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 opportunistic 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 turn to 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 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 as well as in the Allies, 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 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 gullish 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 at a price fixed for it 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-America 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-America 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 can be taken at their face value, taking no heed 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 ... foregone 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 his duty has important consequences, for in addition to incurring the charge against public safety, 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 Have-
lock Wilsons a double pull: their own economic control
and the control of the State by its penal laws. The
Serville State could not be more clearly indicated.

The journals that have called out for air-reprisals
upon Germany in the belief that reprisals would terri-
ify Germany have already had their reply in the air-
raid of last Friday night. Like Gallo, 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
its own conduct. The Press, however, cannot admit itself to have been 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 squab-
bling on the stair-heads, the directors of the air-service
are squabbling in the drawing-rooms and all to the advan-
tage of Germany. It is only after three years of
war that we have at last the minimum promise of a
independent Air-Ministry, for hitherto the public has
been too engrossed with the "Evening News" to ob-
serve that what the "Times" calls "vested interests"
have been preventing the establishment of an Air-
Ministry; and if, doubtless, 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 eleva-
tion to partnership with their arm of the new arm of
the air. They desire to maintain the air-weapon as an
auxiliary 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 indis-
penusable that a solution 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 Birm-
gham's resolution to make Mr. Neville Chamberlain one
of its parliamentary members in gratitude for his
manifest public incompetence. Mr. Neville Chamber-
lain is not distinguished by modesty or even by a
proper appreciation of his own talents. He learns
nothing of Mr. Neville Chamberlain by the blunderings 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 busi-
ness. 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 will bend the submissiveness of the
working class to the will of their masters, he may lose its independence by forcing 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 Janu-
ary, we hesitate to say much about it. Our scheme
roughly outlined in the Press last week, is, however,
promising in some respects. The old distinction be-
 tween hand and brain workers—in other words, be-
tween the wage-earners and the salariat—within which
we have so often quarrelled, has been cast aside.
"Labour" is now to include all the necessary methods
of 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 bring-
ing 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 the focal political
problem. The salariat, in short, will expect fair deeds,
as well as fair words. Another innovation is the cre-
ation of individual membership of the party. Hitherto,
as we 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
the "Times" for having been the chief means of bringing
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" mem-
ber. 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 politi-
cal purposes. This amalgamation of two move-
 ments 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 amal-
gamation 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 programme 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
they are likely to be large, more or less in line with the
party to set up its own economic control; and 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 Move-
ment 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 peaceful 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 0. From the first reports this looked satisfactory, but it turned out that 190 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 37 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 the dismissal 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 cooperate 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 involving its distrust of Socialist patriotism. In order to make definite preparations for an international conference to that principle, to 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. Renan and others, it is quite clear that the French Socialists have no intention of extending unconditional support to any Government; nor 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 so 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 Socialist 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 Socialist, 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 all, it is not impossible that the long-delayed Inter-Allied Conference on war aims may take place.

A LIFE OF SCHOOL DAYS.

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;
Lod of a puny principedom unrenowned,
And with a leaden wreath of dulness crowned,
From which no joy 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 passing 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 devotion 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, or the conservative in all of us. It possesses the parent at the moment when his son is coming of age, the schoolmaster when 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, but he is denied his claim, to ruin not only himself, but his former masters. And it is precisely this in the case that arises when a working-class movement, having become organised and executive, 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; 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 paternal responsibility holds in the case of Capital and Labour, 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 prove to them that 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 perleying. Your dependence, moreover, upon Labour makes it advisable that you stand not upon the ground of theoretical wisdom, but upon the ground of common sense; that any demand of Labour or Labour will ruin both itself and Capital.

That this is not altogether an improbable situation after the war is 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 the financial causes of discontent which will undoubtedly exist must be added the psychological causes brought about into being and trained into expression by the war. 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 enforce 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 sale 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, as 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.
The Nature of Societies.

By Ramiro de Masaryk.

... 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 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 useless, and yet precious. Something more is needed; we need the feeling of pity for human sufferings."

... 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. Durkheim 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 imitate others, 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 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 countenance; the imitation may say "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 things 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 common work, a common action, 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 itself at us through the eyes and returns itself 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. Tardé'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 still in the same collective, and 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 social consciousness is 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 goods that the individuals like to possess, and 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 contracted for the activities 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, 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 more 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 law 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, but that 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 call delegates to a meeting of delegates who should be called upon to investigate such differences as cannot be settled separately in each workshop, and, in short, that this common delegation 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 consider themselves as 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 of each, 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 shop-stewards 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 years in the factory. But, since the 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, the 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 ask 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 reelection, 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 employer's alone at any time. Their claims should be submitted 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 evidence for the view of Antwerp as 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 scarred soil of Belgium. The Hohenzollerns may for three generations have subscribed to many English periodicals; from the bulk of them the decadence of the "Journal," for no monarch could have wrested to himself the "discoveries" most in the mind's eye of the 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 shady, jeet-the-weetie-least shade "photographic." The rear-admiral is, unsuuspectingly, 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 a laggard and sluggard; he would have approved and despised.

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 aestheticism 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 sparks 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 (instant joy of health)," "Could you lift a ton?" Mind and Memory, Don't wear a truss, and Enos 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 wheeze-shouts, 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 is recognizing inventions is sternly censured.

Hold this in mind, I shall refer to it later. Or no, metaphorical, and He has been, in practically, 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. "'Me... was a brave man,' the King said, returning the captain's salute."

The officers and men stand rigidly to attention regarding that they had not shown more foresight in appreciating their paramount peril.

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 shady, jeet-the-weetie-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 a laggard and sluggard; he would have approved and despised.

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 aestheticism 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 sparks 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 (instant joy of health)," "Could you lift a ton?" Mind and Memory, Don't wear a truss, and Enos 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 wheeze-shouts, 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 is recognizing inventions is sternly censured.

Hold this in mind, I shall refer to it later. Or no,
This prose is followed by a poem beginning with "sweet violets," running on through "sward," "dawning of each happy day," "glories manifold," "yonder" and "rich." However, the pseudo-Wordsworth has no more inversions in his rhyme than Mr. Bart Kennedy has in his prose dythymbics on the potation of the aqueous fluid.

Item 14. Story of the man who hadn't the naval style and ou 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 Bosch.

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


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 5. Typical British travellers from the wilds describes the relative merits of black races as servants, 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 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 have nothing that has gotten 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 it in the Alhambra gardens. The total absence of fresh water is specified only in hell; around the throne the Redeemer the ever-flowing water of life will doubtless be found an aptæral, palatable substitute.

—E. F.
Drama.

By John Francis Hope.

This 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 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 Ephesians in Cilicia, became rich by supplying the army with bacon, was jibbed into the episcopal throne of Alexandria, and was lynched when Julian arrived there in A.D. 361. Our "Saint George" is neither an ancestor of 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. Shaw, I believe, has been kind permission of his victim"; and with reminiscences of Bellamy and H. G. Wells, has made the sleepy awakè 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 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 author of "The Inca of Perusalem," Bernard Shaw, 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. Shaw, I believe, has been kind permission of his victim"; and with reminiscences of Bellamy and H. G. Wells, has made the sleepy awakè 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 author of "The Inca of Perusalem," Bernard Shaw, 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," 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 opening scene in the second act is a 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 author intends than by hearing and seeing what his 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 author of "The Inca of Perusalem," Bernard Shaw, 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," 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 opening scene in the second act is a 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 author intends than by hearing and seeing what his 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 author of "The Inca of Perusalem," Bernard Shaw, but between my snuffles, I hope to be his Chorus, and the Chorus, it may be remembered, was usually critical of the performers.

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 reared another victim to 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 the play is 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 moments, a heritage, 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 monetary value is, however, a poor criterion of their real value, to 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 humours regret, but certainly not for serious complaint. Forbid that this should ever become a paper with 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 phase of 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 holiday they take heart from this evidence and continue content in their honourable obscurity. Them and I, 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 walking 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 Latermer. 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 concluded by 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 assurance 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 book, it was considered presumptuous to announce 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, and not through 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 reviewer's verdict that it will 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
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, pretentious, 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 democracy.

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 own 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 principles. To hear you speak, one would think you were a Liberal. To us, the working-class movement disavows the strict, 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 beneficence. 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: 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 beneficence. 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, nor love, but we don't trust them for nothing.

Sutton: What do we trust them for?
LOVER: 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.
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. (Enters 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.
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. (Enters Lord Lover.)
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 favourable 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 (sputtering): But—but—but—but—
SUTTON (leading him to the door): Bear up! Take comfort from the fact that though you hate democracy, democracy 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 initiated or 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, "the causes which give rise 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 and the certain political fact of the day, to these causes of insurrection, honesty confesses, 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 rebellions against unjust and oppressive laws may be morally justifiable. This admission must certainly be made by any conscientious objectors 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 fact, and, as such, making it a possible method of right government. 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. Everyone was unjustly treated by the laws that he would be justified in taking whatever steps were considered the 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 revolutionary, 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 been found on European soil, and will, therefore, not succeed in forming 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 Voila" referred to the calamity: "While expressing profound sympathy with the American people in the death of President 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, whatever 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 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 used as an agent of total policy by the 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 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 itself, I may remark, is supported
spite of the fact that the early Christians suffered for
pacifism. But I doubt whether martyrdom really ap-
peals to the English people; I think it is precisely
because the conscientious objectors adopt a passive
resistance to the Allies, and fastening 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 of
the word of a ear."

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 them-
selves in useless suffering, instead of advancing their
cause with the English people, and hastening the day of
repeat.

A. E. R.

Reviews.

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

Mr. Vosnjak was, at one time, Lecturer at the Uni-
versity of Lüegreb, and it may be presumed that he
knows the history of the Slovenes, which he here re-
counts, 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
abused. The fundamental fact that, since Charle-
magne conquered them, the Slovenes have been sub-
ject 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-Croat, whom Mr. Vosnjak
numbers at eight and a-half millions, we have
a nation of only ten millions against the eighty mil-
ions 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 situa-
tion; 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 suc-
cess we all know, it is a curious commentary on Mr.
Vosnjak's case of imprisonment that he had been
removal, enumerating in his "History of Serbia" the
great divisions of the Jugo-Slavs into Serbo-
Croats of Croatia, Serbs of Dalmatia, Bosnians, Mon-
tenegrins, and the Serbians of Serbia, puts a foot-
note: "There are also the Slovenes, who inhabit Car-
niola and part of Styria east of the Tyrolean Alps. . .

The Croats alone among these peoples have per-
 sistently 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 bul-
 wrack against Hungary.

"Triumvir," although re-
garded for the late Emperor as too drastic a remedy
to 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 tells us that the pride of the older nation, the
pride of a man who is surprised to find humanity intelligente, is
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 character-
istics peculiar to a nation without tradition, and only
just about to form its society, the unexhausted
strength, the primitive instincts, the aversion to the
introduced differentiation, the war of nature against

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
fact, that irreparable which is only ac-
quired 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 arguments against Italian claims to Trasci
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 to some
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 dom-
inate the Jugo-Slav States of the future and make the
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 pre-
pared 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 capacity of
the Jugo-Slavs? We beg him to put his thoughts into
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 expect
an alliance between a Jugo-Slav State and the
Northern Slav State of Russia? Are we to con-
template this admirably adaptable people with no tradi-
tions, and with elementary political ideas, stretching
from the Ural Mountains to the Adriatic, and make
some appeal to Europe of their culture? Of Russia, all that Stepn-
ian 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. Semen-
noff 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,
Kotlow, Nekrassov and Nadson. Among these items
there are a few of those dull pieces of verse that inex-
piably 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 " Russia 
 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 ac-
quaintance.
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 available corner. He wore a red fez and a pair of dirty white trousers. 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 that the eyes of commerce 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-bearded air, blinks 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 ye lampin' that plummy 'eathen for?"

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

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

"You're balmy, Bill."

"Swelp me, 'us, Bill."

"No, Bill."

"'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 passed, confidentially. "Wot?" he then, then. Plurry 'eathen!"

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

"You vant 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'tics."

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

"Nor, blimy!"

"Bill gasped with the effort of enlightening so dull an intelligence. "'E ye a Christian?"

"Yes, Bill."

"'Ere a Catholic?"

"No, Bill."

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

The girl shook her head, unembarrassed, 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 head. "City Road!" snapped the conductor.

"Our thanks, Bill!" whispered 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 weet 'e is," whispered the bricklayer. And not Bill and Liz alone, but the four other non-descripts in the car least forward eagerly to catch the words of wisdom. The bricklayer passed again. He was a great believer, evidently, in the mysteries of pausing. Finally he spoke.

"Minjer," he said. "I don't wanter say anything against the man. But my nephew's a saltman, and if that wasn't a Nadir Lascar, I'm a Bloomin' Dutchman."

"Are you Lascars 'eatens?" queried the tremulous and panting Liz.

"The bricklayer looked at her sternly."

"'Eathens?"

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

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

"Nor then!" He put his arm about her waist, gently and kindly. "Wotcher grizzlin' abart?"

LEOPOLD SYRRO.

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 insensate folly 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, so successfully inwards of the war.

In ancient days, before the invention of money the exchanges tendered necessary by war must have been made by barter, so that there could have been no war debts beyond pensions to the widows and orphans of the warriors. It is possible that this system of gifts 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 it is 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 necessities, to put the conveyances to those whom 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 upon the power of their issuers to supply such 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 then 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 equivalent 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 the modern workers and fighting men. It is true, no doubt, the burden 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 3d. for every £100, and cease altogether when the war is over; yet so dense a sombre cloud over the workers, this comparatively trifling service is being made to exceed the cost of all our battleships, guns, aeroplanes, etc., and sheds 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 people 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 of the rapacity of 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, and to all honest working people, including the people in small regular 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 upon mankind, 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 as he makes them visible; heding the generous farmer from 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 wasteland of hopeless wealth. 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 as rubbish racks and tombs, which 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 "Again, I ask how... 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 Lien of Manhattan; 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 indubitable 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 cannot see how by these sentences they will develop into; and those of us who do not want what "A. F. C." calls the "law that dwells with us," but the written law of the land, the will of the people, the will of the jury, the will of the jury as expressed in the Assize Courts, the Vernacular page 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-
PROVINCES," and show that Ontario has enlisted about 128,000 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 between Quebec and Ontario was due to the immigrant population. 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 an interest in the French-Canadian element of the Canadian army; 3. The large proportion of Ontario citizens born in the British Isles; 4. The proportion of unmarriageable 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 240,000 men, and the country only 148,684, the 3,300 difference 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 our work. I might mention here that there is no district in Canada where the people of any nationality have enlisted in such large proportions 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. Colonel Mignault told me he was glad of my offer, and asked me if 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 shirkers, and the newspapers do not contradict this statement, and, being prepared to make the special point against Quebec of their being slackers and shirkers, we are told that Quebec is the only province that has enlisted this month. But that did not prevent Brigadier-General Lessard, appointed so tardily to the charge of recruiting in Quebec, from announcing his desire to make 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 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 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 flattering, 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 forceful 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 the consent of the governed 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 to mystery regarding the nature of its neighbours.

The joke is a letting out of the unimportant or trifling can. Recent literature is a letting out the big cat. "Punch" has never been on the side of a minority.—Extra 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 remainder—has been replaced 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. Probably to the guiding mind, which makes all the difference between success and failure, the intelligentsia are being added, as the "proletariats." For some time past the expression "intellectual proletariat" 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 who open their arms to the "proletariats," realise the part played by the guiding mind, which makes all the difference between success and failure? How do they perceive the part played by the guiding mind, which makes all the difference between success and failure? How do they perceive the part played by brain-work in the formation of parties, and do they perceive the part played by the guiding mind, which makes all the difference between success and failure? How do they perceive the part played by brain-work in the forming of parties, and do they perceive the part played by the guiding mind, which makes all the difference between success and failure? How do they perceive the part played by brain-work in the formation of parties, and do they perceive the part played by the guiding mind, which makes all the difference between success and failure?

"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 educationalist, 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 fulfill 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 fulfill their proper function. Voluntary associations must fulfill 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."
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