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

No. 1311] New Series. Vol. XXI. No. 26. Thursday, Oct. 25, 1917. [Registered at G.P.O. as a Newspaper.] SIXPENCE

CONTENTS.

NOTES OF THE WEEK.

We can understand, even though we do not agree with, the people who complain of the conduct of the war by the Allied statesmen. Such a confusion as our diplomacy publicly presents was seldom seen. To this moment the most painstaking of readers must be in the dark concerning the precise objects and means of Allied diplomacy; and, worst of all, it is a darkness that appears to grow deeper. To attempt to throw any light on it, moreover, is to attempt the impossible. We frankly say that the information at the public disposal is insufficient to enable us to guess what our politicians are after beyond the mere military defeat of Germany. Is it a real peace they are in search of, or is it an "arrangement" with Imperial Germany? Do they want the war to end by any means if only they can save their face, or are they prepared to see it through at any cost? We do not know. But there is one thing of which even the plain man may be certain, namely, that the real issue of the war, its central crux, has little or nothing to do with the thousand and one issues stirred up like dust round about it, but that it concerns wholly and entirely, to the exclusion as secondary of everything else, this question: Is Germany to be democratised, or are all the existing democracies to become militarised? We are amazed that after more than three years' experience of the nature of Prussian militarism our Liberals should remain of the opinion that a peace upon any terms short of the democratisation of Germany is possible. We are no less amazed that other parties should believe that peace with Prussia is possible even after our military victory. We say, on the contrary, that military victory or no military victory, a patched-up peace or a peace by negotiation, it is all one, provided that the Prussian system remains standing; in other words, real peace will be as far off from the world as ever. The notion that it can be otherwise rests upon the assumption that a full-grown tiger can be taught to become a house-dog; that a Prussia created and by nature trained to turn out soldiers can be suddenly made to turn out citizens instead; that, in short, a mechanical system designed solely to produce military efficiency can be diverted to the production of civic virtue. The idea is so incredible that we do not wonder that intelligent observers in America are doubtful whether, in fact, Europe really desires to see the end of militarism. After all, they say, militarism may have its uses in the policy of the aristocratic, capitalist, and financial classes. Suppose, therefore, that the real extinction of the Prussian menace by means of the democratisation of Germany is precisely something that a powerful section of our governing classes does not want to bring about! Upon that hypothesis the failure of Europe to respond whole-heartedly to the appeal of Mr. Wilson becomes intelligible; for we are democrats only with reservations.

* * *

Unless there were in the chief Allied countries some ground for this conclusion, it is impossible that the presidential address of Herr Ebert at the recent German Majority Socialist Conference should have been passed over, as it was, with sneers. We know our Herr Ebert. It was he who with Herr Scheidemann returned from the Stockholm Conference with the conviction that, in order to put herself right with the world, Germany must democratise herself. It was a genuine conversion, and we must say that Herr Ebert has faithfully acted upon it; for no sooner had he returned to Germany than he began a democratic propaganda, which has now culminated in his presidential address. In the course of this address, and speaking, be it remembered, for the largest political party in Germany, the party, moreover, upon which the future of a peaceful Germany rests, he said that it was essential that Germany should become democratised. Not desirable merely, it is to be understood, not merely expedient from the present and opportunist point of view; not aim-worthy only as a plank in the doctrinaire programme—but essential as a German policy in the midst of the war. What could suit the Allies better, we ask, than support from within Germany itself for our greatest security for peace? What help and encouragement would be too great to lend to the German party that is fighting our intellectual battles in the very heart of Germany? Yet, as we say, for the most part, Herr Ebert's speech was received in this country with jeers and sneers. We do not hesitate to affirm that more attention has been paid to any German

capitalist or professor than to the president of the German Socialist Conference. We shall have to pay for it, however; and so will our Labour, Socialist and democratic parties and groups. The cry from Macedonia for democratic help cannot be ignored without, on the one hand, encouraging the German militarists who can turn upon Herr Ebert and point to our sneers as evidence of our ill-faith, and, on the other hand, discouraging democrats everywhere. For neglecting to nourish with our sympathy the feeble efforts of German Socialists to democratise Germany, we shall have to pay, in a word, in the prolongation of the war, and in the bitterness of democratic estrangement.

* * *

Mr. Bottomley has been once more telling his readers to get their flags ready. This unbounded demagogue finds it necessary, in order to keep up the spirits of his victims, periodically to assure them that the mine is just about to pay the handsome dividend of a victorious peace. That a peace of a kind may be about to be tinkered up behind our backs we are not in a position to affirm or deny. As we have just been saying, there are powerful interests in this country scarcely less than in Germany itself that would regard a democratic peace as the very devil, and to whom, therefore, a tinkered peace is the most desirable end to the present war. Such people argue quite openly in the "Morning Post" and the "Saturday Review," and, more guardedly elsewhere, that Kaiserism is preferable to what they call Kerenskiism, and that, in any case, Kaiserism ought to be maintained if only as a counter-balance to democracy. To these, as well as to the pacifist, a peace before Christmas, a peace leaving the Kaiser in full possession of his autocracy, would be as welcome as it would be unwelcome to us. And it is plainly for some such preposterous peace as this that Mr. Bottomley is advising his gulls to prepare their flags. For of what other sort of peace is there the smallest immediate prospect? Militarily and navally our progress is slow. In the air our strategy has scarcely begun to take itself seriously. Diplomatically, politically, psychologically, and, in most other respects, we have by no means yet established anything like mastery for democracy. Upon what, then, are our Mr. Bottomleys counting in their prognostications of an early and victorious peace? For ourselves we cannot see any evidence for it. The only alternatives we see are, on the one side, an early peace implying the victory of Prussia, however disguised; and, on the other side, the indefinite continuation of the war until the Allies include the aims as well as the material resources of America within their own body. In short, the alternatives are an early peace and the militarisation of the existing democracies, and continued war until Germany is democratised. No third course presents itself to our minds.

* * *

There can be no doubt that the popularisation of the proposal to make a levy on capital is working for an early peace. Mr. Bonar Law and Mr. Henderson, while he was a Minister, were quite right in saying that the proposal to conscript wealth as well as men would put an end to the war. We are also confirmed in our view that the way to end war is to insist that wars shall always be paid for out of private capital. The practical problem at the present moment is this: To discover whether our wealthy classes are more afraid of parting with their money or with our national liberty; for the preservation of both seems to be no longer possible. Following the lead of the Trade Union Congress, the Labour party and several other "powerful" bodies of Labour opinion, the Workers' National Committee have now issued a statement in favour of an immediate levy on capital for the purposes of the war. They point out that of the five and a half thousand millions the State has spent since August 1914, four and a quarter thousand millions have been borrowed and chiefly at a rate of interest which to financiers of twenty years ago would have seemed, in the words of the "Economist," "an impossibly beautiful dream." They further state that they are not prepared to countenance any longer the policy of loans, but that, whatever the consequences, they will demand that the war be in future paid for out of private capital. That a levy on capital is legislatively possible the Committee has, of course, no doubt. Only a "jackass," indeed, as Mr. Belloc wrote the other day, could be in doubt whether the machinery of the Death-duties could be applied to capital whose owners differ from the dead only in being alive. A levy on capital is, on the contrary, one of the easiest operations of taxation. It is only the politics of it that present any difficulty. We hope that now that every Labour organisation of any importance has approved of the conscription of wealth the Labour Party will carry it through as a means to the war and as a measure of justice to the men whose lives have already been conscripted. And we hope, further, that the resistance of the wealthy to the proposal will be called what it is—the pacifism of capitalism.

* * *

The Bill passed in the Reichstag last week for the Restoration of the German Mercantile Marine after the war has several features of interest. To begin with, the Reichstag agreed to make subsidies for new shipping to the varying degrees of twenty to eighty per cent. of its cost during the first twelve months of peace. Next the Government was successful in resisting every democratic proposal to "control" the shipping so subsidised. The German Mercantile Marine was not only to be spared nationalisation in the interests of the "enterprise," etc., of private owners, but even the proviso that the State should have the option of purchasing the ships it is paying for was ruled out. The "Times" was therefore quite justified in remarking that "the German Government's arguments throughout seem to have been those of the Hamburg-Amerika Line." Very true, and how horribly Prussian! But there happens to have been recently published in the "Times" the summary of the recommendations made by the Chamber of Shipping of the United Kingdom, the implications and explications of which are, if anything, more Prussian than those of the Hamburg-Amerika Line. Were the Chamber of Shipping a body with small political influence we should pronounce their demands impertinent; but being what they are, one of the most powerful secret political wirepullers in this country, their demands become alarming in the baseness of their character. Exactly like their German confrères, our shipping magnates are "satisfied" with their industry is the one industry in the world that should be assisted by the State but never controlled by the State. "The State should render all such assistance as may be necessary to re-establish, at the earliest possible moment, the British ocean services . . . rendering financial help where necessary . . . relieving the industry of special and onerous charges . . . developing ports and harbours . . . foregoing the excess profits tax on shipping, etc., etc."; but on no account must the State presume to share in the control of shipping, since this would be "fatal to the improvement and development" of the industry. In one respect, indeed, our shipping magnates surpass the Prussians in the commercial villainy of their demands; for in addition to demanding of the State every sort of financial assistance they demand that their own private employees, the seamen, shall be treated by the State as if they were State servants. Here is the astounding passage: "The State must recognise that neglect or failure on the part of a seaman to perform the duties he has undertaken to discharge is an offence against public safety, and not merely a breach of the contract entered into by him with his immediate employers." In other words, the

private shipping companies are to have over their Havelock Wilsons a double pull: their own economic control and the control of the State by its penal laws. The Servile State could not be more clearly indicated.

* * *

The journals that have called out for air-reprisals upon Germany in the belief that reprisals would terrify Germany have already had their reply in the air-raid of last Friday night. Like Gallio, Germany cares no more than ourselves for any of these things. The yellow Press, however, cannot admit itself to have been in the wrong; and its developed policy is therefore to call for still more reprisals while blaming the Government for having adopted the policy too late to take Germany by surprise. Thus does stupidity endeavour to conceal itself in the offices of Fleet Street. Unfortunately, as we have often pointed out, the discussion of reprisals is not only foolish in itself, it is prejudicial to the proper conduct of the air-service. While the public are squabbling on the stair-heads, the directors of the air-service are squabbling in the drawing-rooms and all to the advantage of Germany. It is only after three years of war that we have at last the definite promise of an independent Air-Ministry, for hitherto the public has been too engrossed with the "Evening News" to observe that what the "Times" calls "vested interests" have been preventing the establishment of an Air-Ministry; and it is still doubtful whether the Air-Ministry will be able to perform its duties in the face of the interested opposition. The fact that must be faced and, if possible, overcome is this: That both the Admiralty and the War Office are jealous of the elevation to partnership with their arms of the new arm of the air. They desire to maintain the air-weapon as an auxillary to each of their own, and subject, therefore, to their own exclusive control. Its independence of both of them is one of the few things upon which they can agree even in opposition. Nevertheless, it must be plainly stated that the opposition must cease if the war is to be won. The appearance of deadlock that has been reached both on land and sea makes it indispensable that a solution should be sought in another medium. And it is no less just that the direction of the new line should be vested in new hands. We add our voice to the growing demand for the serious treatment of the air-service; though we confess that if Mr. Churchill were to be appointed as its first Minister we should again be struck dumb.

* * *

The way to get on publicly in this country is to fail in every public office. This is not the only conclusion to be drawn from the announcement that Mr. Churchill, the war's most conspicuous failure, may be made Air-Minister, but it is confirmed by Birmingham's resolution to make Mr. Neville Chamberlain one of its parliamentary members in gratitude for his manifest public incompetence. Mr. Neville Chamberlain is not distinguished by modesty or even by a proper appreciation of his own talents. He learns nothing of Mr. Neville Chamberlain by the blunders of Mr. Neville Chamberlain; for, doubtless, he assures himself that they were really strokes of genius which a malevolent world would simply not let come off; and he is encouraged to fail again. On the subject of the future relations of Capital and Labour, however, it is imperative, if we are to have any peace, that failures like himself should be told to mind their private business. Their interference in these matters is likely to do untold mischief. When, therefore, he complains that there is a certain class of men who are bent on revolution, who will accept no olive-branch from Capital, and who persist in warning Labour that it may lose its independence by forgoing the right to strike—and when he adds that with such a class he will have nothing to do, it is enough to reply that we are glad of it. His nearer approach than contempt to the heart of the problem of Capital and Labour would be much more dangerous than his present sentimental distance.

* * *

Until we have seen more of the details of the new constitution of the Labour party, which the Executive will submit to the Nottingham Conference next January, we hesitate to say much about it. The scheme, as roughly outlined in the Press last week, is, however, promising in some respects. The old distinction between hand and brain workers—in other words, between the wage-earners and the salariat—with which we have so often quarrelled, has been cast aside. "Labour" is now to include all the services necessary to the conduct of industry. This is a considerable step forward in the direction of the Guilds; and we shall not refuse the laurel offered us (anonymously) by the "Times" for having been the chief means of bringing the change about. But the present directors of the Labour party must recognise that words, even when they are written in the constitution of the party, are not enough to win over to "Labour" the salariat and the intellectual proletariat generally. Practical consideration must be paid to their needs, and a proper understanding must be shown of their special psychology. The salariat, in short, will expect fair deeds, as well as fair words. Another innovation is the creation of individual membership of the party. Hitherto, as is well known, it was necessary to belong to some organisation before becoming eligible for membership of the Labour party: a provision that has excluded most of the writers upon the subject of National Guilds. In future, however, anybody in a Union or not is eligible; simple citizenship is enough. This, again, is a considerable step towards the formation of a real national party, and once more we accept a sprig of bay for having persistently advocated it. Lastly, we have to note that it is now the intention of the Labour party to set up a general caucus over the whole electorate, with a representative body in each constituency, charged with the duty of returning a "Labour" member. This, again, is common sense; but the practical issues from it no man can yet foresee.

* * *

The compact between the Labour party and the Co-operative Movement is still obscure in its details, but, in general, it follows the lines with which our readers have been long familiar. The two organisations are for the present to maintain their independent existence; but a perpetual alliance, defensive and offensive, is to be formed between them for both economic and political purposes. This amalgamation of two movements totalling many millions of members is an event of tremendous potentiality. Ideas, of course, will prove decisive as always, for in their mere bulk alone movements are never formidable. We, therefore, turn with interest to the programme of the new amalgamation to discover in it, if we can, the ideas that are to convert its potency into actuality. For the present, we must confess ourselves to be disappointed. Neither in the programme of the new Labour party nor in the programme of the political Co-operative Movement do we find more than a trace of contact with present-day aspirations. Everybody knows—and why should we not say so?—that the central problem for industry is the problem of the control of Capital. This control, it is obvious, may, theoretically, be exercised by one or more of these following groups: by the State or Capital or Labour alone; by any two of them; or by all three of them; and upon the actual choice of the Labour party depends the whole future of society. What is that choice to be? Beyond remarking that the control must be "the best obtainable"—which means nothing—the Labour party ignores the problem as if it were a minor issue; and the Co-operative Movement in its elaborate programme makes no mention of the problem at all.

Foreign Affairs.

By S. Verdad.

It has already been pointed out in these columns that the new French Cabinet could not be regarded as secure in view of the attitude of M. Painlevé towards the Socialists. Rumours of movements made by Germany in the direction of a peace settlement—which appear to have had little foundation in fact, considering Herr von Kuhlmann's definite statement ("No; never") on the subject of Alsace-Lorraine—led to a secret session of the Chamber on October 16; and the order of the day was carried subsequently by 313 to nil. From the first reports this looked satisfactory, but it turned out that 200 other members present in the Chamber simply abstained from voting. Afterwards the question of M. Malvy came up for discussion, and it is hardly necessary for us to follow the intricate details of this affair. A division had to be taken, and the Government's majority was only 57 votes, which, as even the Paris correspondent of the "Times" is forced to admit, is not enough for a stable Cabinet.

* * *

Unfortunately, the British public has not been at all well informed on this point. It is suggested by the "Times," for example, with the same facile cunning as that which led to its distortion of Mr. Churchill's recent speech, that there may now be a reshuffling of the Ministry. With reference to this operation, the Paris correspondent says: "In considering the possibilities which it offers, it has to be borne in mind that at the recent Bordeaux Socialist Congress authority was given to the Socialist members to enter any Ministry offering serious guarantees that it will energetically prosecute the war." He adds that on the issue arising out of the secret session the Socialists refused to vote for M. Ribot. This is a very important point, for the number of abstentions undoubtedly included a large proportion of the Unified Socialists in the House. One thing, nevertheless, must be remembered, and that is that the Socialists refused to co-operate with the present Cabinet because M. Ribot formed part of it; and it is not at all true that at the Bordeaux Congress authority was given to Socialist members to enter "any Ministry" offering to prosecute the war. Every Ministry formed in belligerent countries since the war began has sought to justify its formation with that promise. It is well known, or should be, that the Socialists distrust the extremist policy, outlined in the "Times" only a couple of weeks ago, of taking over the entire left bank of the Rhine from the Germans, and it is because M. Ribot's name is associated with this policy that the Socialists refuse to have anything to do with a Ministry in which he proposes to accept office.

* * *

Apart from that, the Socialist permission to allow members of the party to join any Cabinet is conditional on many things. Next week I hope to publish in this journal the long complete text of the Bordeaux resolution; but I may as well state here that one of the clauses it contains is the following relating to the Stockholm Conference:—

> The Socialist Party declares that it will seek to obtain passports for a conference of this nature, and it will urge that the Government shall not deprive the country of a force of diplomatic action which it cannot neglect without implying its distrust of Socialistic patriotism. In order to make definite preparations for an international conference, to the principle of which it unanimously agreed at its National Council of May 29 . . . The Socialist Party will continue its negotiations and conferences with the other Socialist Parties and with the Labour organisations of the Entente countries.

This passage is taken from the official organ of the Unified Socialist Party, the "Humanité," dated October 11; and from it, as well as from the leading articles of M. Renaudel and others, it is quite clear that the French Socialists have no intention of extending unconditional support to any Government; not even to a Government in which their own members may be permitted to hold office. This resolution with regard to the Stockholm Conference is particularly important; much more important than any similar resolution would be if passed by Labour organisations in this country. However, as recent events in France have shown, the Socialists can at any time turn the Government out and assume power themselves; and, even if they permit their members to join a Government, they maintain their party control. In England, on the other hand, there is no immediate prospect of a Labour party of any kind holding office, nor will there be so long as the leaders of our Labour organisations openly despise the intellectual proletariat, and declare that Labour can work out its own salvation. I do not know how far this tendency is to be modified by the "hand and brain" proposals which have just appeared; I speak only of the position as it actually exists.

* * *

One further point. Since M. Briand went out of office early in the spring of this year, he has hardly spoken in the Chamber at all; but when he did speak on the occasion which has now given rise to a crisis he spoke definitely against M. Ribot. It is true enough, as the Press messages hint with suspicious unanimity, that the issue between M. Briand and M. Ribot is largely personal; but the fact remains that M. Briand has deemed it opportune to oppose M. Ribot's position in the Cabinet, and thereby M. Ribot's policy; for, despite personal issues, the two things cannot really be separated. Whatever name M. Briand may now choose to apply to himself politically, the fact remains that he has always maintained his old Socialistic connections, and his parliamentary ability is unquestioned. It is not giving him too much credit to say that it was almost he alone who inspired and maintained the "union sacrée" from the beginning of the war; and the definite stand he has now taken up may indicate the formation of another coalition Ministry, strongly Socialistic, with M. Briand in charge of it. As it is impossible for M. Briand to put himself at the head of the opposition to M. Ribot without explicitly disowning M. Ribot's policy with regard to the annexation of the left bank of the Rhine, it is not improbable that we may soon see a Government in France definitely pledged not merely to disown, but to resist this pernicious suggestion. And, after that, it is not impossible that the long-delayed Inter-Allied Conference on war aims may take place.

A LIFE OF SCHOOLDAYS.

When out of utter weariness I see
  My cramped and stooping soul for ever bound
  To trivial tasks in one contracted round,
A king of pigmy minds I seem to be,
Mocked by a lifelong weak authority;
  Lord of a puny princedom unrenowned,
  And with a leaden wreath of dulness crowned,
From which no day my brow may wholly free.

In such a mood I hunger for a space
  Wherein to stand upright among my peers,
And feel the world's strong breezes in my face,
  Where grown men walk with men of equal years;
And none need note his manhood pass away,
Labouring the obvious from day to day.

S. M. Rich.

Towards National Guilds.

RECENT discussions in elevated circles have convinced us that there is now nothing wanting in theory to the bringing in of National Guilds to-morrow than the trifle of an educated working-class. "Yes, yes, it is said to us, your idea of National Guilds is excellent. Why have we not thought of it before? To give the working-classes responsibility for industry is obviously the right and proper thing. It is in line with the devolution of authority in politics—the movement we call democracy—and it is even more obviously desirable as a means of bringing the working-classes into touch with the difficult problems of the higher management of industry. Oh yes, of course, of course; but then, you see, they are not sufficiently educated for the part at present. We must educate, educate. Then, but not until then, we can safely entrust some of our responsibility to them." We understand very well the point of view, since it is the historic, not to say the ethical, point of view of the conservative, of the conservative in all of us. It possesses the parent at the moment when his son is coming of age, the schoolmaster as his pupils are leaving school, the manager when his subordinates ask for a higher position, and every governing class when a class beneath it demands more responsibility. Nor are we contending that it is by any means a foregone conclusion that this attitude should be wrong. The conservative instinct is a preservative instinct; and often enough it secures a delay in youth's assumption of responsibility which ensures a better use of power than would otherwise be made of it.

There is an exception, however, even to this rule of wise conservatism. It is when the aspirant to responsibility has it within his power, if he is denied his claim, to ruin not only himself, but his former masters. And it is precisely this case that arises when a working-class movement, having become organised and extensive, decides to ask for a share of responsibility. The parent, the schoolmaster, the manager in a similar circumstance has at least the freedom to choose. Their own ruin is not involved in the contemplated ruin of their applicants, since their applicants are not absolutely essential to them. A parent can survive if his son cuts him off and decides to go abroad to make his fortune. A schoolmaster has other pupils to attend to; and a manager has only to ring up a labour exchange to find a blackleg to his hand. But in the case of the demand of Labour upon Capital, Labour is Capital's all, or nearly all. Without Labour Capital is an idle and profitless tool. Labour, in other words, is already, in fact, a full partner with Capital, whose ruin would be therefore brought about even more certainly by the revolt of Labour than by the recognition of Labour's demand to a share of responsibility. Understand this well, you who imagine that the parallel of paternity holds in the case of Capital and Labbur, or the governing and the working-classes. Though in a certain sense the cases are parallel, they are different in the vital matter of the parity of the parties.

With this in mind our first line of reply to the argument we have summarised is as follows: Admitting in the abstract all you say, there is still this practical difficulty: What if the working-classes will not wait to become educated in your sense of the word before insisting upon a share of control? It would be useless in that event to urge upon them what you have just urged upon us; for even if your counsel were as wise as Solomon's, with a determination such as you have to meet, there is no parleying. Your dependence, moreover, upon Labour makes it advisable that you stand not upon the ground of theoretical wisdom, but upon the ground of commonsense; and the fact that you must face is this, that either you consent to the demand of Labour or Labour will ruin both itself and Capital. That this is not altogether an improbable situation after the war must be apparent to anybody who examines the psychological in addition to the economic prospects. Economically, no doubt, we are in for a difficult period within a year or two of the conclusion of the war. That is the forecast made by those who have most closely examined the outlook. But from a psychological point of view the outlook is even more disquieting, for to the economic causes of discontent which will undoubtedly exist must be added the psychological causes brought into being and trained into expression by the war itself. On the whole, in fact, we should not be greatly surprised if the situation above alluded to makes its appearance, and Capital is met by Labour's demand for a share in control couched in peremptory tones.

We say that it will be no use, if that situation arises, to meet it with the objection to which we have listened. It will be no use, indeed, to meet it with any objection whatever. All that can be said of it with any profit is that we must make the best of it; and all that will then remain will be to determine with Sir Robert Lowe (but in how different a sense!) that Capital must now educate its masters. And, after all, the prospect is not so appalling that Capital need tear its hair, as we are told that honourable members did when the Reform Bill was carried, crying that the end of the world had come because the middle classes had come of age. The coming of age of the working-classes, though naturally obnoxious to their economic seniors, will mean, we are pretty sure, no more ruin than was involved in the rise to power of the middle classes. On the contrary, we foresee from it the renovation of national life, and as its most hopeful feature the subordination of precisely that wretched class which the Reform Bill brought into power!

Our second line of defence of the economic revolution must be addressed, however, to the educationists. We have no doubt whatever that the motive of education is powerful when the object of education is the emancipation of a class. Suppose, for example, that at the end of the war, and as a reward for their marvellous exertions in it, Parliament should pledge its word to create a system of education designed to fit the working-classes for a share in the control of industry, would not the incentive be considerable? Would not education profit by the possession of a definite goal? It would; we affirm it; we should gladly welcome it. But now let us ask whether the profit to be derived for education from a *distant* goal would not be multiplied by the existence of an immediate and a present goal. Economic emancipation as the reward of education would indeed act as a stimulus upon educational zeal in all those with a sense of future values. But economic emancipation in the future would be nothing of a stimulus in comparison with the stimulus of a present and pressing economic necessity. You begin, we hope, to see the point we are driving at, you teachers who desire some noble and practical object for your labours. Education for the sake of the future is good; for a specified and promised future is better; but education for the present is best of all.

What we are saying is, after all, a simple matter to comprehend. We do not claim that it is recondite, or that nobody else has ever thought of it. All that we are saying is that if the working-classes should insist upon sharing in industrial control *before* they are judged by the other classes to be sufficiently educated for it, education will have no cause to complain. Instead of remaining a thing of speculative value (since its fruits are always slow in ripening) education under the new circumstances would become of a real industrial, economic, and national value; for all our eggs would be in the schoolmaster's basket.

NATIONAL GUILDSMEN.

The Nature of Societies.

By Ramiro de Maeztu.

. . . And there is another point, an essential point, that separates me from M. Duguit. The Bordeaux Professor founds his social rule on the fact of social solidarity, and defines solidarity as the inter-dependence which unites, by the community of needs and the division of labour, these members of mankind, and especially those of the same social group. M. Duguit bases society on the fact of the inter-dependence of men. But this foundation is insufficient, and M. Duguit admits that it is so when he faces the problem of public assistance to the aged and invalid. The following are his words: "The duty of assistance raises the most disturbing problem of all that are set before modern consciousness. . . . That the rulers are obliged to provide medical aid to all those men the cure of whom is possible—of that there is no doubt; the aid has then the aim of conserving social force; it co-operates towards the increase and maintenance of the inter-dependence. But assistance is also due to the aged who consume without producing, who must inevitably disappear in a few years; and to the incurable who are not only unproductive, but who may introduce into the race a germ of death or decadence. Are we not, then, violating the very law of social inter-dependence?" And M. Duguit replies: "It must in all sincerity be acknowledged: the law of inter-dependence by itself is in this case powerless. Something more is needed; we need the feeling of pity for human sufferings."

I am afraid that in order to save his good feelings M. Duguit has sacrificed his theory. The error consists in basing society exclusively on the inter-dependence of men. Plato said: "A city takes its rise from this, that none of us happens to be self-sufficient, but is indigent of many things." Plato's City is not founded merely on the fact that men need each other, but on the fact that they are in need of things, and this implies that there are things anterior to all societies which man cannot obtain in isolation.

One of the goods that man cannot obtain in isolation is the feeling of pity for human suffering. There is, therefore, here one of the goods which serve as a basis for the constitution of human societies which is not based on the inter-dependence of men, but is only to be realised by means of it. Inter-dependence is not here the basis fact, but the means of realisation. And this is not the only good of the same kind. Intrinsic values may be defined, as Mr. O. Latham has truly defined them, as those values which ought to exist, although no other benefit than their own existence could be derived from them. One of the intrinsic values is scientific investigation; another is artistic creation; another moral satisfaction. It is true that from investigation are frequently derived considerable benefits to industry; but this is not the proper spirit to inspire the laws and social devices that promote research. The value of astronomy does not lie in the services it may render to navigation; "astronomy is beautiful," said M. Poincaré. A certain knowledge may be useless, and yet precious. Art, too, may be useful, but this is not the reason of its value. You may also say that collective works of pity result in social advantage, but it is obvious that a society that tries to promote pity, knowledge or art with the sole aim of exploiting these goods will not only fail in the attempt, but will not know how to take the first step towards it, for no Macænas will know how to distinguish the moral, scientific, and artistic frauds from the genuine articles if he does not start from the experience that a work of art, science or pity is an intrinsic value, which deserves to be honoured for its sake.

All these ideas are platitudes; but their consequences for the theory of society and of law are not platitudes, but rather, at the first glance, paradoxes. M. Duguit's theory, according to which law has no other object than the regulation of human inter-dependence falls to the ground, because all the laws relating to art, science and pity remain outside of it. Law must be something else. But we are also pushed towards a new conception of the nature of societies, and it is this which forms the ultimate object of the present discussion.

We are trying to find what are the original facts which must be considered as the ultimate social phenomenon. This theme was discussed in my presence by two young English officers during the first year of the war. One of them from the Regular Army said: "Every man who has passed some years in a regiment knows that there exists, besides the consciousness of the individuals that constitute it, a collective or common consciousness, which could be called the soul of the regiment, from which the regiment derives its vitality, and which is stronger in some regiments than in others." His friend replied: "That is metaphysics. You say that some regiments have a soul, and others not; but what you really mean is that some regiments have had good colonels who have left the tradition of their good example; and others not." I followed the discussion silently, because I was too interested to take part in it. It stirred in me things deep and half-forgotten. It was, in fact, the same dispute that was initiated twenty years ago by the two best sociologists of France, MM. Durkheim and Tarde—a dispute which I followed at the time with passionate interest, but which left me disenchanted and uncertain. M. Durkheim used to say that the ultimate social phenomenon must be sought in the fact that in primitive societies there is no individual consciousness. Individual consciousness only acquires importance in the field of action in later or organic societies, which always retain the impress of their original and ultimate unity—common consciousness—as is proved by the existence of altruistic feelings otherwise inexplicable.

M. Tarde replied that it is true that the ultimate social fact is a certain coercion to which the individual must submit, but that this coercion is exercised by the social consciousness upon the individual best by some individuals upon others. The central fact in all societies is imitation. We begin to speak, to think, and act as other people speak, think and act. Some individuals have the faculty of imitating movements which hypnotise other men; and this imitativeness of the mass of men constitutes the fact or essence of society. In short, M. Tarde's conception of society of one of the Assyrian reliefs in which the leading figure in a procession makes a gesture and all his followers repeat it.

All the current theories on the nature of societies can be reduced to these two. Either society is a common subject—a "spirit" in Hegel, consciousness in Durkheim—or society merely consists in the interaction of individuals, in the immediate influence that some exercise upon others—as in Tarde, or Nietzsche, or any other individualist. But if we begin by acknowledging that we find in every society leaders and followers, inventors, and imitators, the question arises whether imitation is possible without imitating something. To say that we are imitating Beau Brummel is to say that we are imitating his manners or his dresses or his social conduct. The inventor says: "that is good"; and the imitator echoes: "that is good." The relation between the inventor and the imitator is not immediate but mediate, through the things. The thing may be a religion or a territory

or a system of government or a language or a social function or an amusement, but in all real societies and even in all possible societies, we find always that the ultimate social phenomenon is a thing, a common thing, a commonwealth, a republic, which may be either material or ideal, an interest or a doctrine, but which is always something distinct and distinguishable from the individuals who will it or on whom it is imposed, precisely because the characteristic of the social thing consists in being a good one which the individual cannot obtain in isolation.

Once we have fixed the social thing as the ultimate foundation of societies, there is no need for M. Durkheim's collective consciousness, which is as well a self-contradictory explanation of altruistic feelings. According to M. Durkheim we are altruists because we carry social consciousness in some part of our individual consciousness, let us say, in the back of our heads. When we love our neighbour we are loving ourselves with the love, let us say, that the bones of the forehead feel for the bones of the occipital, or with the joy that our higher self feels when he recognises his own self in the universal Self of Love. In Love it is the tribe that loves itself, according to M. Durkheim, or the universal Self that peeps at itself through our eyes and returns to itself through the eyes of the loved neighbour, without letting us know what may be the meaning of this perpetual travel of the Self about itself.

But if we love our neighbour because this love is imposed on us by the fact of the social consciousness we carry about with us, why is it that we do not love him always? If society is imminent, if we are social by nature, why is it that we do not act socially always? In the same way that M. Tarde's theory does not explain social continuity, but only social atomicity, M. Durkheim's theory only explains continuity but remains mute before the fact of atomicity.

We can only be satisfied by a theory in which neither the individuals disappear in the society nor the society disappears in the individuals. In a satisfactory theory the ultimate social phenomenon cannot be the action of some individuals upon others, for thereby we remain stuck in individuals; nor can it be the assumption of a metaphysical collective consciousness, which is not only improbable, in the meaning that it cannot be proved, but that proves self contradictory as an explanation of social phenomena. But let us admit that societies are constituted around things, as is shown, moreover, by our immediate experience and then we can also easily explain not only the stability but also the instability of societies. Societies are stable so long as their members consider the things that constitute them as values of the greatest importance which the members cannot secure except in their societies, and societies become unstable when the things that constitute them have ceased to be regarded as values of the greatest importance or do not need a society to secure them.

M. Duguit starts from the sociology of M. Durkheim, according to which society is a group of men already inter-independent, already solidary, as they all share in the same collective consciousness, which an ironist could also call the unconscious consciousness. Then asks M. Duguit: What sort of a thing is Law? And he replies that Law is the regulation of social inter-dependence. The true method is different. The original and ultimate facts are, on the one hand, those things that are goods, and, on the other, the human individuals. Among the things that are goods there are some, like civilisation, of such a kind that man cannot obtain them except by co-operation; but co-operation, if efficient, must be regulated. Law is therefore the regulation of human co-operation for the maintenance and increase of those goods that man cannot obtain in isolation.

Workshop Delegates

[Extracts from a circular on this subject issued by M. Thomas, as French Minister of Munitions, shortly before his resignation.]

You are aware of the circumstances which led me to urge manufacturers to create shop-stewards in their workshops. From the outbreak of war, the workmen in our factories have played their part in national defence unreservedly, and with a whole-hearted devotion. Their wish to see our production of war material increased and increasing inspired them with the desire to put an end to the petty disputes which inevitably arise in workshops. They also aimed at putting themselves in a position to give more complete assistance in war work by taking a more responsible part in the organisation of the work itself. It was in this spirit that they asked for the institution of delegates from the workshops. At the same time large manufacturers, wishing to collaborate more closely with their staff, and to bring about relations of mutual confidence in their factories, either instituted such delegations, or conferred greater responsibilities upon the delegates already appointed in their factories; and the encouraging experiments they thereby made created a state of mind favourable to the development of this institution generally.

As you know, it is only by means of individual initiative—which has often been manifested as the result of your intervention; and I should like to thank you for your efforts in this regard—that it was possible to create such delegates in the factories; for our present legislation has never legalised their institution. As I informed you in my circular of July 24 last, workshop delegations can be legally organised only after and by means of the insertion of special clauses in factory rules, which, moreover, in the present state of our factory regulations depend purely on the initiative of the employer, though they may none the less have the value of a working contract. They bind the manufacturer who has introduced them and form a series of agreements which may be traced to Prud'homme's recommendations.

I believe, nevertheless, that even if the clauses of workshop regulations relating to the institution of delegates had given rise to a pronounced divergence of views in any establishment, and even if it had not been possible for you to bring about an understanding between the employer and his staff, the question, by virtue of the decree of January 17, 1917, might have been legally submitted to the Permanent Conciliation and Arbitration Committee.

I wish to call your attention to the nature of the functions of the shop-steward. If we want a new institution to work with all possible efficiency, and to secure the confidence both of manufacturing and working-class circles, no doubt must be allowed to exist upon this point. In the course of recent negotiations, entirely different conceptions of the rôle of the delegates have come to my notice. In some cases the predominant desire appears to be to make the shop-steward a mere intermediary, whose intervention is only necessary for the conveyance of individual claims put forward by the workmen. On the other hand, among workmen the shop-steward is often regarded as the actual mouthpiece of the Trade Union, whose action is not to be limited to questions relating to the workshop he represents, but who ought to take cognisance of the more general questions relating to the factory as a whole. For this reason, it is sometimes urged that all the delegations in all the factories should be empowered to elect in turn a commission of delegates who should be called upon to investigate such differences as cannot be settled separately in each workshop, and, in short, that this commission of delegates should act towards the manufacturer in the capacity of a Trade Union delegation.

There would be, in my view, grave danger in giving this character to the institution of workshop delegates at the outset. Far from aiding in the development of relations of mutual confidence within the factory, this would be more likely to bring about frequent disputes; and, again, would tend to hinder smooth working and the development of Trade Union organisations, which have their own part to play just as the shop-stewards have theirs. For the Trade Unions to concern themselves with the choice of the delegates; to carry on a propaganda with this object among their members; to enter into relations with those shop-stewards forming a part of their organisations: that is quite a permissible practice; but we must not lose sight of the fact that the workshop delegates have their own part to play—a part which is entirely distinct from the rôle of Trade Union delegations, and one that is, moreover, sufficiently important in itself.

It is for the shop-stewards to investigate the individual claims which, in each workshop, have not been satisfactorily settled; and it is also their duty to convey them to the employer, to explain and discuss them, and to intervene in any difficulties which may have been brought about by the application of the rules relating to scales of wages, or to sanitary and safety measures.

On the one hand, in questions relating to the technical organisation of the work, the delegate may be the intermediary of his fellows for bringing to the notice of the management new methods of work or procedure likely to make their labour more productive, or to enable them to exploit the machinery to greater advantage, to economise raw materials, to lessen the fatigue of the worker, etc. On the other hand, the delegate may become the indispensable interpreter of the staff of the workshop for indicating to the management certain situations in which the status of the workmen might conceivably be endangered. It happens only too often among a population as sensitive and as jealous of its rights as ours that certain movements owe their origin simply to the clumsiness of subordinate agents in the factory and to their want of respect for the dignity of the worker. The workmen by means of these interventions with the management may prevent such incidents from arising.

Thus, the action of the delegate will be confined exclusively to the workshop which has elected him; but the scope of his work is at the same time broad enough to enable him really to bring to the management of the factory some of the collective life of the workshop in its many and varied manifestations.

Every workman and workwoman aged twenty-one years and over is to be a voter. It has been proposed that in certain circumstances the electoral age should be lowered to eighteen years; but it seems preferable, for the purpose of these elections, to adhere to the age fixed for political elections. The right to vote will be accorded only to women in enjoyment of their civic rights and to men in enjoyment of their civic and political rights, and will be granted to French people only.

Should the right to vote be made conditional upon a certain period of service in the factory? The regulations which have been submitted to me on this point vary. Labour organisations would prefer such a period not to exceed one month; the employers' organisations would prefer that the workman should have been four months in the factory. In the course of a recent intervention of mine, I succeeded in inducing the management and staff of a large establishment in the Paris area to agree to a period of two months.

Where the circumstances are not of an exceptional nature, this period may be generally adopted.

So far as the eligibility of candidates is concerned, as the result of my interventions and those of the Permanent Conciliation and Arbitration Committee of the Seine, it has been admitted that in areas such as those of Paris a period of one year was quite sufficient to give the employers the guarantees they asked for. This period may be generally accepted, and it is only in exceptional circumstances, in the case of certain well-defined regions, that a more extended period of time may be contemplated, which must not, in any case, exceed three years. These rules, too, have been modified by a practice which has happily been adopted in certain establishments, and which I should like to bring specially to your notice; if in any workshop the number of persons eligible for the Workshop Committee does not represent at least one-tenth of the inscribed voters, this list of eligibles must be completed, to the extent of this one-tenth, by the addition of the older voters. I may add that eligibility is refused to workmen engaged in retail trade or upon the managerial staffs, but it is extended, on the other hand, to workmen previously in the Army and to women during the period in which their husbands are mobilised.

With regard to the election procedure, it is left to the discretion of the management to fix the date of the elections for each workshop, and it is customary for this date to be announced at least six days in advance by a notice put up in the workshop. At the same time, a list of the voters and of the eligible candidates is also put up, and any claims to which these lists may give rise must be lodged within twenty-four hours.

The electoral board charged with the conduct of the election is composed of the two eldest and the two youngest voters, and is presided over by the eldest. This board is aided by a clerk who furnishes, in case of need, any information that may be required. The secrecy of the voting must be ensured by the use of envelopes of a uniform kind.

It has sometimes been urged that the elections should take place outside the factory, but it is preferable that they should, so far as possible, be held in the factory—the workers would find in this procedure the necessary guarantee of independence; and if the question arose, you would be able to intervene in order to ensure it. It is always best for the elections to be proceeded with uninterruptedly. When the workers are employed on both day and night shifts, the elections should begin at the time when the day shift is leaving its work and the night shift is arriving. Most of the regulations assume that the elections will be held in the ordinary manner of political elections. In order to be elected on the first count, the candidate must secure the absolute majority of the votes cast, representing a number equal at least to one-fourth of the inscribed voters; on the second count a simple majority is sufficient, whatever may be the number of voters.

Both manufacturers and workmen have unanimously agreed that the elections should hold good for a year, and the right of re-election, in my judgment, ought to be unreservedly maintained. It is, indeed, advisable that the shop-stewards should carry on their functions for an extended period.

I have emphasised the individual character of the delegate's functions. It is advisable, however, that this should not be made too dogmatic. If we cannot contemplate the formation of factory delegations, the workshop delegation must be in a position to offer every guarantee to the workmen; and, with this end in view, it is desirable that the delegates should not be received by the employers one at a time, but that claims should be investigated in the presence of either the chief delegate and the assistant delegate, or the body of the delegates of a workshop or of a corporation representing similar interests.

The reception of the delegates may take place at least once a month, according to a notice posted in the workshops; but in urgent cases the delegates concerned must be received on request, apart from the regular reception days.

In factories of average size, where such a procedure is possible, it is desirable that the director should himself receive the delegates. In larger establishments, where this practice cannot be followed, it would be advisable for the director to nominate a departmental head of long experience or special knowledge for each of the principal groups in the workshops. The director would reserve to himself the right to receive delegates in exceptional cases.

It should be remembered, in order that the work of the delegates may be simplified, that they must particularly intervene in contentious and delicate cases. The workman who believes himself to be aggrieved must present his claim to the foreman if it is a question of wages, or to the overseer or the head of the workshop if it is a matter relating to the work, scale, or discipline. The delegates must not be allowed to be obstructed in their action by an excessive number of claims. The workman must not bring his claim to the notice of the delegate unless the answer given to his first claim by the overseer or the foreman does not seem to him to be just.

Studies in Contemporary Mentality.

By Ezra Pound.

X.—THE BACKBONE OF THE EMPIRE.

In the periodicals we have examined hitherto we have found every evidence for the loss of Antwerp and the Gallipoli muddle; and no sign of a reason why England should have won the battle of the Marne or held the Ypres salient. The virtues recommended or implied by "The Strand Magazine" might have helped with the commissariat; the "Edinburgh" is but one voice, and a slow one; the editorial in the "Family Herald" is retrospective, and counterbalanced by the concurrent fiction in its pages. But I am morally certain that the Kaiser had never opened a copy of "Chambers' Journal," for no monarch who had ever perused this phenomenon could have hoped to starve England with U-boats or permanently to have wrested to himself the scarred soil of Belgium. The Hohenzollern may for three generations have subscribed to many English periodicals; from the bulk of them the decadence of the *Anglo-Saxon race was a not unlikely conclusion; people* fed on these things would "plump dead for neutrality." The poor simple German!! Thorough in so many things, he had neglected, to his cost, "Chambers' Journal."

The tone of this paper is indicated in such sentences as:

"On these the boy set to work with a quiet, dogged resolution that, after a while, met with its due reward." or:

"Buckle was a conscientious student, and worked ten hours daily for seventeen years before publishing."

Madame, one copy of this paper is sufficient to form your boy's character—and irrevocably. It is the Nelson Column, the Bull-dog breed, the backbone of the Empire, the Trafalgar Square among papers. I do not make mock of it. For three hours after first opening its pages I sat spell-bound, tense, muttering to myself the lines:—

"and man in tail-less terror
Fled shrieking to the hills."

At last we have escaped Shaw and Nietzsche. It is mentioned, in a curious article on President Wilson, that his parents read him Scott and Dickens in his boyhood. Since the date of these authors, the readers of "Chambers' Journal" must have read, I think, "Chambers' Journal" exclusively.

There is in this paper no intellectual vacillation, no Russian irresolution. I am glad to say that even God is almost eliminated. He is, I admit, referred to vaguely and occasionally, but, on the whole, He is metaphysical, and He has been, in practicality, replaced by the king, who says a few choice words over the body.

"'I regret to inform you, sir,' the captain said, addressing the king as his admiral. . . ."

"'Mc . . . was a brave man,' the King said, returning the captain's salute."

The officers and men stand rigidly to attention regretting that they had not shown more foresight in appreciating their paymaster's assistant.

A rear-admiral has congratulated "Chambers" on a former serial, in the words: "The 'Navy' as shown in the story is absolutely photographic." Of course the Navy *is* just the least shade, jest-the-wee-little-least shade "photographic." The rear-admiral is, unsuspectingly, a master of English. I should have searched for that word a long time.

However, let us turn backward to "Chambers' Journal." It is a dam fine thing that a man should have grit enough to die for his duty as he conceives it; or even that he should stick at something or other until he makes a good job of it. That is the beginning of "Chambers."

The "Strand" might have inculcated a few commercial virtues, but the "Strand" is a puny weakling compared with the strenuous "Chambers," Sam Smiles is a laggard and sluggard; he would have approved and despaired.

Style, of course, is not for them; they are wholly impervious; to rally them on their rhetoric would be as useless as trying to persuade a bronze lion with argument. No true Chambersite would regard a problem of style as anything but immoral, a sort of absinthe, an æstheticism in the worst sense of the term. We must meet them on their own ground, on the high moral tone of their subject matter.

Madame, one copy of this periodical . . . boy's character . . . and irrevocably!! Consider this outline of a story.

Will, sickly and the dullard of the class, had a stutter, and limped, but once having come upon a noble French motto, he was enabled to translate the same later and save his form from detention. This lit within his breast the spark of ambition. He diligently ascended the school to the tune of "On these the boy, etc." Issuing from school he was denied the advantages of a University education, but set to learn modern languages; he also took a course in non-stammer, and courses in physical exercise—"Ossa upon Pelion—Muller upon Sandow," is the phrase. The family noticed his improvement. The reader looks to the ad. col. There is, however, no ad. for the curing of stammer, only "Wincarnis," "Electricity Victorious (infinite joy of health)," "Could you lift a ton?" Mind and Memory, Don't wear a truss, and Eno's as usual.

However, "Will" is not content with these mentioned advances; his lame leg still handicaps him; he consults a doctor; he does not want his family to be worried; his father gives him a vacation; he conceals his whereabouts, and has the limp rectified. Possibly the long leg is sawed off a bit to bring it level with the short one. Anyhow, war is declared. One expects it (from the tone of the sentences) to be the Crimean, but we come on a mention of khaki. It must be the Boer war! But no! it is our own Armageddon. "Will" turns up in uniform to the unmingled delight and wonder of his admiring family. "Stutter, limp, rotten chest, no muscle," what of it? Invictis! Dogged as does it! Let no man despair.

We are next told that "The Discoveries of Genius Alone Remain." Buckle's steadfastness is cited, also the marvellous padded passage of Buckle containing this sentence. Breechloaders and percussion-caps seem to be the "discoveries" most in the mind's eye of the writer. The dilatoriness of the War Office in recognising inventions is sternly censured.

Hold this in mind, I shall refer to it later. Or no,

let us turn at once to the article "Agriculture as a fine art." I had thought arts beneath them, but the art of the hedger and ditcher is proclaimed for its craftiness. "Canopied by azure glimpsed between a shower of snowy petals decked with virginal green," the virtuous agriculturist perseveres in skill far surpassing that of the theoretical layman. Excellent, excellent. The plowman replete with primæval virtues, etc.

This is really dam fine. These people whom I thought so stern in their cult of efficiency have wrought round Hodge this mantle of poesy. They have rebuked the War Office for inefficiency. Their strenuous hold on tradition has led them to ignore the existence of steam ploughs, of steam tractors, or of any of the modern farm implements. They are truly a wonderful people.

One had best take their paper in due order.

Item 1. Story in the manner, more or less, of Walter Scott. "The air seemed truly to merit the epithet of filthy bestowed on it by one of Shakespeare's witches."

Item 2. Agriculture, as mentioned.

Item 3. Chap. XXXVII., of continued story, begins with farce Dickens, introduces a rough diamond, little cripple girl,

"'Oh, my God!' and huddling to the fence, Spike broke into a fierce and anguished sobbing" (The term "righteous ire" occurs not in this tale but in item 1). Continued effort contains also love interest "between those quivering, parted lips came a murmur of passionate prayer and pleading." Heroine legally married, presumably to high class gent. boxer, long resists consummating her marriage on the ground that her brother's intention or attempt to murder her spouse has declassed her for such honours of wedlock. Finest possible feelings displayed by all the "good" participants in the story.

Item 4. "Civilizing influence of Buffalo Bill." *Finale verbatim sic*: "Guess Bill's a greater civilizer than Julius Cæsar himself or any noble Roman of them all. Perhaps he was." Bill had succeeded in roping a few bronchos inside the precincts of the Coliseum, despite police prohibition.

Item 5. The self-helpful tale of the lame boy who began with a stammer and ended in uniform.

Item 6. Discoveries of genius, as mentioned.

Item 7. A Chaplain describes the front.

Item 8. The continued effort intrudes itself again.

Item 9. Typical British traveller from the wilds describes the relative merits of black races as servants, "get through a deal of hard work on very little food, etc." "Variety of rickshaw boys and found them willing enough. Bearing the white man's burden, why shouldn't the beggars . . .?"

Item 10. Continuation of Item 1.

Item 11. Shark stories.

Item 12. Effusion, by Mr. Bart Kennedy, beginning "Wine of the grape is good, but wine of the earth is better." "The most delicious I have ever tasted. . . . Finer was it than the finest wine of the grape that I have ever tasted. . . . We used to go to the Alhambra to drink it when day was nearing its close. It was an Italian count who first put me on to it. . . . A time will come to pass when the wine of the earth will have gone. . . . Man and his works and his heroes and his gods will be as nothing that has gone nowhere. And the earth will roll, a thing of desolation. When gone is the earth wine."

FOOTNOTE.—Mon Cher Bart, the scriptural prophecy refers only to more briny varieties of the liquid; the good book declares that the "sea" shall be no longer extant. You cannot possibly have been imbibing seawater in the Alhambra gardens. The total absence of *fresh* water is specified only in hell; around the throne of the Redeemer the ever-flowing water of life will doubtless be found an apératif, palatable substitute. —E. P.

This prose is followed by a poem beginning with "sweet violets," running on through "sward," "dawning of each happy day," "glories manifold," "yonder" and "rill." However, the pseudo Wordsworth has no more inversions in his rhyme than Mr. Bart Kennedy has in his prose dithyrambics on the potation of the aqueous fluid.

Item 14. Story of the man who hadn't the naval style and on whose corpse the King placed a verbal wreath.

Item 15. Effect of war on the nation's gold.

Further sections of items already mentioned.

Item 18. German doings in South America. The ethics of the Chançon de Roland. "The pagans are wrong the French are right," applied rather heavily to the Bosche.

Item 19. "A million a year down London drains."

Item 20. Poem.

Item 21 is devoted to President Wilson as follows: "In time so distant that even the history of this ghastly and fateful world-convulsion will be condensed by the historians into a page or two, the peroration of Woodrow Wilson's address to Congress will be given in full." "No man is more devoted to home life." P.S.—Considerations of space tore me from the contemplation of "Chambers."

The Empire owes its status to its moral priority. I mean that Herbert of Cherbury, or someone from whom he cribbed it, perceived before continental nations the advantage of some sort of probity. That Hesperian bloom, Benj. Franklin, condensed it into his aphorism on "Best policy," but long before his day England had seen the superiority of a moral claim to naïve Machiavellianism, such as lately practised by the Bosche. So long as you have a strong moral case you are, perforce, either a conqueror or a martyr, and the bones of the martyrs are excellent fuel for rebellions. The children's children of the oppressors, however efficient, may at any moment be called on to pay. "Chambers," which is more full of self-helpful maxims than any German possibly could be, has taken a firm stand on this pedestal. Its moral foregoneness is most bracing. Heroes are bred on such reading matter, and possibly blockheads.

The only other problem that faces us is that of rhetoric. Is it necessary to drug the young with such doses of it, in order to bring them up to the scratch? I dare say it is. "Chambers" has lasted a long time. The mind, set like a rock, and immobile as to two-thirds of its possible excursions and activities, may be driven concentrated into the remaining territory, OR it may acquire the habit of immobility.

If anyone wants to know how people wrote and thought in 1832, "Chambers" is available; and if anyone is so naïve an utopian that he imagines that people no longer think in exactly that manner, there is the continued circulation of "Chambers" to confute him.

The ethic of "Chambers" is enough to terrorise any foreign nation to the point of a declaration of war; its tone, its lack of mental flexibility is enough to terrify them from it. It is so obvious that people, thinking as they do, can conceive nothing short of owning *all* the earth. It seems so likely that, having acquired it, they would permit no artist to live; would permit no mental experiments, no questioning of their excellent Lacedæmonian dogma; only in their one great gleam of stupidity (their ignorance of farm machinery in the year 1917) can one take comfort. They are dangerous if unwatched, but such stupidity, though a peril to neighbouring States, will probably be unable to close *all* the loopholes wherethrough an intelligent man might escape. As a wall of brass around Britain, i.e., on the purely defensive, I can conceive nothing superior, save foresight and intelligence, qualities much too rare to be counted on.

Drama.

By John Francis Hope.

The autumn season has begun, and I feel inclined to imitate the dormouse; several new plays have been produced, and according to the reports written by other critics, they are excellent. When I have stopped sneezing, I may go and sniff at them; meanwhile, I have been reading a play that has not been produced, although I believe that it was on the list of the intended productions of the Stage Society, but the war—well, this is a terrible war, as we all know. The play is written by a contributor to this journal under the pseudonym of "Saint George," who must not be confused with that national saint of ours who was born at Epiphania in Cilicia, became rich by supplying the army with bacon, was jobbed into the episcopal throne of Alexandria, and was lynched when Julian arrived there in A.D. 361. Our "Saint George" is neither an army contractor nor a Churchman, nor do I intend to lynch him, although he has written a play, which, I may as well say now, is called, "Paradise Found"; but between my snuffles, I hope to be his Chorus, and the Chorus, it may be remembered, was usually critical of the performers.

"Saint George" has taken for his dragon Mr. George Bernard Shaw, I hope "by kind permission of his victim"; and with reminiscences of Bellamy and H. G. Wells, has made the sleeper awake in a world governed in accordance with his ideas. Shaw, it seems, was taken seriously while he was asleep, and he awoke in a world in which joking was punished by a fine of forty shillings. "Saint George," I may suggest, need not have imposed this self-denying ordinance upon himself, for a satirical burlesque is none the worse for being witty; and as only the performers are living in this ideal world, a few jeux d'esprits would help the audience to maintain that comfortable belief in its superiority to the actors which is the real effect of all successful farce. The most humorous passages of this play are the omissions, which can only be read by initiates; for example, the "Most Noble Order Of Hereditary Fabians" includes no descendant of the Webbs. But it is precisely subtlety of that kind which is not dramatic, but intellectual; it cannot be acted, and is therefore unsuitable for the stage. A play must be judged primarily and principally by what it does; the audience has no other means of discovering what the author intends than by hearing and seeing what his characters say and do, and farce more particularly depends for its success on the violence of the contrast between the seriousness of the characters and the absurdity of the situation. Farce is tragedy out of place; comedy alone can allow for the finer shades of naturalness, but the characters of farce must mean much and mean intensely in a situation either devoid of meaning or full of a different meaning.

"Saint George," it seems to me, has set the tone of his play too low for farce, too near the normal "naturalism" of the repertory theatre; while, at the same time, he has not allowed his characters enough literary distinction, sufficiently subtle characterisation, to make a successful comedy. This is not a play of people, but of types v. situation: the conception is farcical, occasionally the treatment is farcical (for example, the moving staircase scene in the second act is pure knockabout farce), but generally the treatment is toned down to permit of a subtlety of satire in the "naturalistic" style that is more akin to the spirit of comedy than of farce. For example, the opening scene between the teacher and his scholars, and the following scene wherein the Hereditary Fabians debate the authenticity of their history, has point only for the Matthew Arnolds who regard history as "a vast Mississippi of falsehood." There is nothing intrinsically funny in a teacher purveying even obviously false history to a collection of children, and unless the contrast between his seriousness and the absurdity of his information is really violent, the farcical effect is not obtained. The fact that the only historical authority for this lesson is a half-burnt file of the "Daily Mail" is another instance of what I mean by "Saint George's" intellectual subtlety; the point could only be successfully made to a selected audience, for a general audience would surely include many persons holding the belief that the "Daily Mail" was a reliable authority on contemporary history. But to the selected audience, the jibe at the "Daily Mail" would be commonplace; "Saint George" would be accused of banality by the only audience that could understand his point.

That is the chief difficulty that I feel about the play. It is full of satirical reference that only a selected audience could understand, and to them the points would be obvious, and the style not witty enough; although when I remember how the Stage Society enjoyed the works of the author of "The Inca of Perusalem," I wonder whether I am setting the standard too high. After all, I am not the Stage Society. But to a general audience, the treatment is not consistently farcical; it does not climb up to a crisis of absurdity by a climax of seriousness. That Shaw should join the Anti-Shavian League, and should urge a public meeting to destroy the Shaw Memorial Hall, is a characteristically Shavian situation; but obviously, it could be no more successful in its appeal to a general audience than was Shaw himself. This is the Shaw of the lectures and the literature, both of which appeal only to a selected audience; the Shaw of the plays made a different appeal, and I may remark that "Man and Superman" was most successful theatrically when it was played breathlessly as a farce. Besides, Shaw *chooses* to join the Anti-Shavian League, and a farcical character must be obviously a creature of destiny, must be hurried against his will into situations which he cannot control. At the end of the act, when his three wives rush in to claim him, the farcical situation is properly rendered; the marriage by proxy at the offices of the Connubial Board has the fateful touch so necessary to farce, the fact that the marriages run consecutively in fortnightly periods adds the touch of absurdity to the fate that has befallen him. That is pure farce; but he *chose* to address a public meeting, and that is a lapse into serious intention (for he explains himself successfully, instead of fatally), which not even the mechanical devices of the moving staircase and the mechanical chairman can lift into absurdity. The "comrades" are not funny, nor is Shaw's triumph over their hostility farcical; the scene is a lapse into the world of reason where men are convinced by argument, or, at least, oratory of a kind.

The third act could easily have proceeded from what, indeed, is suggested in it, the jealousy of his wives; and, by the way, "Saint George" makes the fatal farcical blunder in this act of sparing the victim the knowledge of his danger. Certainly the audience is aware of it; but the farcical effect depends on the victim's consciousness or fear of the impending calamity, and "Saint George" has already scattered that effect by using it very effectively against the Hereditary Fabians. Once again, too, the satirical intention has reduced the quality of the humour to banality; the Maharajah's official humour is not enough to sustain interest for a whole act. The defect of the play is its variety of effects, not one of which has a universal appeal or is consistently produced; and I think it would be better enjoyed in reading than in performance, although it is quite capable of being performed with some success. But it could have been a screaming farce if the satirical intention had been suppressed.

Readers and Writers.

WITH this week's issue THE NEW AGE reaches its majority in volumes. Ten and a half years, twenty-one volumes. There are, I should say, no more than a dozen complete sets extant, but lucky in every way are the possessors of them. For they have not merely a contemporary history and a library, but they have their original money's-worth in a saleable asset, whose value is always increasing. Volumes originally bought for four and six are now worth a guinea in the ordinary market; and as their number decreases by fire, flood, lightning, accident and short-sighted neglect, the price of the survivors is increased. Their money-value is, however, a poor criterion of their real value; the second-hand dealers may look at them of this point of view, but it behoves us to regard them in a higher light. For various purposes I have lately had to turn over most of the pages of the past volumes. Believe me, I could scarcely ever find what I was looking for from my interest in everything else. It is worse than looking for a needle in a bottle of hay; it is like looking for a needle in a needle-factory. I only escaped after hours that should have been minutes, and even then with my original purpose incompletely fulfilled. Volumes of this enchantment are not to be entered without consideration. Perhaps, after all, the possessors of them are not so much to be envied as pitied!

* * *

We begin our adult life next week in good heart, with a wholesome modesty for the things we have already accomplished, and with a wholesome ambition to do better in future. That THE NEW AGE is as yet only an acknowledged influence, and not an acknowledged power, is a matter for humorous regret, but certainly not for serious complaint. Forbid that this should ever become a paper with a personal grievance. As it is, we owe no grudge and feel no resentment to anybody for their treatment of THE NEW AGE. We have given everybody such excuses for avoiding us that it is no wonder we are without resentment in a world fairly full of it: it is easy to forgive one's victims. On the other hand, they will all one day realise that they have been made our victims for no personal or petty reasons. Unless there has been a public duty to be discharged, I think that upon no occasion has a hard word been said of a soul in these pages; and our readers may, at any rate, be sure that our motives, in any case, have lain upon the surface, and have had no secret sources in advertisements, personal friendships or enmities, personal ambitions, or the like. Our one object, I am not ashamed to confess, is to do good, or, rather, to get the good done. By whomsoever the good is done the world is improved thereby—what matters it, then, who does it? Let us continue to stimulate one another in building Jerusalem in England's green and pleasant land. The foundations have already been laid upon the plan of National Guilds. Precisely while I am writing this, someone has shown me the leading article in the "Times" of to-day's date (October 19) in which acknowledgment is for the first time made of the influence of "the Guild Socialists" in bringing about the complete transformation of the Labour party into a National party. This is a proof that THE NEW AGE has not laboured in vain, for who has desired this transformation if not we, who has not worked for it if not my honoured colleagues? May they take heart from this evidence and continue content in their honourable obscurity. Them and you, our faithful readers, I salute in the name of the new age, and of THE NEW AGE its imperfect instrument. To all who wish the world well!

* * *

This affecting passage in an otherwise impeccably unsentimental column having been made, I must now proceed in my usual stride. My gait, however, will be unsteady for a paragraph or two, for I must still be talking shop. To begin with, my recent list of books republished in whole or in part from THE NEW AGE requires amendment, as I said it would. One omission is that of "War-Time Lectures," by Professor E. V. Arnold, published by Messrs. Allen and Unwin at one shilling. The sale of this work, I believe, has been very satisfactory. The same publishers have also notified me that they are now the publishers of the two volumes of parody and satire by Mr. J. C. Squire, which were attributed to the now extinct firms of Swift and Latimer. Another "forthcoming announcement," if not two, might also have been included in the list. This is "We Moderns," by Mr. Edward Moore, which Messrs. Allen and Unwin have undertaken to publish. The other, about which, however, there is still a little doubt in my mind, is a certain series of "Tales for Men Only," by one R. H. Congreve. My doubt is upon the following ground, if I may trouble you with it for a moment. That series was designed to be the first of a Trilogy representing in successive phases the whole problem of the relations of Men and Women in the forms of Hominism, Feminism, and Humanism. "Tales for Men Only" was to be followed by "Tales for Women Only," and these were to be resolved in a concluding sequel of "Tales for Men and Women Only." The two later phases, however, I have not yet written; yet without them the first will certainly give the little world that reads them a misleading impression of my views about men and women. The wrong sort of man would feel himself flattered by them; and the right sort of woman would feel herself hurt by them—a double offence I do not wish to be guilty of. What, then, should I do? Provisionally, I have agreed to publish the first series with a warning note that they form only the first series, and an introduction cautioning their readers to beware of laughing first and not last. And probably that it is what I shall do.

* * *

By a coincidence that I cannot believe to have been undesigned, the majority of THE NEW AGE falls in with the announcement of a second edition of "National Guilds," published by Messrs. Bell at five shillings. This is quite an event in itself, and its significance can scarcely be unrelated to the recent tide in the popular discussion of the subject. Some years ago, on the appearance of the first edition of this epoch-making work, it was promised in THE NEW AGE that the name of its anonymous writer should be published in the second edition, together with that of the named editor; and this promise is to be carried out. My readers, however, will have guessed the secret long ago, for we cannot plume ourselves that it has been too well kept. Who could the writer have been but my colleague, Mr. S. G. Hobson, the editor of Anthony Farley's Letter and Papers, and the author of "Guild Principles in Peace and War," and of many other articles in these pages? You are right, it is he; and the new edition of "National Guilds" will appear as written by Mr. S. G. Hobson and edited by the Editor of THE NEW AGE. The latter's work, "An Alphabet of Economics," was duly published last week by Mr. Fisher Unwin at the war-price of four and six net. Orders, if you please, may be sent directly to this office. Mr. Orage is not responsible for the announcements of the publisher, and least of all for the reference to him as an exponent of "Guild Socialism." I trust, therefore, that neither the book nor the author will suffer on their account. It amused me yesterday to anticipate the reviews that will (or not) be published in the general Press of a work signed by the editor of this journal. They will probably be neither serious nor complimentary. A sniff here, a dig there, and a bite in another place are all that can

be expected. But it is no matter. The reviewing Press has so much written itself down that it can no longer write anything either up or down. The reading public has its own means of arriving at a just judgment; and the Press can only delay, it cannot affect it otherwise. "An Alphabet of Economics" will, like THE NEW AGE, sell and do its work in silence.

* * *

I have two items to mention before closing this volume. There are in hand a number—a score or so—of the companion volume to THE NEW AGE containing the caricatures contributed to these pages by the Polish artist who called himself "Tom Titt." They are wonderfully brilliant and their lustre does not fade. These few remaining copies of a fair-sized edition are on sale at five shillings; and the office would be better pleased with their room than with their company. Lastly, I have to thank my readers for their response to my recent appeal for direct subscriptions. Not for nothing, after all, were my knees worn to the bone, for my prayers have been answered. Within the last few weeks the direct subscriptions to THE NEW AGE have been almost doubled in number; and it is only the exaggeration of surprise and gratitude to say that they are still pouring in. No better coming-of-age gift could possibly have been sent to me. I am pleased for the editor, I am pleased for my colleagues, I am pleased with my readers, and I am pleased with myself. And all these pleasures are innocent, for only the middleman is twopence the worse for them. But for committing an anti-climax, I should compose another passage of sentiment. Art, however, is always to leave off. R. H. C.

That Terrible Revolution.

By Triboulet.

(OFFICE of General Manager of the Moonshine Soap Company, Port Moonshine. Trine, the general manager, and Sutton, the secretary of the company, stand staring at Rade, a deputy of the Moonshine Works' Committee.)

RADE (who is about to go out): You have made a mistake, gentlemen. The people have nothing against you personally. We appreciate your abilities, and the rumour that we only want certain officials dismissed is false. I'll repeat the real ultimatum. On Monday next we take over complete control of production in Port Moonshine. If you do not report yourselves to the Committee before Monday you are dismissed. That will be a pity, and we know it, but we have capable men to take your places. I've said enough. All I add to the ultimatum is "good morning." (He goes out.)

TRINE: Thank God, Lord Lover will return this afternoon!

SUTTON: I've made up my mind. I sympathise——

TRINE (savagely): What's that?

SUTTON: It was a nightmare to think that a hundred thousand souls should find a complete life in a soapery.

TRINE: Rubbish! The fact that the material base of Moonshine is soap does not diminish the nobility of Lord Lover's work.

SUTTON: It is private profit, not soap, that spoils the nobility.

TRINE: No mob phrases, please. I admit Lord Lover made a mistake. He gave these people cleanliness, pretty houses, comfortable workshop and home conditions, but he could not make them happy.

SUTTON: Yes, that is a miracle. After generations of social reform movements which promised nothing but a little more cake the people don't say "thank you," but they throw the cake in your face and demand power. It makes my heart leap, and I'll offer my humble services to the Work's Committee. You must come with me.

TRINE: I'll see you hanged first. I hate democrary.

SUTTON: You hate democracy! I always thought you were a Liberal.

TRINE: So I am. Lord Lover is one. (He looks suspiciously at Sutton.) It is strange how one minute of alarm reveals what has been concealed for years while we worked together. I see you are a very ordinary fellow, Sutton.

SUTTON: You always talked like his lordship's pious butler, but I thought that was only your business style. This day of emancipation shows you up. My dear fellow, you don't owe Lord Lover anything. He has spent his life supplying the community with a useful commodity simply because of his interest in the manufacture of a by-product, profit.

TRINE: I believe the by-product was the soap.

SUTTON: Now you talk sense. You cannot think it is unjust to dispossess him. Now that labour claims its labour-power as property the values of all dead property are transformed.

TRINE: In these days any fool knows that.

SUTTON: What, even you, Trine!

TRINE: What about it? I don't bother with elementary morality; but I tell you I hate democracy. I choose to stand by the master, not the anti-master.

SUTTON: The anti-master is master on Monday.

TRINE: Don't you believe it. Go over to the Committee, you simpleton. Lord Lover and I will put you on the losing side.

SUTTON: (laughing): You!

TRINE: I suppose you have as little respect for me as I have for you. It is natural. We have been twenty years in this business without daring to speak out. We discover each other at the opening of the great civil war.

SUTTON: There'll be no civil war, no disturbance, not the squeak of a hinge.

TRINE: There'll be bloodshed and the wailing of widow and orphans. I can hear the shrieks of the dead and the dying. The blood will be upon the people's head. Capitalism has not produced the strong, hard type of master for nothing. In the past the masters have only fought with kid gloves on. Look at Lord Lover! He has a reputation for benevolence. His pamphlets and his speeches show his gentle humanitarianism. There was only one thing in the working-class movement he discouraged, and that was trade unionism, but when he found ways of dealing with democratic organisations he was not slow to recognise them, and make concessions in a graceful manner. Why? Because he knew that the time for open war had not arrived. At his back stands his class. If the workers make the ultimate demand, as they do now, he will prove how well he can champion his class and his interests.

SUTTON: I don't admire him, but he is not so black as that. Some people call him a hypocrite, but——

TRINE: Let them call him what they like. He will be the only master.

SUTTON: But, Trine, has he really a chance?

TRINE: To hear you speak, one would think you were educated at a board-school. You talk like a working-class person. If all the high officials in industry had been as weak-kneed as you there would have been twenty revolutions. We must trust the upper classes, Sutton. It is that trust that has made a solid salariat. What else explains it? Not money, not love, but we don't trust them for nothing.

SUTTON: What do we trust them for?

TRINE: I don't think it is safe to speak to you. You have no ideals and you won't appreciate mine.

SUTTON: Why?

TRINE: I look a gentle, peaceful individual. I dress so, I speak so. That has been my business. I believe that not only my figure and general air but my thoughts represent the best members of the salariat in the country. Every time I have seen the working classes gain a point my blood has boiled, but I repressed my anger when I saw how coolly my superior acted. I admit I did not like his public declarations about industrial reform, but at last I understood the deep purpose of the man. Men like him are pieces of rock in the desert.

SUTTON: There is no rock about Lord Lover.

TRINE: You have gone no deeper than appearances. It needs nerve, fortitude, self-reliance, and a strong passionate heart to stand for anti-democratic government in industry in these days.

SUTTON: I must go, Trine. I do want to laugh. What a ferocious fellow you are! If you don't fix up about Monday, I'm sure your wife will be vexed with you.

TRINE: Hang my wife! That is to go no further than ourselves, Sutton. This is no ordinary time. When Lord Lover comes——

SUTTON: He comes. I hear a car.

TRINE: Then you had better go. I shall certainly tell his lordship who are his friends and who his enemies. That is my duty, and I wish to spare you from a painful situation.

SUTTON: Do not be alarmed for me. I shall stay, for I must tell his lordship why I leave him. I'll do nothing underhand. (Enter Lord Lover.)

LOVER: I am here to time. I only got news of your difficulty when I was in Aberdeen. Johnston met me at Edinburgh, and told me as much as he could of the matter.

TRINE: Ah, I am glad you have come. I could not stand by myself.

LOVER: The whole affair is painful, and I am sorry, Trine, that there does not seem to be any way to save you if the people are as Johnston says.

TRINE: Save me! What do you mean?

LOVER: Believe me, Trine, it cuts me to the heart to think that I have to lose you because the people have taken offence at your management.

TRINE: But——

LOVER: At first I felt desperate. I resolved to keep you in face of all other workers. I felt the old fighting instinct stir in me. But it all resolved to a question of the definiteness of the demand. We conceded when they asked to appoint foremen, and the question of appointment of managers follows.

TRINE: If they ask for me to be dismissed they will ask for more to-morrow.

LOVER: I think they will.

TRINE: And is not every demand a declaration of war? You are one of the leading representatives of your class, and to-day the prestige of your class is in danger.

LOVER: Where have you learned this unchristian language, Trine? Some misguided people speak like that, but I have always maintained that there should be no hostility of classes.

TRINE: But you didn't believe it!

LOVER: My dear fellow, what is wrong with you? You don't charge me with public lying, do you? I never would listen to class talk. I started years ago to make equality in this town. On the very day the Trade Union Congress agreed to demand an eight-hour day for everybody, I advocated a six-hour day. I work longer than that myself. The public knows I believe in democracy, and democracy must have tender treatment when on trial. That was why I considered the proposals for electing staff managers.

TRINE: And you won't fight?

LOVER: Fight whom?

TRINE: These greedy ignorant people.

LOVER: Good gracious, are you mad? We want social peace, not war.

TRINE: Do you mean to say that all your cheap platform sentiment is genuine?

LOVER: I hope my public utterances will never give my private professions the lie.

TRINE: I don't believe you. How subtly, how dexterously you can play! You act in this way because you do not think it is time to take your gloves off.

LOVER (looking at his hands): You amaze me! I have no gloves on.

TRINE: You think the people only want me dismissed. That is a false rumour. I am fairly popular. The demand they make to-day concerns you alone. On Monday they will take over complete control in Moonshine. What your position will be after that, God knows.

LOVER (very serenely, turning to Sutton): Is this really the position?

SUTTON: It is.

LOVER: I have always wondered when they would come to the point, and finish bothering about foremen and managers.

TRINE: Doesn't your blood boil?

LOVER: Not at all.

TRINE: But my blood boils, and I'm only one of the salariat.

LOVER: That is quite natural.

TRINE: Don't you think this is the time for merciless action?

LOVER: What do you mean, Trine?

TRINE: Don't you see that to-day will decide whether industry is to be ruled from above or from below?

LOVER: No, that was decided five years ago.

TRINE: Five years ago!

LOVER: It was the day the last strike for wages took place, and the unions began to organise exclusively for control. I gave up then.

TRINE: You were afraid; afraid of the civil war.

LOVER: When the workers made up their minds they wanted control of capital through control of labour-power the revolution commenced and finished. The civil war between wages and profits was a myth. At first we discouraged the idea; we slandered the movement, but what else could we do? Men could not practice control by striking, but by staying in and only working well under favourite leaders: they did it. We could not use the lock-out because the people would have continued working, and been forced to devise immediate means for complete control. You could not lock out men who kept registers of prospective foremen and managers, and had sound banks full of their own capital. The lock-out was smashed morally when the men made work efficiency the honour of their unions. I was never romantic, Trine. I like peace and comfort, so I simply waited for the inevitable conclusion, and prided myself on the fact that I was one of the few in England who saw the success of the greatest revolution which made less noise than an angel walking on snow. I'll go and see the Work's Committee at once. Let us go together.

TRINE (staggering): But—but—but—but—but——

SUTTON (leading him to the door): Bear up! Take comfort from the fact that though you hate democracy, dmocracy doesn't hate you. It is a merciful monster.

Views and Reviews.

THE PROPAGANDA OF SUFFERING.

My recent remarks on the conscientious objectors have elicited a suggestion which is worthy of some consideration. It is to this effect, that unconstitutional resistance to a law is sometimes necessary even to the initiation of a constitutional resistance, that a person who has no other remedy, or none, at least, that can be quickly applied, is justified in his refusal to obey the law. Mr. Justice Stephen told us that there is no legal remedy for unjust legislation; political agitation for repeal is a long process, and during that time much injury may be effected; in what other way can a protest be made, can the public even be made aware of the injustice of the law, but by individual defiance of it and suffering of the consequences? The blood of the martyrs is the seed of the Church, and their suffering may be the necessary inspiration of the resistance that will result in the repeal of the obnoxious Act. Grant that it is rebellion, yet rebellion is sometimes the necessary condition of good government.

Let me say at once that no one, not even Dicey, denies the sacred right of revolution. In the last edition of his "Law of the Constitution," published in 1915, he says: "Happily, crises arise from time to time in the history of any great State when, because national existence or national independence is at stake, the mass of a whole people feel that the authority of the nation is the one patent and the one certain political fact. To these causes of lawlessness, honesty compels the addition of one cause which loyal citizens are most anxious not to bring into prominence. No sensible man can refuse to admit that crises occasionally, though very rarely, arise when armed rebellion against unjust and oppressive laws may be morally justifiable. This admission must certainly be made by any reasoner who sympathises with the principles inherited by modern Liberals from the Whigs of 1688. But this concession is often misconstrued; it is taken sometimes to mean that no man ought to be blamed or punished for rebellion if only he believes that he suffers from injustice, and is not pursuing any private interest of his own." The conscientious objector, then, is really claiming the right to act according to the revolutionary principle, but is ignoring the qualifying conditions, and is, therefore, exalting rebellion to the status of a political policy, and, as such, it is a most fatal policy.

For if the principle prevails, it will be differently interpreted by different people. The conscientious objectors suffer, but the militant suffragettes inflicted suffering; Ulster was preparing to plunge into civil war in resistance to what it regarded as unjust legislation. The conscientious objectors cannot dissociate themselves from these associations either by their good intentions or their passive resistance; once it is admitted that any man who is affected by a law has a right to resist the administration of the law, it is impossible to repudiate any particular form of resistance without denying the right of other people to choose, as you do, what they regard as the most suitable method. The burglar would be morally justified in shooting the policeman, the employers, in strangling the collectors of Excess Profits Tax, the jerry-builder, in drowning the surveyor who condemned his plans or workmanship. Every one who felt that he was unjustly treated by any law would be justified in taking whatever steps seemed to him most suitable for effective resistance, if this principle were to be admitted. The passage of any Act of Parliament would be the signal of rebellion by the persons affected, for repeal is a slow process which is, therefore, not worthy of trial.

I turn to my beloved Stepniak, who was a real revolutionist, and not a dabbler in revolutionary theory. In his essay on "Terrorism in Russia and in Europe" (and terrorism, I must repeat, is only one expression of the principle maintained by the conscientious objectors), he argues that "terrorism has no raison d'être on European soil, and will, therefore, not succeed in forming for itself the indispensable surrounding of a mass of sympathisers and supporters." It may be remembered that there was an outbreak of imitative assassination following the Vera Zassoulitch affair, and President Garfield was murdered by one inspired by the Russian example. But this was how the "Narodnaia Volia" referred to the calamity: "While expressing profound sympathy with the American people in the death of President James Abram Garfield, the Executive Committee feels itself obliged to protest in the name of the Russian revolutionary party against all acts of violence like that which has been perpetrated. In a country where the liberty of the subject allows peaceful discussion of ideas, where the will of the people not only makes the law, but chooses the person by whom it is administered—in such a country as this, political assassination is a manifestation of the identical despotic tendency, to the destruction of which we are devoting ourselves in Russia. Despotism, whether wielded by individuals or by parties, is equally condemnable, and violence can only be justified when it is opposed to violence." One needs to be a most thorough revolutionist really to appreciate the benefits of law and order.

But I object to the invocation of the sacred right of revolution by the conscientious objectors for yet another reason. It is only just over fifty years since the franchise was extensively granted to the people of this country, and more than ever Bagehot's warning needs to be remembered. "The common ordinary mind is quite unfit to fix for itself what political question it shall attend to; it is as much as it can do to judge decently of the questions which drift down to it, and are brought before it; it almost never settles its topics; it can only decide upon the issues of these topics." It is quite clear that if men of otherwise unblemished character attempt, by a propaganda of suffering, to popularise the revolutionary principle of resistance to any law, and succeed in that propaganda, they will have perverted popular government into popular revolution, and, as Bagehot says, "the great political trial now beginning will fail. The wide gift of the elective franchise will be a great calamity to the whole nation, and to those who gain it as great a calamity as to any." What is more necessary than ever is that people should recognise their responsibility in election, should recognise that, in casting their vote, they have yielded their political power to their representative, and are in honour bound to respect their own choice. It is a defect of human nature that, as Dicey puts it, "while every man of at all respectable instincts desires what he considers justice for himself and for the class to which he belongs, almost all men desire something more than, and different from, justice for themselves and against their neighbours." If people are to be encouraged to believe that they can elect their legislators, and retain the right to resist the application of the laws made by them, there is no means of making them understand the fundamental principle of self-government, that they are themselves responsible for the laws of the land. Luckily, the people of this country have wisdom enough to abide by the consequences of a choice that is usually rather foolish, and the conscientious objectors find themselves without public approval and support. If, for no other reason than this, the conscientious objectors would be politically wrong; for what people do not sympathise with, they are not ready for, and they are certainly not yet ready for the repeal of the Military Service Acts.

But even as propaganda, the tactics of the con-

scientious objectors are ill-chosen. The blood of the martyrs may have been the seed of the Church, but the Church, I may remark, is supporting this war, in spite of the fact that the early Christians suffered for pacifism. But I doubt whether martyrdom really appeals to the English people; I think it is precisely because the conscientious objectors adopt a *passive* resistance to the Act that they find themselves without substantial support in the country. Emerson said of the English: "They are good at storming redoubts, at boarding frigates, at dying in the last ditch, or any desperate service which has daylight and honour in it, but not, I think, at enduring the rack, or any passive obedience, like jumping off a castle-roof at the word of a czar." The conscientious objectors, so far as they have any political importance, are appealing to a national sentiment that does not exist, in a manner that is unsuitable; they are wasting themselves in useless suffering, instead of advancing their cause with the English people, and hastening the day of repeal. A. E. R.

Reviews.

A Bulwark Against Germany. By Bogumil Vosnjak. (Allen and Unwin. 4s. 6d. net.)

Mr. Vosnjak was, at one time, Lecturer at the University of Lagreb, and it may be presumed that he knows the history of the Slovenes, which he here recounts, and can utilise it effectively for the propaganda of the Jugo-Slav idea among his compatriots. But as an appeal to the Powers of Europe to set up a Jugo-Slav State as a bulwark against Germany, this book is absurd. The fundamental fact that, since Charlemagne conquered them, the Slovenes have been subject to Teutonic influences, with an interval of four years under Napoleon, gives us an idea of the value of this "bulwark" of a million and a-half Slovenes; and even if we add the Serbo-Croats, whom Mr. Vosnjak numbers at eight and a-half millions, we have a nation of only ten millions against the eighty millions of Germans and Austrians. For the rest, Mr. Vosnjak writes about the Jugo-Slavs, and particularly the Slovenes, as though he were applying for a situation; for example, "in no Jugo-Slav country has the struggle between Slav and German been contested so fiercely as in the Slovene provinces," with what success we all know. It is a curious commentary on Mr. Vosnjak's sense of importance that Captain Temperley, enumerating in his "History of Serbia" the five great divisions of the Jugo-Slavs into Serbo-Croats of Croatia, Serbs of Dalmatia, Bosnians, Montenegrins, and the Serbians of Serbia, puts a footnote: "There are also the Slovenes, who inhabit Carniola and part of Styria east of the Tyrolese Alps. . . . The Croats alone among these peoples have persistently shown political gifts of a high order." Mr. Vosnjak would have been well advised to write his history as a history, and not as an appeal to Europe to create as a bulwark against Germany a Jugo-Slav State which the Austrians were thinking of as a bulwark against Hungary. "Trialism," although regarded by the late Emperor as too drastic a remedy for the defects of Dualism, none the less remains as a possible solution; and really, when Mr. Vosnjak tells us that the Slovenes have a peculiar aptitude for this, that, or the other, we smile.

None the less, if we can overcome our feelings, there is much of interest in this book about a people of whom not too much is known in this country. Mr. Vosnjak talks of their culture with the pride of a man who is surprised to find humanity intelligent, and boasts of their lack of a noble class and of traditions as though these defects were qualities. "The Slovene mentality, like the Serbian, possesses the characteristics peculiar to a nation without tradition, and only just about to form its society, the unexhausted strength, the primitive instinct, the aversion to the stilted differentiations accepted by the older nations. They are opposed to all that is formal and ceremonial, and incidentally to social artificiality and insincerity. It cannot be denied that there is something uncouth, sometimes even rude and immature, in types like these. The temperament is not yet fully controlled by social tact, that irreplaceable something which is only acquired in the course of generations. But all these deficiencies are balanced by an admirable adaptability which is peculiar to all the Jugo-Slavs." This we find anything but attractive.

The real interest for an English reader lies in the author's argument against Italian claims to Trieste and the Dalmatian sea-board, and his publication of some of the terms of the Treaty which, he alleges, has been made between Italy and the rest of the Allies. He tells us that the Treaty was extorted from Russia at the time of the great retreat of 1915, that it handed over the Adriatic to Italy, and will create a more troublesome European question than Alsace-Lorraine and the Danish question in Schleswig put together. More than a million of these "admirably adaptable" Jugo-Slavs will be handed over to Italy under this treaty; Italy, by dominating the Adriatic, will dominate the Jugo-Slav State of the future, she will make Jugo-Slavia, a dumping ground of Italian industry, and will have a monopoly of trade in the Balkans. "Perhaps they even think of directing the stream of Italian emigration towards the Balkans, and dotting the country with Italian colonies." But is not the adaptability of the Jugo-Slavs equal to it, and prepared for it? He boasts that "a love of intellectual life is far more innate in the Jugo-Slav people than in the German or Italian masses"; does he then fear that Italian immigration would lower the standard of living in the Balkans, or debase the intellectual currency of the Jugo-Slavs? We beg him to put his thoughts into some shape; not to waste his time arguing against the Imperialism of the Teutons and the Latins (after all, the Anglo-Saxons have a little Imperialism left), but to expound his Jugo-Slav idea. Is it in any way connected with the Pan-Slav idea; are we to contemplate an alliance between a Jugo-Slav State and the Northern Slav State of Russia? Are we to contemplate this admirably adaptable people with no traditions, and with elementary political ideas, stretching from the Ural Mountains to the Adriatic, and talking to Europe of their culture? Of Russia, all that Stepniak could prophesy was: "A nation of labourers, she is to bring to the brotherhood of nations something peculiarly her own, in the development of new forms of labour." Of the Jugo-Slavs we can hope not even this.

Russian Poetry Reader. Edited by A. E. Semeonoff and H. J. W. Tillyard. (Kegan Paul. 1s. 6d. net.)

Although this is mainly an educational work, it deserves a little more notice than it is likely to receive in the "educational" papers. The selection consists of twenty-six poems by Pushkin, Lermontov, Krylov, Koltsov, Nekrassov and Nadson. Among these items there are a few of those dull pieces of verse that inexplicably wander from anthology to anthology, and seem to gain prestige by so doing. But for the most part the editors have shown good taste in their choice of material and common sense in handling it with a view to the student's needs. By an oversight the heading "Nadson" has been transferred to p. 54 from p. 53 where it belongs. Otherwise there is little fault to find with the introduction and notes from which a good deal of Russian can be learnt in what is one of the pleasantest ways of making its acquaintance.

Pastiche.

THE 'EATHEN.

A Syrian gentleman entered the early morning tram with a sigh of relief, glad enough to deposit his pack of gaudy carpets in an empty corner. He wore a red fez and a long robe of dirty white. His complexion was sallow and greasy, but he had a curly moustache and deep eyes of liquid black. This is probably what caught the attention of the young woman in the picture hat. The eyes of romance do not gleam very often in Commercial Road at two o'clock in the morning.

She watched the Syrian carefully as he dozed in his corner, jerking up every now and then as the car crossed lines. Suddenly, her middle-aged escort, who wore a cloth cap and a blue muffler and an under-beered air, blinked and woke from a fitful slumber. She was still looking at the stranger, but it took him some time to grasp the fact. At length he did grasp it.

"'Ere!" He tugged her arm.

"Wotcher want?"

"Wot are you lampin' that plurry 'eathen for?"

"Stow it, Bill," said she. "Go ter sleep agin."

"Yus, an' 'ave you makin' eyes at 'im."

"You're balmy, Bill."

"Swelp me, am I balmy?" He appealed loudly to the other passengers, who all woke up now and became interested. The Syrian alone slept on. "Wot do we 'ave them 'eathens for in England, corruptin' of our women folk with their Mormon ways!"

"'E ain't a Mormon, mate," suggested a dingy bricklayer, who wore a bowler hat most wonderfully indented. "'E ain't a Mormon." The bricklayer bent forward and paused, confidentially.

"Wot is 'e, then? Plurry 'eathen!"

"'E's a Christian, Bill," said the girl, rather anxiously.

"You shut yer jaw, Liz. 'E ain't no Christian. 'E's a bloomin' Eyetalian!"

"Ain't Eyetalians Christians, Bill?"

"Course they ain't. They're Cath'lics."

"Well, ain't Cath'lics Christians?"

"Lor, blimy!" Bill gasped with the effort of enlightening so dull an intelligence. "Er you a Christian?"

"Yes, Bill."

"Er you a Cath'lic?"

"No, Bill."

"Well, then, 'ow can Cath'lics be Christians?"

The girl shook her head, nonplussed, and Bill shook his head at her with sardonic satisfaction. At that moment the car came to a sudden stop, jerking the bricklayer out of his confidential stoop, and the Syrian out of his sleep. "City Road!" snapped the conductor, and beckoned to the Syrian. That gentleman, taking up his pack mechanically, shuffled along the aisle of the tram, oblivious to the seven pairs of eyes that were fixed upon him as the subject of a discussion among anthropological experts. "Careful, now," said the conductor, and helped him into the road, with a kindly arm.

"I'll tell yer wot 'e is," whispered the bricklayer. And not Bill and Liz alone, but the four other nondescripts in the car leant forward eagerly to catch the words of wisdom. The bricklayer paused again, He was a great believer, evidently, in the mysteries of pausing. Finally he spoke.

"Minjer," he said. "I don't wanter say anything aginst the man. But my nephew's a sailorman, and if that chap wasn't a Nindu Lascar, I'm a bloomin Dutchman."

"Are Indu Lascars 'eathens?" queried the tremulous and penitent Liz.

The bricklayer looked at her sternly.

"'Eathens?" . . . He paused yet once more, and looked significantly at Bill. . . . "'Eathens?"

"Ferringdon Street!" snapped the conductor. Bill rose, and bade "goo' night" to the bricklayer. Liz followed him unsteadily, and he turned to see why.

"Nar then!" He put his arm about her waist, gently and kindly. "Wotcher grizzlin' abart?"

LEOPOLD SPERO.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

A BOGUS WAR DEBT.

Sir,—It is monstrous that a huge War Debt should now be hanging like a sombre cloud over the workers, threatening to drive them to incessant toil for many years to come, when not one penny is really due by them, and when in actual fact they are now making a free gift of hundreds of millions annually to a lot of idle investors in War Loan, who have done nothing and sacrificed nothing, as such, towards carrying on the war.

In ancient days, before the invention of money, all the exchanges rendered necessary by war must have been made by barter, so that there could have been no war debts beyond pensions for disabled soldiers and indemnities exacted by a victorious enemy, which were paid in kind. Now money is merely a contrivance for avoiding the great inconvenience and waste of time and labour involved by barter, but the principle remains just the same—viz., that goods and services are still exchanged for other goods and services of equal value. Indeed, the rank and file of our sailors and soldiers are now paid partly by barter and partly by money: they receive their clothing, food, shelter, and medicine by direct barter for their defensive services, and their meagre pay conveys to them the few small luxuries they enjoy. It thus becomes apparent that the cheques and currency notes, which form 98 per cent. of our money to-day, are claims to goods and services, and therefore their value depends entirely on the power of their issuers to supply those goods and services. The warriors of ancient days were, no doubt, withdrawn from their ordinary productive work whenever they were required to defend the nation from the attack of some foreign foe, and were supplied with everything they required for carrying on the war by the labour of the rest of the community, just as has been the case with us during the last three years. And when they returned home from a successful campaign they were fully entitled to a period of rest after their arduous and dangerous work against the enemy, and the enjoyment of ample pensions for such of them as were disabled in the war. Should they have been confronted on their return home with a huge war debt, doubling itself every twenty years, and thus driving them to work harder than before their successful campaign, they would naturally ask what great service their creditors had rendered them to make them liable to meet such enormous claims, which exceeded many times over the value of all the arms and ammunitions, etc., supplied to them during the war.

And when they were informed truly that these creditors had performed no service whatever and contributed nothing in the form of goods, their indignation at such preposterous demands would have been no greater than that of our workers and fighters should be now, because the position is precisely the same as in the days of barter, the money nexus not altering it in the slightest degree.

The war is being paid for from day to day by the blood and wounds and exhausting toil of our heroic and wretchedly paid fighters, and by the labour of our workers in the fields and factories, who are maintaining a full and constant stream of supplies to them of everything they require for carrying on the war. The financing part of these huge operations consists merely of the necessary book-keeping and the printing of credit instruments in the form of cheques and currency notes, which should not cost more than 2s. 6d. for every £100, and cease altogether when the war is over; yet so dense is the ignorance of banking of our people that the cost of this comparatively trifling service is being made to exceed the cost of all our battleships, guns, aeroplanes, etc., and shedding a gloom over the household of every worker in the country.

The small investors in War Loans make no profit, because their taxes far exceed the interest they receive. They have been appealed to and brought into this vast scheme for the exploitation of the workers merely to throw dust in the eyes of the public and justify the operations of the big financiers, who will take good care that their super-tax is never raised high enough to prevent them from raking in millions of unearned wealth. If it be asked how it is that every other country engaged in the war has adopted the same method

of financing its operations, I answer that these big financiers are cosmopolitans who care nothing for patriotism, and regard the workers of every nation as fit subjects for their schemes of wholesale plunder. By their power over the private banks they are enabled to cause expansions and contractions of the currency, which mean ruin to thousands of honest merchants and manufacturers, but never fail to add to their own power and wealth. And not one of these nations has yet started a State Bank to furnish a paper currency based on the productive power of its workers which would have enabled them to finance the war at the mere labour cost of keeping the accounts and printing the currency notes.

The invention of money should have been the greatest boon to the workers of the world by enabling them to co-operate with each other, though separated by the greatest distances, and by rendering possible that minute division of labour which has so vastly increased the rapid and efficient production of wealth. But, by the irony of fate, what should have been a blessing has been converted into the greatest curse that ever weighed down suffering humanity, the adoption of gold as the sole basis for the issue of currency being the root cause of wage slavery and widespread starvation side by side with vast power and senseless unearned luxury of the money monopolists.

As T. L. M'Cready so splendidly says: "Man learns to conquer the Universe, to produce wealth with constantly diminishing effort, to harness Nature's forces and make them do his bidding. But, like Dead Sea apples, his wealth turns to ashes in his mouth and yields him no satisfaction, though he longs for it with constant intensity. For with wealth comes poverty, hand in hand, making the workers to suffer and the idle rich to go in fear."

But there is no reason for despair; many acute minds are now concentrated on this greatest of all problems, and the veritable mountain of bogus War Debt imposed on the workers of the world by this great war must hasten the solution.

Four years ago a State Bank was put in operation by the Commonwealth of Australia, whose paper currency is secured by the productive power of the Commonwealth, and its rapid and increasing success should soon lead to the adoption of the same sound principle of banking throughout the world.

Slowly as we seem to be advancing, the day must come when unearned incomes will be impossible, and the bonds and title-deeds on which they depend will be as useless and curious as the ancient racks and thumbscrews that remind us of a state of barbaric society now happily extinct.

G. O. WARREN (Major).

* * *

LAW AND ORDER.

Sir,—Your correspondent, "A. F. C.," can find no more to say in reply to my letter than: "Again, I ask him, what would he have done with Malcolm—hanged him?" The question is unnecessary, for I said in my article: "Let us grant that no one, myself included, wished the death penalty to be inflicted on Lieut. Malcolm; the fact remains that the prerogative of mercy inheres in the Crown, and the jury has no right to exercise it." Everybody knew that the prerogative would be exercised in his favour, just as everybody knew that he was charged on his own confession. The jury, having proved itself to be a most incompetent judge of fact, is not, in my opinion, the most suitable dispenser of mercy. All that they have done is to render more incalculable than ever the popular conclusions from evidence; and when we remember that the law protects all of us not by the severity of its punishments, but by the certainty of conviction of crime, we can see how much damage is done by these sentimental verdicts of "Not Guilty." As I write, three soldiers in different parts of the country stand charged with the murder of their wives, and, in one case, it is reported that the man accuses his wife of unfaithfulness. If the certainty of conviction, when the facts are clear, is to be jeopardised by sentimental jurymen, we may confidently expect a revival of the crime of passion; and the absurdity of condoning execution by a private person without trial, while condemning legal execution after trial, will then be apparent even to your correspondent. If he objects to the death penalty, let him object to it when it is inflicted by a private person, as well as by the legal authorities.

Your other correspondent, "W. D.," states a case for the abolition of the jury, and although, as "A. F. C." says, I am "little of a rebel," I am inclined to agree with him. When the Romans used to seize a number of responsible persons of the neighbourhood, and compel them to find an answer to such a question as whether a certain farm in their district formed part of the property of a deceased person who had bequeathed all his belongings to Cæsar, the jury justified its existence. When, in the year 1122, a dispute arose between the monks of St. Stephen of "Brideton" and the tenants of the Royal manor of Bridport, and that dispute was, on the King's command, referred to a sworn jury of sixteen men of the neighbourhood, the jury performed a proper function. It was the judge of fact, because it knew the facts and knew the people. But now, when its local knowledge is not required, when a fact has to be proved by argument and evidence, we want some assurance that the men who will decide are capable of following an argument and assessing the value of evidence; and that assurance is not provided by the jury as at present constituted. Speaking of the French system, Dicey tells us: "Trial by jury, we are told, is a joke, and so far as the interests of the public are concerned, a very bad joke. Prosecutors and criminals alike prefer the Correctional Courts, where a jury is unknown, to the Courts of Assize, where a judge presides, and a jury gives the verdict. The prosecutor knows that in the Correctional Court proved guilt will lead to condemnation. The criminal knows that though in the inferior Court he may lose the chance of acquittal by good-natured or sentimental jurymen, he also avoids the possibility of undergoing severe punishment. . . . In 1881, the judges were deprived of the right of charging the jury. Year by year, the number of causes tried in the Assize Courts decreases." Sentimentality is as unjust in punishment as it is in condonation; "The Wasps" of Aristophanes gives us a very shrewd idea of what "popular justice" as dispensed by a jury may develop into; and those of us who do not want what "A. F. C." calls "the law that dwells within the average human breast," but the written law of the land, will be at least inclined to support "W. D.'s" plea for the abolition of the jury. We are not living in a primitive community, and primitive standards of judgment, primitive methods of doing justice, are an anomaly. As juries seem to be, under the influence of the ethics of the cinema, reverting to type, and asserting the morality of primitive man, it is time that we sought some more efficient method of determining legal fact than by referring the question to the primitive instincts of untrained jurymen.

A. E. R.

* * *

Sir,—Just a line to correct an error, either mine or the printer's. What Sir John Bigham said was: "I think more *injustice* is done by juries than people know."

W. D.

* * *

CANADIAN RECRUITING.

Sir,—Your Colonial readers are indefatigable correspondents. I had almost forgotten that I had ever written on the subject of Canadian Recruiting, with particular reference to the case of Quebec; but all the way from Canada comes another batch of reading matter, and intended enlightenment on two points. My purpose in writing my article was to state the case for Quebec; we had heard from the "Times" only the case against Quebec; and the authority for the statement made in my article was, as I declared, a pamphlet prepared by "La Presse," supplemented by some information supplied by M. Alex. Clément. I cannot, of course, enter upon an elaborate statistical inquiry; I have neither the time, nor the training, nor the material; and my latest correspondent has only added to my difficulty by sending me official figures, which are prepared on a quite different basis from those prepared by "La Presse." The particular point on which my correspondent wishes to correct me is my statement that there was only two-fifths of one per cent. difference between the recruiting in Ontario and Quebec. But I made it clear in my article that this figure related to the native-born of each Province; it excluded the immigrant population, because Ontario had a large number of these people, and Quebec had practically none. The official figures sent by my correspon-

dent do not contradict this statement, and, being prepared on a different basis, do not enable me to find complete confirmation of it. They give the "actual enlistment by Provinces," and show that Ontario has enlisted about 138,000 more than Quebec. But I cannot find anywhere in these figures what proportion of these men were native-born Ontarians; "La Presse," using earlier figures, stated that the difference of 100,000 between Quebec and Ontario was due to the immigrant population of Ontario. The official figures do not even give us the total numbers, according to nationalities, of the men enlisted; they only give us the total number of men overseas. But of these 329,000 men, 162,000 were British-born, and only 132,000 were English Canadian-born. The English immigrant population sent overseas 52.8 of its men between 18 and 45, the Canadian-born English 19.8, and, according to these figures, the French only 3.3. These figures, as I say, are those of the men overseas; but as these figures relate only to the total population of Canada, and not to the local populations of the Provinces, I have no means of discovering whether or not they contradict my statement. But I must remark that the 3.3 of Quebec men overseas does not represent the total enlistment of Quebec; in actual figures, it is only 14,684 men, but the total enlistment for Quebec, according to these same figures, was 46,777.

But whether or not I can sustain the statement made, the fact remains that the French-Canadian case does not rest upon it, but upon the five reasons given by "La Presse." They were: 1. The deep mortification and insult resulting from the anti-French movement of Ontario and Manitoba; 2. The placing of all the recruiting organisation in the hands of English-speaking officers, who do not take account of the French-Canadian temper; 3. The large proportion of Ontario citizens born in the British Isles; 4. The proportion of unmarried men, which is larger in Ontario than in Quebec; 5. The excess of the rural population in Quebec. When I say that the urban and rural population of Canada are about equal, but that by about June, 1916, the towns had recruited about 248,000 men, and the country only 14,200, the importance of this last factor will be apparent. But there is little doubt that recruiting of French-Canadians was deliberately obstructed, as part of the political campaign carried on against the racial partners in Confederation. On this point, Senator Belcourt told the Senate on August 3 of this year: "As regards recruiting, what happened in my own case was this: In September, shortly after my return from Europe with our colleagues, I offered my services to Colonel Mignault, who had been asked to form a general French-Canadian recruiting committee throughout Canada. I said to him: 'We French-Canadians in Ottawa and vicinity are ready to continue to do our best.' I might mention here that there is no district in Canada where the people of any nationality have enlisted in such large numbers in proportion to the population, and have gone over and fought, as the French-Canadians in the district of Ottawa. I do not care what the Government returns show; I know that myself, because I know the people. Col. Mignault told me he was glad of my offer, and asked me if I would take charge of things in Ottawa, and do something, and I said I would—that I would get our friends on this local committee, and see what we could do. The committee was formed, and I was appointed chairman. There were Conservatives and Liberals on it, all French-Canadians, and we begged and begged the Department of Militia to give us the necessary recognition, and the forms to use and send out. We subscribed a considerable sum of money, but never could we get the slightest satisfaction from the Department of Militia. Yet we are told that the French-Canadians won't enlist, that they are slackers and poltroons and cowards. I could give many more similar instances, but the time is too short." In the debate sent me by my correspondent, it was stated that Maj.-General Lessard, appointed so tardily to the charge of recruiting in Quebec, stopped his work directly conscription was announced. But that did not prevent Brigadier-General Mason from making the special point against Quebec of the negligible enlistment during the latter half of June.

The other point concerning which my correspondent sends me information is that relating to the Catholic Church in Canada. Cardinal Begin has given a lead to the Catholic clergy against conscription, and apparently my correspondent wishes me to infer that the opposition to conscription is local and clerical. But it is known that the opposition to conscription comes from many parts of the Dominion; it was so alleged in the very debate sent to me by my correspondent; and even the English reader knows that the Western Liberals have decided, after pressure from their constituents, to support Sir Wilfrid Laurier. That the Catholic Church in Canada is opposed to conscription is probably true, but it does not differ therein from some of the Protestant communities of Canada, nor does it differ from the Commonwealth of Australia. All that I want to do is to counter the assumption that because Quebec is both French and Catholic, it is not, therefore, entitled even to its rights under Confederation. I have lately read much of Canadian politics, and it is obvious to an outsider that there is a deliberate intention to hold Quebec up to the scorn of the world. But she is a partner in Confederation, and if she presents special problems, she needs special treatment. If she is insular, you do not cure insularity by ostracism; if she is, as Mr. Justice McCorkill said, more intensely national than she is religious, you do not eradicate national feeling by flouting it, by depriving it of its rights, and threatening it with forcible suppression. The present state of feeling in Quebec really measures the incompetence of the Dominion Government to handle its special problems, just as Ireland measures our incompetence; and campaigns of calumny are no substitute for good government.

A. E. R.

Memoranda.

(From last week's NEW AGE.)

Nothing would less suit our own "Morning Posters" than a forcible demonstration in Germany or anywhere else of the triumph of democracy.

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.

A journalistic "Opposition" is as necessary in these days of government by newspaper as ever was a Parliamentary "Opposition."

We need a Defence of the World Act, designed to control world-production and to control world-distribution.

More Acts have been killed by Capitalism in their cradle than have been opposed by Labour after they were passed.—"Notes of the Week."

It is the essence of a democracy that it does not wage a war of aggression.—S. VERDAD.

The abolition of wagery 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.

The fundamental change envisaged in the Guilds is the withdrawal of labour as a commodity, its recognition as a function, and its consequent economic predominance. —S. G. H.

Neither all real is rational, for many laws are absurd; nor all rational is real, for we are fighting to realise the rational.—RAMIRO DE MAEZTU.

A more intelligent race would not wait for an Armageddon to awaken it into curiosity regarding the nature of its neighbours.

The joke is a letting out of the unimportant or trifling cat. Realist literature is a letting out the big cat.

"Punch" has never been on the side of a minority.— —EZRA POUND.

Experience gives us one damned paradox after another.

Coherency consists in the harmony of the reports of all the mental faculties.—R. H. C.

The advantage of an extreme proposal is that it makes all other proposals seem moderate.

Most simple proposals assume far too much.—A. E. R.

Christ is the Eternally Crucified.—"Reviews."

Trial by jury is becoming more and more a form of trial by newspaper in the final stage.—W. D.

PRESS CUTTINGS.

In recent years, however, a modification has gradually crept in, and the old crude conception of production as carried on by two elements—capital, which takes most of the product, and manual labour, which has to be satisfied with the barest subsistence—has been qualified by the admission of direction or management to a share in the activity. This is brain work, now formally recognised in the new movement of the Labour Party. Presumably it is counted as belonging to the "proletariate." For some time past the expression "intellectual proletariate" has been in use among Socialists, and has paved the way; but we may perhaps attribute the Labour Party's action mainly to the influence of the Guild Socialists, whose theory of the ideal industrial order requires the participation, as an organised unit, of the whole staff of persons engaged in carrying on an industry. The manager, the technician, and the bookkeeper come into the scheme, as well as the lift-boy and the night-watchman. The Guild Socialists perceive that a business cannot be successfully carried on by ordinary trade unionists without intellectual direction. But do the members of the Labour Party who open their arms to the "producers by brain," and propose the equitable distribution of the product, quite realise the part played by the guiding mind, which makes all the difference between success and failure? How do they propose to compute its equitable share? And do they perceive the part played by brain-work generally in our social life? If the Labour Party includes all the people who work, it will include everybody except the handful of persons called the "idle rich," whose disappearance would hurt nobody, not even themselves. But in that case we shall get in this multitude all the divisions of opinion which now result in the formation of parties, and the enlarged Labour Party will itself break up into as many groups.—"Times."

The industrial unionists refuse to recognise the State, and it is at this point the main divergence between their theories and National Guilds occurs. Like two superimposed triangles, the bases of the two movements are coincident, but variety of angle prevents complete congruousness. Both start from the proposition that labour is treated as a commodity, and that by industrial action alone is it possible to overthrow the system which according to their analysis is responsible for this phenomenon. They are agreed that organisation by industry is an essential preliminary, but they differ as to the power of an industrial organisation wholly to fulfil the functions of the State.

Thus the Guildsmen would clearly distinguish between economic and political activity, and, whilst entrusting every manifestation of the former to the Guilds, would reserve the latter for the State. It is claimed that statesmen freed from the trammels of economic perplexities would develop in vision, and would be able to confine themselves to the real purposes of politics—law, medicine, the Army, Navy, and police, foreign relations, education, central and local government and administration. The exact relations which should subsist between the State and the Guilds have, however, not yet been determined with any minuteness; only the broad general lines have been laid down.

Further, under this scheme the State would not permit the Guilds to obtain absolute possession of land, houses, and machinery, a hold upon which would require to be retained in the interests of the community. In addition, the exponents of this theory are not so uncompromising in their attitude to capital, and in certain circumstances might allow an annuity for two generations as compensation. In short, National Guildism is a compromise between Collectivism and Syndicalism; on the one hand it allows for a field of national life in which there must reign some organisation not purely economic in origin, and for the ultimate sovereignty of the community; on the other, it believes firmly in the necessity for the workers obtaining control of industry by direct action.

Its whole tone is less conscious than the normal industrial unionism, and throughout all the dissertations upon it there runs the conception of national solidarity as the supreme end to be sought. In certain circles it is rather suspect, because it owes its forcefulness and energy to a small coterie of so-called "intellectuals," though Marx surely belonged to the same category. A group has been formed in Glasgow for the propagation of the doctrines, and its weakness is the lack of definite and intimate contact with the workers in their economic activities. This, however, is being overcome in a variety of ways, and undoubtedly the proposals are percolating into the workshops, and at least are turning the minds of the workers in the direction of considering their status.—"Glasgow Herald."

Under the auspices of the Plymouth Trades Union and Socialist Educational Alliance Mr. T. W. Mercer delivered an interesting lecture on "Education for All" in the Plymouth Chambers recently.

Mr. Geo. Neilson (Dockers' Union) presided.

The lecturer contended that not every man who talked about education was an educationist, and that such a person must be judged by his motives. He regarded education as an effort to prepare the individual for associated life, and held that it should lead to the enlargement of the human spirit, and be a conscious attempt to make a man the master of himself. The right to live included the right to receive education as much as the right to be able to obtain bread, shelter, and employment.

There must be education for all, but whence was it to come, and who was to give it? The State must give some forms of education, but there were some it must not give. The State must maintain its own life, preserve its own existence, and train men and women for citizenship, thus enabling them to discharge their civic duties and fulfil their social functions; it should be remembered that the child was to be a future citizen, not a future wage-earner. Mr. Fisher's Education Bill represented an advance, but how small it was compared with the opportunity. The State must not only educate for citizenship, but must endow science, encourage research, foster and support every effort to enlarge realms of knowledge and extend the borders of the known. There, however, it must stop. The great Trade Unions must educate for labour. Where the State began to give technical instruction, it travelled beyond its sphere. Let every Trade Union build up its *own education, possess its experts, its teachers, its examiners*, and its certificates of proficiency, supplying skilled labour, raising the standard of craftsmanship, and supplying industrial training and technical education for all its members. Unless they did that, the State would combat them, the employers would undermine them, and they would cease to fulfil their proper function.

Voluntary associations must fulfil the remaining functions of education; voluntary labour associations must seek to provide that knowledge which was power, and other associations that understanding which lead to peace. —"Western Daily Mercury."

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

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

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

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