to the merits of the individual case. The essence would be, in Mr. Jacobs’ words, “the presence of foreign troops within a nation’s frontier is invasion,” and until the invader had been expelled, no inquiry would be made into the merits of the case. But how many troops constitute an “invasion”? We all remember, at the beginning of this war, the allegations made by both France and Germany that the other country had crossed the frontier. Is a vedette an invasion, or a battery, or a battalion; or are we to regard nothing less than the presence of,

* "Neutrality versus Justice." By A. J. Jacobs. (Fisher Unwin. 2s. net.)
say, a division as evidence of invasion? And then, what about aeroplanes? They raise also the question of how far an enemy aeroplane must penetrate before its hostile intent may be assumed. Obviously, these questions must be determined before the other signatories will know against whom to declare war; otherwise, the 1925 Hague Tribunal was a colossal failure. Therefore, the treaty must be a defensive one, not an aggressive one, and all against one be converted into an alliance of half against half. So far as we are concerned, it is not the presence of foreign troops but of foreign aircraft or ships' appearance in our territorial waters that constitutes an invasion. And if all the Allies had marched through Poland, the position of small States in proximity to great ones would be made more pleasant by the presence of their Russian defenders than they were by the invasion of the Germans; and if all the Allied forces had marched towards Poland, the positions of Poland, the Poles would not, I think, have been more than superficially true.

It is easy to perceive, also, some of the practical difficulties. To such a treaty most of the South American States would probably be signatories, as they are parties to the Hague Tribunal. But the position of Europe being called upon to mobilise its resources at the request of a South American State is not an alluring one to us; and it is possible that it might not be acceptable to the South American State. For if the terms of the treaty are that all the signatories shall use all their forces to repel the invader, the invaded State might easily find itself overrun with defenders who would be a greater afflication than the attacker. It is by no means certain, for example, that the Poles were more pleased by the presence of their Russian defenders than they were by the invasion of the Germans.
Second Thoughts. By Miles Malleson. (National
Labour Press.)
Mr. Miles Malleson has written this pamphlet to explain why he will be unable to rejoin the Army. He did join the Army in September, 1914, and after a few months was discharged; but is again liable for service or, at least, re-examination under the Review of Exceptions Act. 'The first thing we must say to Mr. Malleson is that he will be quite able to rejoin under the terms of this Act; the relevant words of the Act are: 'Any man to whom a notice is so sent shall, as from the date of the notice, be deemed to have come within the operation of section one of the Military Service Acts.' His ability to rejoin will therefore be determined by the military authorities, and all that Mr. Malleson can do is to resist the legal action of the military authorities. We do not advise him to do anything of the sort, not because we have any tender regard for Mr. Malleson, but because he has no case. He cannot plead conscientious objection because he has been in the Army of his own free will; and, in fairness to Mr. Malleson, we must say that he declares that he makes his refusal not particularly on moral or social or political or religious grounds, but, as far as we can understand him, on intellectual grounds. He quotes largely from Mr. E. D. Morel's "Truth And The War," a volume which is certainly destructive of the claim to moral superiority made on our behalf. But although it is quite possible that the purposes of the action by the government will not be limited by the purposes that were declared, the fact remains that we are at war and have been for three years, that the country has accepted the Military Service Acts, and that refusal to obey them is a crime. If Mr. Malleson sets himself against the military and legal machinery of the country, he will, we believe, be smashed; if he does so as a result of considering evidence supplied by Mr. Morel, he is going far beyond his moral or social or political or religious grounds.

Physical Education in Relation to School Life.
By Reginald E. Roper, M.A., M.Ed. (Allen and Unwin. 2s. 6d. net.)
While we are all discussing psychological education, and are interested in rehearing the thinker and artist in the child, it is worth while to be reminded that the child has a body as well as an imagination, and that the body suffers as much from our present system of teaching as does the mind. We all know that it is unnatural for children to sit still, but few of us troubled to think out the consequences in terms of anatomy. Mr. Roper devotes his too brief essay to this task, shows us that the sitting position, particularly for writing, is about the worst that could be devised; and supports his physiological argument by some outline photographs. He concludes that physical education is necessary for the formation of a correct muscular memory; and that "the irreducible minimum for gymnastic lessons—apart from games, dancing, boxing, fencing, wrestling, or other forms of physical activity—is three lessons per week of half an hour," not including times for changing clothes. His views on co-education and sex-education derive from his interest in the body as a machine; and have not the authority of his exposition of physical education.

Pastiche.

THE EYE-WITNESS.
As I passed him I thought he was not looking quite himself, and I turned back to make inquiries. It seemed that he was certainly off colour. Business worse than usual... all his best men gone. . . . Wife away. . . . And now his doctor told him hischild was ill. Really these medical men! . . . What the devil was he going to do in the country . . . damned hole. . . . Still, it wouldn't do to break down. . . . Did I know anyone who wanted the most convenient little flat in town? "Oh, till the end of the war, he supposed! Hang these medical fellows! I promised to write to everyone I knew, but people seemed particularly fond of the country this year; and the conversation turned to air raids as naturally as it once did to the weather.

"Awful nuisance they are," I said. "You can't work in the kitchen with your cook simply yearning to have that Kayser just for one minute. It's positively heart-breaking to have to refuse her."

"But, my dear fellow, you don't mean to say you go down into your kitchen?" I felt I had been knocked down with a white feather. The question, in just the tone in which it was put, was a matter of course to me. "If you're going to be hit, you'll be hit. Besides, we don't see me running away from any damned Hun. No, my boy; if I've got to die, I die like an Englishman."

I flushed anew. I was cross with him, and I was cross with myself for my eagerness to alter his opinion of me. But I couldn't help myself. It was his tone.

"I'll have a surprise for Mr. Morel and the Union of Democratic Control is to attach to them any degree of control of foreign affairs. The worst service that anyone can do to Mr. Morel and the Union of Democratic Control is to attach to them any degree of control of foreign affairs, it is exactly the parliamentary tradition that they desire to apply. As the Military Service Acts are Acts of Parliament, Mr. Malleson, who does not come within any of the descriptions of exceptions, can expect no sympathy from them or anybody in his determination to disregard the parliamentary tradition.
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It has been my good fortune to travel much but never in that fair land. If I were your equal... but what's the use? He took me by the buttonhole and breathed into my face. It was the breath of a free Englishman, unhampered by narrow-minded and bureaucratic liquor legislation. "I have taken a fancy to you, young sir," he went on, "and if you do not mind, I propose to read to you a poem I have written about the war. It is called 'The Kaiser's Breakfast.'" I took advantage of the pause he made to urge him into the shelter of a shop entrance. Reading parties in the open Haymarket are apt to excite comment. While I was doing this, he produced a poem from one of the most mysterious inner pockets that ever descended from Savile Row via Petticoat Lane to the final bourne of the gutter.

He began to read in high-pitched, thin notes of emotion, which rose to a scream as he reached his climax:

"The Kaiser he tried to take Paris by storm,
And what did we give him?—SHRAPNEL!"

I forget how it went on, but I know it did go on for a good time. Meanwhile, the placid stream of London life flowed by untroubled. "I suppose it would greatly hearten your own brave men to be able to sing a song like that?" suggested the old man. "But," he went on impressively, "I have still another poem they can sing in the evening. It is called 'The Kaiser's Dinner.'" Would you like to hear me read that? But, of course, you would.

He read it. It was in no essential different from the previous literary meal.

"I have a number of other songs dealing with the war," he went on, "but these that I have read to you are the best. Personally," he explained, "I prefer the 'Breakfast.' But you may prefer the 'Dinner.'" His voice sank to a confidential whisper. "The peculiar thing about it," said this peripatetic patriarch, "is that I am only asking a bob per copy for any of 'em!

LEOPOLD SPERO.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

LAW AND ORDER.

Sir,—How little of a rebel is "A. E. R." Lawlessness would lead to chaos—agreed and dismissed. The real danger is not that the spirit of law be abandoned. He agrees with me that it is possible the law will be amended if we have more war," he went on. "But these that I have read to you is that I am only asking a bob per copy for any of 'em!"

A. F. C.

Sir,—Pray permit me to show cause why complete abolition of the jury system is unquestionably the best of the various suggestions advanced by "A. E. R." as a remedy for the abuses. Trial by jury is becoming more and more a form of trial by newspaper in the final stage. We find precisely the same phenomena in India and in the United States. Its unifying concomitant is increasing uselessness. Incidental features are the effacement of the judge and the glorification of the advocate. Rhodesia has given us a lead in the direction of abolition. In the spring of 1914 a draft ordinance was issued in Rhodesia abolishing the jury in the case of serious crimes committed by natives against Europeans and vice versa. A positive danger in such cases, it must be admitted, is that the law is overbalanced in favor of the accused. Why do we retain this discredited survival? Just because it is the advocate's sheet anchor.

But do not let us forget that progressive members of both Bar and judiciary have always regarded the jury system with marked disfavour. In "The Dark Side of Trial by Jury" (1896) Mr. Joseph Brown, K.C., wrote: "Verify we are a wise people whose commonality possess by intuition the quality of a finality of eloquence without being deluded... Every one of the murders and conspiracies perpetrated under Charles II. were committed by means of a jury. This condemnation is brought almost up to date by the Report of the Commission on Divorce as cited in the "Observer" of February 27, 1910. Mr. Justice Bargave Denne said: "Greater justice was done by judges than by juries. In the Bar I advise that all doubtful cases should be tried by jury (laughter)." Sir John Bigham said: "I think more justice is done by juries than by people know.

The jury system must go; but while the opposition of the reactors of the Bar is being overcome, two alterations in the present jury law are urgent and should be effected by a short Act: imprimis, the unanimous verdict should be abandoned and the Scotch majority verdict adopted; secondly, the vote should be taken on unsigned slips of paper immediately after the judge has summed up. The retirement is a farce and worse. They do not consider their verdict. The noble persuasion which has been already practised by two professional persuaders is continued, and the judge's advice is further discounted by a masterful jurymen who takes them in hand and turns them worse than the first; they fall into the clutches of a sea-lawyer.

W. D.

THE NATIONAL MISSION.

Sir,—As one of the proletariat, I am distressed, as possibly others among your readers may be, by the serious indictment of the failure of the National Mission of the Anglican Church to effect any visible improvement in the social and economic conditions of England services proportionate to the need of the times. As I have learned to depend on "The New Age" for information and enlightenment in matters intellectual, I wonder whether one amongst your most intellectual writers can offer some suggestion whence the new gospel, to be preached by a new order to a new age, is to be derived, in order that the work of reforming the country by the Church may be commenced. I certainly trust that at least one possessed with intelligence enough to offer some guidance on this subject may have wisdom enough to essay the solution of the need indicated in your article.

G. B. C.

Sir,—May I ask for a line or two of space to say a few things about the article on "The National Mission," by "Saint George," in last week's issue of your paper?

To begin with, the title is either an afterthought, or else "Saint George." has rambled grievously from his subject. There is scarcely anything about the National Mission (which was a particular venture made by the English Church), but a great deal of general criticism and cool assumptions, and not a few contemptible statements.

God knows the English Church and organised Christianity as a whole is in urgent need of radical reform, but when your contributor says the Church is "incapable of self-reform" and yet "she must reform herself before she can reform the nation" one is left to look for help of self-reform "and yet "she must reform herself before she can reform the nation" one is left to look for help of self-reform " and yet "she must reform herself before she can reform the nation" one is left to look for help of self-reform " and yet "she must reform herself before she can reform the nation" one is left to look for help of self-reform " and yet "she must reform herself before she can reform the nation" one is left to look for help of self-reform " and yet "she must reform herself before she can reform the nation" one is left to look for help of self-reform " and yet "she must reform herself before she can reform the nation" one is left to look for help of self-reform " and yet "she must reform herself before she can reform the nation" one is left to look for help of self-reform. But do not let us forget that progressive members of both Bar and judiciary have always regarded the jury system with marked disfavour. In "The Dark Side of Trial by Jury" (1896) Mr. Joseph Brown, K.C., wrote: "Verify we are a wise people whose commonality possess by intuition the quality of a finality of eloquence without being deluded... Every one of the murders and conspiracies perpetrated under Charles II. were committed by means of a jury. This condemnation is brought almost up to date by the Report of the Commission on Divorce as cited in the "Observer" of February 27, 1910. Mr. Justice Bargave Denne said: "Greater justice was done by judges than by juries. In the Bar I advise that all doubtful cases should be tried by jury (laughter)." Sir John Bigham said: "I think more justice is done by juries than by people know.

The jury system must go; but while the opposition of the reactors of the Bar is being overcome, two alterations in the present jury law are urgent and should be effected by a short Act: imprimis, the unanimous verdict should be abandoned and the Scotch majority verdict adopted; secondly, the vote should be taken on unsigned slips of paper immediately after the judge has summed up. The retirement is a farce and worse. They do not consider their verdict. The noble persuasion which has been already practised by two professional persuaders is continued, and the judge's advice is further discounted by a masterful jurymen who takes them in hand and turns them worse than the first; they fall into the clutches of a sea-lawyer.

W. D.

G. B. C.
WHAT TO DO.

Sir,—Too often the newspapers have to report the inhumanly cruel and cowardly crime of throwing corrosive fluids such as spirit of salt (hydrochloric acid), oil of vitriol (sulphuric acid), aquafortis (nitric acid), caustic (burning) action of the corrosive agent, whatever it be, renders it inert. Damping or a little water is useless; salvation depends upon the quickness with which the part with which the corrosive has come in contact is plunged into abundance of water and swilled freely. Then oil should be applied freely to the injured part. Olive, rape, linseed, carron—a bland, oleaginous fluids allay the pain by arresting the caustic (burning) action of the corrosive agent on the tissues, and soothe and heal them. Milk or almond oil so applied is the first remedy plasterers or others should use in case of lime in the eyes, or cloudy ammonia. "Lotions" from the chemist are worse than useless, and the eyes are sustaining most serious injury during the time lost in procuring such. Afterwards, if the eyes continue weak, a little tonic and sedative lotion should be applied is the first remedy plasterers or others should use in case of lime in the eyes, or cloudy ammonia. "Lotions" from the chemist are worse than useless, and the eyes are sustaining most serious injury during the time lost in procuring such. Afterwards, if the eyes continue weak, a little tonic and sedative lotion should be applied is the first remedy plasterers or others should use in case of lime in the eyes, or cloudy ammonia.

Drayman, with carbongs of oil of vitriol to deliver, got the acid about him through the broken bottle of one, not knowing what to do, was so badly burnt that he died in hospital. Another man, employed at aerated-water works, by accident got oil of vitriol about him; but, knowing what to do, leapt instantly into the water cistern, and thereby escaped all injury. This is a forcible illustration of the value of knowledge in enabling the possessor to escape the most serious, irreparable, and often fatal injuries.

A person who would throw corrosive fluid upon another must be a fiend; but if you cannot exterminate such dangerous beasts of criminal cruelty, do what you can to defeat their seditious purposes.

Maurice L. Johnson.

Memoranda.

(From last week's New Age.)

The penalty of not stating our terms clearly is that as the war continues it is we and not our enemies who will be made more and more to appear implicated. We cannot base a successful air policy simultaneously on the lowest motives of terror and on the highest motives of military science.

Inconvenient as Parliamentary commissioners may be, they are not so humiliating as Parliamentary Reports.

The initiation of whatever revolutionary feeling there may be in this country lies at the doors of the men who refused at the outbreak of the war to forgo their chance of special war-profits.—"Notes of the Week."

The Anglican Church shares, in common with all the other Christian Churches, the misfortune of having survived Christianity.

The Ritualists have only captured the Church at the cost of expelling the congregation.—Saint George.

The German Empire is not densely populated in comparison with its neighbours; its emigration had dwindled to a mere fraction of the population, and it had to rely on the permanent services of over a million foreigners, with substantial seasonal additions. What conceivable excuse is there here for forcible expansion on the ground of overcrowding?—J. M. Kennedy.

No contradiction of our ordinary experience would be implied were we to admit that liberty was only an instrumental value, and not a means of its own. Liberty is the free and responsible direction of one's own life.

Into a connected, orderly, and varied social life liberty will enter at every point.

Nothing is more necessary than to develop at the expense of established order the socially unstable mind, the mind open to receive and less controverted by the suggestions of the herd.—O. Latham.

Apart from the tax-roll ancient empires had no statistics.—Erza Pound.

Painting, far from being affected by photography, has affected photography.

The photographer can show you what a person looked like at a given moment; but the genius of the portrait painter is to reveal what the sitter is. A reproduction cannot, by its very nature, affect the original.

Cinematography is the drama of the deaf.

The difficulty with drama at the present time is that it is provided mainly by literary men who do not devote themselves to the study of the peculiar medium of the theatre, but think it is provided simply by literary men who do not devote themselves to the study of the peculiar medium of the theatre, but think it is provided mainly by literary men who do not devote themselves to the study of the peculiar medium of the theatre, but think it is provided mainly by literary men who do not devote themselves to the study of the peculiar medium of the theatre, but think it is provided mainly by literary men who do not devote themselves to the study of the peculiar medium of the theatre, but think it is provided mainly by literary men who do not devote themselves to the study of the peculiar medium of the theatre, but think it is provided mainly by literary men who do not devote themselves to the study of the peculiar medium of the theatre, but think it is provided mainly by literary men who do not devote themselves to the study of the peculiar medium of the theatre, but think it is provided mainly by literary men who do not devote themselves to the study of the peculiar medium of the theatre, but think it is provided mainly by literary men who do not devote themselves to the study of the peculiar medium of the theatre, but think it is provided mainly by literary men who do not devote themselves to the study of the peculiar medium of the theatre, but think it is provided mainly by literary men who do not devote themselves to the study of the peculiar medium of the theatre.

Drama is the art of the living, and those who prefer the cinematographic reproduction are dead already.—John Francis Hope.

Repudiate the rule of law, and you are not entitled to any of its benefits.

The prime condition of existence of society is law; it is also the necessary condition of that state of peace which the conscientious objectors desire.

The constitutional method entails submission to a bad law until it is repealed, or replaced by a better one; we suffer for a constitutionalism as well as for conscientious objection to the rule of law.—A. E. R.
PRESS CUTTINGS.

"My policy, broadly stated, is to fix the prices of those articles into which my capital is invested, and which I have obtained control of in the course of my business, so as to be able to fix the price of the particular commodity in an advantageous position, and to which I can obtain exclusive control at all stages from the producer down to the retailer. Such prices will, as far as possible, be fixed on the principle of allowing a reasonable rate of profit to the producer, and ensuring a fair share to the public, and so preventing the necessity for maintaining a price at which the public, through the State, have a right to be consulted. If there were no choice but between the bureaucrat and the syndicalist, we should plump for syndicalism. But, with the guild idea also in the field, we are no longer committed to either of the old alternatives, and when the new idea has begun to permeate Australian unions, as syndicalism had already begun to do, we shall feel more hopeful about the future of Labour in Australia."—"Fellowship" (Melbourne).

Labour, it is now recognised, is one of the raw materials of industry; as much so as coal, iron, or refractories. It is the most expensive. Anything that cheapens, or economizes it, or renders it more efficient is as much a factor in the ultimate result as anything that cheapens iron, or economizes coal, or makes a furnace lining last longer. The problem in any given industry is not merely how to manufacture a given material or machine, it is how to manufacture it better and more economically than before, and no body of men can expect permanently to further the needs of scientific manufacture if one of the essentials of the problem be ignored or ruled out of order..." The Engineer.

The practical argument for a capital levy takes such a shape as this. The capital value of private property in this country, as expressed in money, has probably risen during the war from something like 10,000 millions, to 20,000 millions. For though the values of most bonds and other fixed-interest securities have fallen, war expenditure has raised the yield and the capital value of most share and other capital. Moreover, though it is true that, as the "Economist" urges, the debt is "a tertium quid known as Guild Socialism. The Guild that cheapens iron, or economizes coal, or makes a furnace lining last longer. problem in any given..."

The older Socialist movement has, in the last decade, been giving birth to two divergent and one-sided tendencies, one of which is...