NOTES OF THE WEEK.

President Wilson has been consistent. From his earliest notes since America has been in the war, he has made it plain that the United States would deal only with the German people; and now in his latest note his affirmation is explicit, and there can no longer be any doubt, even in our own country, that the crux of the world-war is for America the democratisation of Germany. The "Times" itself is constrained under the pressure of the evidence to admit that this is "now" the case. Not only did it entitle its report of President Wilson’s Note, "Democracy or Surrender," but in subsequent articles the "Times" affirmed that the character of the German political institutions would have a great influence on the peace-settlement, and, again, that the guarantees demanded of Germany would differ in proportion as we were dealing with a free or with a militarist Government. All this is to the good; and we are naturally gratified that even at the eleventh hour a distinction which we have always made has been so generally recognised. At the same time, it is as well to realise what is actually involved in the distinction. On the one hand, it implies that if, and only if, the German people insist upon clinging to their Prussian autocracy it will be necessary to proceed to their complete military conquest; while, on the other hand, if the German people choose to throw aside for ever their obsolete institutions, they may be spared the experience of conquest and admitted upon probation into the comity of free nations.

To those in this and other Allied countries who feel that by thus democratising herself, Germany will escape the punishment due to her past conduct, there are several things to be said. To begin with, it is obvious that the only form of punishment that will be spared Germany is punishment in kind, that is to say, punishment in the form of the crimes committed by Prussian militarism. Upon every other item of the account of the world with Germany, the punishment of Germany will be considerable, even upon the most favourable terms of settlement. In the event of the complete and irrevocable democratisation of Germany we are, it is true, to forgo the satisfaction of the instinct of Mosaic revenge; but a consideration and a comparison of the state of Germany before and after the war will show, we think, that her punishment will, in any case, be severe. Before the war Germany was not only the most powerful nation on the continent, but her prospective power was such as to bid fair to place her among the two or three greatest of the Powers of the world. Little by little she was adding to her strength and there seemed to be no obstacle sufficient to stay her expansion. After the war, however, end as it now must either in her conquest or in her democratisation, the position of Germany will be anything but enviable. Her old Allies will have been broken to pieces or utterly alienated. New nations carved from her actual or potential possessions will have been created to become her rivals on the continent. Her world-possessions will have been taken from her. Her debts will be incalculable. And, over and above all this, her credit and prestige in the world will have disappeared, and she will have to start her career as a new nation with the handicap of her past upon her. Looking at all these things, it appears to us that her punishment should be enough to satisfy the world that Germany’s war has not “paid” Germany. For centuries to come, her account will remain open; and history will never doubt the folly of her crime or the criminality of her folly.

***

We must remark also on the cost to ourselves of pursuing the military conquest of Germany. Without denying that the military conquest of Germany may be forced upon us—in which event its perils must be faced—nobody can deny who will take the trouble to examine the consequences that the price to be paid for such a conquest is terrible. We need not mention the continued sacrifice of the lives of our troops, though that is a first consideration in the minds and hearts of everybody who is fit to consider the war at all; but attention must also be given to what are certain to be the reactions of a military conquest. In the first place, it implies the continued militarism of Germany, in other words, the reinforcement of the very spirit of evil which the Allies are striving to exorcise from the world,
And, in the second place, by a no less certain implication, the militarisation of the European Allies would have to be assumed. Only reflect what it would mean, not only to carry war into Germany, but to maintain in her midst after her conquest an army of occupation. No Continental Power—and England is now a Continental Power—would be exempt from the obligation to maintain an army always in being against the menace of recrudescent militarism in a nation numbering seventy millions. Imagination staggers at the picture that Europe would present under these circumstances. Giant serpents would have been placed in the cradles of the young nations now forming around Germany; and in all the older countries the chains of military organisation would everywhere be fast riveted upon the peoples. All this is so certain from the fact of the military conquest of Germany that we are of opinion that nothing should be spared to bring about the democratisation of Germany in the interests of Europe itself. That Germany should be democratised is of advantage to Germany; that we do not deny. But the advantages to Germany from democratisation are outweighed a thousand times by the advantages to be derived from it by the rest of the world. A final consideration may be added in the form of a doubt whether, given even a partial democratisation of Germany, the Allies will not find their own national morale opposed to the prolonged military conquest. We do not say that under these circumstances a military conquest will be impossible; still less do we affirm that it might not still be necessary. On the other hand, we are certain that as fast as Germany moves towards democracy the war-spirit of the Allied peoples will everywhere decline. A democracy cannot fight a democracy.

It is proper, with these considerations before us, to concentrate ourselves afresh upon the real problem now facing us. While, on the one hand, we have every reason to hope for the democratisation of Germany and to seize the moment of its inducible appearance to make a final peace; on the other hand, remembering all the world has suffered, all the danger in allowing ourselves to be deceived, and all the deception of which the German character is capable, we have no less reason to require evidences of democratisation which in themselves shall be universally and completely convincing. No merely verbal assurances are sufficient; nor are we convinced as yet by the deeds already performed by the new German Government. That events have moved in Germany, and that the centre of political gravity has inclined unmistakably to the Left we have no doubt whatever. But, in our judgment, the inclination has not as yet been sufficient to establish democracy in Germany beyond a peradventure. Moreover, we cannot say that Lord Milner's fears that a little further and Germany will fall into Bolshevism impress us as well founded. Upon Herr von Bahr's own admission, the changes so far made in Germany have been "sober, quiet and business-like"; no disorder of any violence has become evident. The changes so far made in Germany have been "sober, quiet and business-like"; no disorder of any violence has become evident. Lord Milner, however, is not the only Junker in the stables of the House of Lords; for Lord Lansdowne, whom only a few weeks ago Mr. MacDonald and Mr. Lansbury were choosing for their democratic leader, is himself an incorrigible example of Prussianism amongst us. Speaking in the House of Lords on Wednesday on the subject of Indian Reform, Lord Lansdowne not only echoed the sentiments of the pan-German Count Westarp, but from an affinity of nature he delivered himself in almost precisely the same terms as those in which his German confrere had spoken earlier in the week. The proposals of the Government, he said, spelt revolution in India; the goal defined as the object of our rule in India, namely, the earliest realisation of full representative government, was, he said, dubious and full of danger. We were at the tope of an inclined plane "at the bottom of which we should find unmigrated democracy." We invite Mr. Lansbury to compare this speech of his "leader" with the speech of Count Westarp. On the following day, another of our Junkers, Lord Selborne, was, if possible, even more explicitly Prussian in his remarks on the same subject. With an obvious glance at the present situation in Germany, Lord Selborne remarked that "to attempt without any gradation to turn an autocracy into a democracy was a dangerous performance"; it was difficult in Europe, it would be still more difficult in India. Nobody would deny that this is, indeed, the case. But the alternative to the attempt seems never to strike the Junker mind until the "damned consequences" are upon them. What is the alternative to the "dangerous" performance of allowing the peoples to govern themselves? It is, as Lord Bryce observed, a course involving, first, disappointment, then discontent, afterwards disaffection, and, finally, we add, disaster. It needs must be that reform should come. Our only choice is between reform with good-will and revolution with bad-will. That there is trouble in store in any event is certain, for the world is born to trouble. But the trouble caused by reform is growth, whereas the trouble caused by revolution is disease.

In spite of the Barnum campaign of advertisement now raging on their behalf, the sale of war-bonds continues to be disappointing. Instead of the necessary twenty-five millions a week, the later returns show a yield of only a little more than twenty millions. The reason, we believe, is not at all that the war is immediately declining in popularity, or that the financial credit of the nation is diminishing. On the contrary, our national credit, that is to say, the belief in our ability to pay our debts, was never higher than it is at this moment. With that very fact, however, stands in close connexion and hostile to the success of the Government's war-bonds; for, as our national credit rises, the interest offered for our capital increases beyond the ability or disposition of the Government itself to command it in the open market. It is not the beggary five or five and a half per cent. which the Government now asks for loans that capital is nowadays content with; capital can easily command double or treble that rate of inte-

Lord Milner's days as a member of a "democratic" Government are, we hope, numbered; for when the "Times" that fostered this typical Junker amongst us is driven to refer to his "timid voice," his "queer anxiety," and his "unexpected Lansdownisms," his early political demise may be confidently expected. Like Sir Edward Carson and many before and after him, Lord Milner has proved to be not only a dark horse but the wrong horse for the "Times."
rest. The folly of allowing capital a free market during the war is now beginning to be seen as the incomparable folly we have conspired to allow every material of war save money, with the consequence that money is now able to laugh at our endeavours to enlist it by voluntary means, and to accumulate in the banks, where it now amounts to nearly two thousand millions of pounds. The contrast between an impoverished and mendicant Treasury and private bankers overflowing with money is too striking not to be visible to the naked eye. Yet, for all the scandal of the spectacle, neither the authorities nor public opinion appear to be willing to adopt the course threatened with such good effect in Australia of raising loans compulsorily.

We may say, in fact, that it is forbidden by the bankers.

In the course of an unwise speech, Mr. Balfour let drop a merely silly remark. "The war," he said, "will leave us all poorer in wealth, but only ninety-nine per cent. of the population. The remaining one per cent., who were wealthy before the war, will be wealthier than ever after the war; for the effect of the war has been to accelerate the pre-existing movement towards the concentration of wealth in fewer and fewer hands. This is not shown at random, but in malice, but a deduction borne out by the facts and figures accessible to the ordinary newspaper reader. There is no excuse for anybody in being ignorant of it. The merest member of the Labour party may be wise in the knowledge. According to the income-tax returns published last week, the number of persons whose income had been raised above £5,000 a year during the last twelve months is 573. Ninety persons are now registered as enjoying an annual income of over £100,000; and, as a final result, 30,000 persons, or one-fifteenth hundredth of the whole population, receive annually between them 250 million, or one-fifteenth of the whole national income. Impressively, not to say alarming, as such figures are, their portent is less ominous for the future than the consideration of the following fact. Land, the instrument of primary production, has appreciated in value in the course of the war, not by tens but by hundreds per cent. The landowners, who, before the war, and, in view of the world-market, were comparatively poor, have become, in consequence of the war and the restriction of the world-market, fabulously rich. Unearned increment in respect of the amount of the product, but they are antagonistic when the division begins. Now the Farmers' Club, being composed exclusively of landowners and tenant farmers, have demanded "complete freedom" for all parties, that is to say, for landowners, farmers and labourers. At the same time, they protest against national control. The only meaning we can attach to their demand is that they wish to exclude from control both the labourers and the State, in other words, the worker and the consumer. We shall see, however, whether this farmyard ideal is practicable. For ourselves, we doubt it.

Of a piece with the foregoing demand of the "farmers" for licence to profiteer at the public expense is the demand of the shipowners to be "released at the earliest possible moment from the paralyzing influence of Government control" (Lord Inchcape, a large ship-owner). The example of America, in particular, has aroused the envy of our private ship-masters; for they see not only that one-fifth of our own tonnage has been lost during the war, but that America, under the impetus of a new spirit of nationalism, is now building mercantile tonnage twice as fast as ourselves. It is a gloomy prospect for our competitive capitalists; but there is no need to make it gloomier than it is by re-emphasizing a policy that inevitably entails disaster. For the fact is in England, whatever it may be in America, that private enterprise both in ship-building and in the shipping industry is played out. We defy our shipowners, given all the liberty they demand, to dispense in future with State-aid of an increasing character. Even if they can provide the capital necessary to such enterprise, it is tolerably certain that nothing less than State-aid will enable them to maintain and to discipline the Labour which is even more essential to their industry. We see, in fact, that this has been the case during the war. But for the action of the State, it is doubtful whether much that has been built or a ton set afloat; and it is common knowledge that only by the assumption of State control has Labour been maintained in efficiency in the yards. If this has been the experience during the war, when Labour has had reason for patriotism, we leave the ship-owners to consider what the chances are of their "complete control" of Labour after the war. As in agriculture, so in shipping, "State control has come to stay." The only remedy against bureaucracy is the Guild.
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Two Books on National Guilds.


It is only six years since the text of "National Guilds" appeared in these columns. Four of those years have been distracted by the war, compelling us to look out upon the world in arms, when, otherwise, we should doubtless have been looking upon ourselves and bending our minds to our industrial and social ills. Nevertheless, such is the vitality of the Guild idea, here is a compendium of Guild doctrine, requiring 450 pages for its exposition, and, even now, not quite up to date. Clearly, as the Americans would say, there is something doing. "The Meaning of National Guilds," by Messrs. Reekitt and Bechhofer (hereafter known as "the authors"), is as stimulating as it is provocative. It is reassuring to know that good brains are working steadily and truthfully at the principles and policy envisaged in National Guilds and, to such good purpose, that one cannot close the book without the conviction that here is a dominant fact both in theory and practice. You say to yourself: "The Guild idea has come to stay."

The authors' aim is two-fold: they seek to develop Guild doctrine by drawing its own deductions from principles already stated, fusing into those principles their own faith and views; but they also would present to their readers a conspectus of what other authors have written. The book is, therefore, one partly of authorship and partly of editorship. In this capacity, as editors, they deserve both our thanks and congratulations. By clear writing and an impartial spirit, they have admirably succeeded in revealing to all enquirers the various strains of thought that have gone into the Guild movement as we know it to-day. If they stress this or that view differently from what others would have done, we have no cause to complain. It is their obvious business to tell us how these various opinions strike them, and the significance they attach to them. In their function as editors, the authors carry us along from the inception of the Guild idea to the problems of middle-class organisation, Trade Unionism, reconstruction, transition, to existing Guild controversies, such as the consumer State, unemployment, compensation, and woman in industry. Every page is documented; Guild literature has been thoroughly sifted, the references being, generally though not always, given. A stranger to Guild writings, on reading this book, will know where to go for the originals, without the slightest difficulty. But as editors I have one complaint to make against the authors. A book such as this, covering so wide a field of research, ought to have an index. When a second edition appears, I hope this omission will be rectified.

I am not so happy when I look at the authors' own original work. On page 356, this curious passage occurs:—"The fact that Mr. Hobson was satisfied that no modification of industrial autonomy was necessary, save what public policy might occasionally dictate, suggests the reason why it did not occur to him to treat in his original articles certain subjects of cardinal importance to the co-ordination of economic life. Nothing was to be found there, for instance, to elucidate the question of how prices were to be fixed, or the Guildsman's pay apportioned as between Guild and State, and the relation of the State was only very generally indicated." This problem of Guildsman's pay (obviously the actuarial basis of price) is dealt with in "National Guilds," in part 3 of our issue on the chapter on "The Finance of the Guilds." I deal at considerable length with the unit of pay. I reject the gold standard, for reasons given, and proceed: "The different Guilds would probably appraise their labour at differing values. The engineers might still aim at remaining the aristocrats of labour; the scavengers might not be able at once to exact a similar value. Before we reached a democratic economy, the value of pay (not wages, please note), there would doubtless be variations in the valuation of the respective trades, an engineer receiving perhaps 100 units per week and a scavenger 60." Then follows the modus operandi. I give the unit name: the "'guild.' I assume the engineer to be earning 100 guilders, the cotton operatives 75, the miner 90, and so on. My plan is that they shall draw on their Guild Bank, precisely as some of us draw cheques on our banks. All this is set out in some detail on pages 381 to 384. I return to the point in the chapter, "Inter-Guild Relations," pages 228 to 231. On page 329, I actually crystallise the problem which the authors say I have ignored:—"Suppose, then, that the Agricultural Guild were to demand such an increase in the value of its produce as would enable it to level up its pay from 65 to 75. Suppose, further, that the other Guilds were to reply that, anxious as they were to see agricultural labour values improved, they felt that any such advance, just then, would upset the equilibrium upon which depended their existing estimates of the way that prices are fixed] and, accordingly, that they must resist the claim. What would be the next step of the Agricultural Guild?" I do not only ask the question but answer it. The fixing of pay-rates is in principle left to the interplay of the labour monopoly between the several Guilds, whilst the machinery for adjusting the pay is found in the Guild analogue to interlocking directorates. The last sentence in this connection reads:—"Two Guilds, each with a membership of 1,500,000, with enormous trading relations covering the whole country, must of necessity evolve suitable diplomatic machinery through which their affairs would be regulated." My purpose in correcting this misstatement is that it brings my solution into contrast with the suggestion made by the authors. My proposals are concrete, clear, and in the line of economic development Messrs. Reekitt and Bechhofer, although protesting their love for local life and rights, argue that pay should be regulated by the Guild Congress as a state matter. They do not believe in applied democracy, and then claim to control their means of life and growth. It is economically unsound and impossible. Worse and worse; if National Guild propaganda were burdened with any such anti-democratic scheme, it would die in a day. How can we assure the coming Guilds that we believe in a democratic development in these matters? Reekitt and Bechhofer seem to be attached (although they would probably reject any special label) that,
having accepted Guilds, it proceeds to restrict their operations in all directions. They must not bank their own money, nor pay their business, they would disfranchise authority will do that for them; they must go to the State for any capital beyond normal requirements; they must fix prices in concert with a shadowy consumers’ council, which, in any event, is powerless, for our authors concede the producers’ dominance; they must arrange their productive programmes according to the consumers’ associations—“the normal stimulus to the expansion of productive enterprises will come from demand,” which, quite frankly, is deadly nonsense. Nor must the Guilds engage in foreign trade with the permission of a joint committee of the Guild Congress and the State. The only conclusion I can draw from these numerous attempts to interject into Guild life these extraneous bodies is that our authors’ outlook is still coloured by the conception of the consumer State and co-sovereignty—a conception that can plausibly be pursued upon suspicion of the producer. For my part, I am not afraid of National Guilds; I fear neither their public spirit nor their industrial capacity. Our problem is not to hamper them with restrictions, but rather to clear away the thousand and one external agencies that will try to put in their ore for intermediating reasons. At the present moment, the greatest obstacle to Guild propaganda is its presumed undue teneurness for the consumers’ interests. This is not surprising when we remember that the overwhelming mass of the workers are themselves producers, bound to the chariot-wheels of the capitalists, who remain the triumphant consumers. The producer, qua consumer, has the means ready to his hands to protect himself; the non-producer, qua consumer, has no friends and deserves none.

Granting, however, their own point of view, which must have reactions not to my taste, and recognising that this book, rightly or wrongly, adopts an attitude towards National Guilds which I regard as heretical, I am none the less grateful for a work that brings into focus the whole body of doctrine that has grown out of the original idea.

To my friend and great Messrs. Cod and Mellor in an entirely non-controversial spirit: “The Meaning of Industrial Freedom” is a brochure, printed attractively, covering the ground of Industrial politics in simple and convincing language. It is one of the most effective pieces of propaganda I have yet seen. If the Trade Union executive reasons that the present arrangements may be left the Faculty of Arts as its mainstay, and that the latter hand over to the Guilds concerned. “With your reasons for this,” it may be said, “we entirely agree, and we admit that its application to primary and education is simple. Even in the latter case some preparation for future divergence can be made by arrangements about optional subjects. In the case of higher education, on the other hand, the principle, we think, either breaks down, or is incapable of application without enormous modification. We find evidence for this view in the history of the development of Universities both in America and in England. The technological side has been enormously emphasised in the newer colleges, and by now the two things seem to be inextricably mingled. On the other hand, if we really mean that professional and technical training is to be under the direction of the new Civic Guild, then from the Universities must be taken away to special colleges or technical schools the Faculties of Divinity, Medicine, and Law, and the Schools of Engineering, Education, Agriculture, Naval Architecture, and so on. In the University will be left the Faculty of Arts as its mainstay and prop, together with Pure Science. Only in this way can you avoid the conflict of interests in one body, to which you have rightly referred, between the care for the development of the soul and the provision that technical skill is not wanting.”

That this argument is relevant, and attractive by reason of its simplicity, it would be impossible to deny. It is one of those arguments, however, which seems more important in the abstract than it proves to be in the concrete. The body of education is, no doubt, one, with many members; and some divisions of it may be faithful, while others mutilate it. Still, it has its natural articulations. We again agree with the argument that there has been a development of the Universities which does less violence to their traditional functions and curricula, certain considerations may be added.

1. An indication of a sound instinct underlying the present arrangements may be found in the fact that the propositions for which the above, in the University, we may pass over the birthplaces of those who were afterwards to become them, will deny its prevalence. Sometimes, no doubt, religious difference or political prejudice is allowed to enter; but, happily, the day for that sort of thing seems to be over. The application of the obsolescence standards to present make of is a much more about evil; and in view of the fact that unless a man be day in his own craft he can hardly hope to escape from the insidious conviction that when he knew it it was at its best, this is not surprising. The irritation of one who knows with the outsider, however acute, who just fails to grasp a technical divergence and the relief of discussing it with a colleague, no matter how opposite in his outlook, we all know. And the constant temptation to unscrupulous or fanatical professors to appeal to the prejudices of non-academic bodies in order to win over their colleagues, is a sufficient condemnation of the system.

The points which remain for consideration are, perhaps, hardly matters of principle, but something should be said about them to avoid misunderstanding. At an early stage of our argument we laid down the principle that civic should be separated from technical education, and the latter handed over to the Universities concerned. “With your reasons for this,” it may be said, “we entirely agree, and we admit that its application to primary and secondary education is simple. Even in the latter case some preparation for future divergence can be made by arrangements about optional subjects. The case of higher education, on the other hand, the principle, we think, is impossible to deny. It is one of those arguments, however, which seems more important in the abstract than it proves to be in the concrete. The body of education is, no doubt, one, with many members; and some divisions of it may be faithful, while others mutilate it. Still, it has its natural articulations. We again agree with the argument that there has been a development of the Universities which does less violence to their traditional functions and curricula, certain considerations may be added.
degree in medicine and that provided by a College of Surgeons. We may perhaps express it by saying that, in the former, students are given an education, the main subject of which is the nature of the human organism and the various processes of life and disease, which merely develops technical skill but induces a wide outlook and permits some appreciation of the unity of knowledge, which should make men philosophers and teach them to be free, is the immediate service of the community. The real division which at present exists in colleges is not between arts and all other subjects, but between professional and technical.

2. Even though the logical application of a principle demanded it, and the convenience of administration were considerably strained by failure to carry it out, the existing arrangement might still be defended on grounds of the resulting social life. To exclude the Faculty of Medicine, for example, would be to strike a blow at a side of University life which ought rather to be encouraged. In the transitory formative period of professional life that men should mix as much as possible with those going in for other professions, seems an in calculable good; and the mere fact that this sort of association has flourished so exceedingly in the past indicates that these faculties are not really purely technical schools. To set up technical schools is for many reasons necessary; but that they have a narrowing effect cannot be denied. A great part of the tragedy of the teaching profession is, undoubtedly, due to the fact that it has almost always been trained in isolation.

3. The root evil which gives rise to the principle of the separation of civic and technical education is that the two lines diverge, and that one authority, it seems, cannot consult and promote both. Within Universities, even on the existing organisation, the difficulty is not very acute, and with the absence of a non-academic governing body, with its confusion of ideas with principles and prejudices with both, it would disappear altogether. Each Faculty would (as it does now) act as a Board of Studies in its own department; no doubt, all would come up for revision before a central Board. But—apart from cases due to mere lack of corporate sense—criticism of the curricula of one Faculty by another is confined to problems where joint interests are in question.

4. To extend and develop the existing system in relation to other guilds would be simple enough. Any guild, so-called, would lay down the conditions of entrance to itself (subject, of course, to the general approval of the State). The training given in the Faculties of Medicine in the Universities would naturally reach at least this minimum standard; for if it did not, nobody intending to enter the profession would take it. The Faculty of Medicine would be in the educational guild, or under its control; it would represent an adaptation on the part of that guild to a general principle. No school or faculty should be independent of the general educational guild, or under its control; it would represent an adaptation on the part of that guild to a general principle. No school or faculty should be independent of the general educational guild, or under its control; it would represent an adaptation on the part of that guild to a general principle. No school or faculty should be independent of the general educational guild, or under its control; it would represent an adaptation on the part of that guild to a general principle. No school or faculty should be independent of the general educational guild, or under its control; it would represent an adaptation on the part of that guild to a general principle. No school or faculty should be independent of the general educational guild, or under its control; it would represent an adaptation on the part of that guild to a general principle. No school or faculty should be independent of the general educational guild, or under its control; it would represent an adaptation on the part of that guild to a general principle. No school or faculty should be independent of the general educational guild, or under its control; it would represent an adaptation on the part of that guild to a general principle. No school or faculty should be independent of the general educational guild, or under its control; it would represent an adaptation on the part of that guild to a general principle. No school or faculty should be independent of the general educational guild, or under its control; it would represent an adaptation on the part of that guild to a general principle. No school or faculty should be independent of the general educational guild, or under its control; it would represent an adaptation on the part of that guild to a general principle. No school or faculty should be independent of the general educational guild, or under its control; it would represent an adaptation on the part of that guild to a general principle. No school or faculty should be independent of the general educational guild, or under its control; it would represent an adaptation on the part of that guild to a general principle. No school or faculty should be independent of the general educational guild, or under its control; it would represent an adaptation on the part of that guild to a general principle. No school or faculty should be independent of the general educational guild, or under its control; it would represent an adaptation on the part of that guild to a general principle. No school or faculty should be independent of the general educational guild, or under its control; it would represent an adaptation on the part of that guild to a general principle. No school or faculty should be independent of the general educational guild, or under its control; it would represent an adaptation on the part of that guild to a general principle. No school or faculty should be independent of the general educational guild, or under its control; it would represent an adaptation on the part of that guild to a general principle. No school or faculty should be independent of the general educational guild, or under its control; it would represent an adaptation on the part of that guild to a general principle. No school or faculty should be independent of the general educational guild, or under its control; it would represent an adaptation on the part of that guild to a general principle. No school or faculty should be independent of the general educational guild, or under its control; it would represent an adaptation on the part of that guild to a general principle. No school or faculty should be independent of the general educational guild, or under its control; it would represent an adaptation on the part of that guild to a general principle. No school or faculty should be independent of the general educational guild, or under its control; it would represent an adaptation on the part of that guild to a general principle. No school or faculty should be independent of the general educational guild, or under its control; it would represent an adaptation on the part of that guild to a general principle. No school or faculty should be independent of the general educational guild, or under its control; it would represent an adaptation on the part of that guild to a general principle. No school or faculty should be independent of the general educational guild, or under its control; it would represent an adaptation on the part of that guild to a general principle. No school or faculty should be independent of the general educational guild, or under its control; it would represent an adaptation on the part of that guild to a general principle. No school or faculty should be independent of the general educational guild, or under its control; it would represent an adaptation on the part of that guild to a general principle. No school or faculty should be independent of the general educational guild, or under its control; it would represent an adaptation on the part of that guild to a general principle. No school or faculty should be independent of the general educational guild, or under its control; it would represent an adaptation on the part of that guild to a general principle. No school or faculty should be independent of the general educational guild, or under its control; it would represent an adaptation on the part of that guild to a general principle.
gaged for the performance of routine work, which, we know, is all that our teachers of to-day are entitled to be. When they happen to be more, it is not in the bond.

Something, however, should finally be said about federal arrangements. The central idea which we have taken as a guide in this discussion is that of autonomy. Various writers on educational reform, the views of some of whom are entitled to respect, have almost gone so far as to suggest that our future Universities will consist of numerous federated colleges of various kinds. "Each University should recognise, and utilise by affiliation, the work by Technical Colleges and Collegiate Institutions (Colleges of Art, of Agriculture, for the Training of Teachers, etc.), in so far as it is on a University level. This would not only bring about much closer co-operation, but would greatly extend University teaching, and save wasteful duplication of staff and equipment. . . . To assist in the work of co-ordination, a Committee, say the National Advisory Committee, should regulate and control the relations between these affiliated centres and the University itself. . . . There should be representation of such affiliated colleges in all the courts of the institution."

No one with any experience of University administration has much taste for federal Universities or affiliation arrangements of the ordinary kind; and this suggestion seems to contemplate an indefinite extension of the idea of the federal or guild educational system, such as that which I am trying to outline, the most prominent causes of some of these difficulties would disappear. No question would arise with reference to their most fruitful source, the affiliation of Universities and Technical Colleges. More generally, indeed, it would be recognised that the prevailing attempts to bring professional and technical institution into immediate relation to the Universities not only presents acute administrative problems, but implies a wrong principle. On the other hand, other types of federal organisation exist, for which more, perhaps, can be said. Some of them, it is true, are due mainly to the necessity for devising some working arrangement between institutions which had been brought into existence by a series of policies all equally short-sighted. Another class, again, the mark of the University of London, which grants all its degrees by examination without evidence of residence or attendance at an affiliated college. As a permanent body, the need to which it ministers to-day would be a centre, available directly for people who may never have been beyond the school stage, it leaves little to be desired. It would be a mistake to assume that even with a great improvement in the relative attainments of the whole citizen body, the need to which it ministers to-day would wholly pass away. Some desire on the part of members of industrial guilds for theoretical instruction in subjects of vast public importance will always remain, and may, indeed, be expected to increase. The University Extension system cannot face it; but the democratic highly adaptable constitution of the W.E.A. may serve as a model to which a greater thing than itself may be constructed.

Of all the services which make up the economic life of the community, that of education is almost the most susceptible of guild organisation as an immediate measure. A discussion of transition is, therefore, hardly necessary. The problems which would most of all press for solution arise rather from the reactions of great educational changes on other services and on industrial life. No matter how inexpensive and easy you make elementary and secondary education, in a society like ours, to say that it gives an equal chance to various sections of the community is flagrantly absurd. A really comprehensive scheme of scholarships on a national basis with the object of ensuring that no child shall be prevented by the poverty of its parents or the obscurantism of local educational authorities from access to educational facilities up to the University stage, is an unquestionable necessity for very many years at least. At the later stages, these should be on a generous scale. We may as well accustom men early to a proper standard of life; they will be the less likely thereafter to submit to exploitation. Most of us, no doubt, have met men who had taken harm from having too much money. We have all seen infinitely more harm come from too little. For the former there is always the remedy of moral reformation of which we have also heard a great deal, generally with reference to the working classes.

This discussion has naturally been concerned mainly with administrative problems. Certain wide educational principles are, I hope, evident and implied. Positively they regard education as the training of the capacities of the soul, and freedom as its core. And negatively they altogether decline to admit that anything worth having can be imposed from above. In American Universities, the compelling idea of organisation was more and more tending to reduce higher education to an enormous loose collection of specialisms. A great tradition has preserved our Universities from this blight, though its influence on the community is flagrantly absent. The demand for technical in place of civic education was one of them; the growing neglect of the Faculty of Arts was another. No final cure can be discovered without a new birth of ideas, and a still newer belief in them. This discussion, however, is not irrelevant. An educational system—even a system of administration—is not mere machinery which can be turned equally to the service of every end opinion may happen to suggest. The principle of local external control, which dominates the present system, is responsible for more than half of our educational deficiencies. It substitutes prejudices for prin-

---

"Reform in Scottish Education; being the Report of the Scottish Education Reform Committee of the Educational Institute of Scotland," p. 117.
ciples; it introduces into education the profit-making
standard; it keeps the teachers of all grades in their
places, and by confusing them to a moral purpose
deprees them of initiative, and induces them to rule
children by fear instead of consent. But it reflects
the economic structure. The deadly trail of the industrial
system is over it all.

Music.
By William Atheling.

FUNCTIONS OF CRITICISM.
The second season must be worse than the first for
any critic who desires impartiality. If a performer has
once bored you to death it is, in the first place, very
difficult to drag yourself to hear him again; and if
this reluctance be overcome it is still difficult not to
carry with you a touch of resentment for the initial
annoyance. Conversely, it is difficult when one has
been delighted by a player not to arrive at his second
performance with a certain readiness to attribute all
faults to chance. Even so we may take it is as un-
likely that any performer over 45 is likely to receive a
wholly new musical intelligence for to develop a new
and raving charm. It is man going to change from an egoistic temperamental impresario of school-
girls to a serious musician the change should happen
before he is much past 35.
The function of musical criticism, or rather of fort-
nightly criticism of performing, is to make it pos-
sible for the best performers to present their best
work; for them to give concerts under present con-
ditions without making any concession whatsoever to
ignorance and bad taste. Beyond that one might have ambitions, both of developing the discretion of a
possible public, and of actually enlightening young
or untrained musicians (or even elderly amateurs) con-
cerning their own shortcomings, and their possible
avenues of improvement. Do bad musicians attend
good concerts? In several cases where great profi-
ciency and obviously great experience in public per-
formance are coupled with overmastering dulnessness, one
would suggest that every piece of music worth presen-
ting in public has a meaning. The composer pre-
sumably felt something, and equally wished to express
something by his fugue, étude, or sonata. My state-
ment is simple, and platitudinous; but correct detail
and even that rather rare thing, correct architectonics,
will not hold the better attentions unless the per-
former have, beyond a concept of the composers'
style, and a style for representing it, some intention
to express the unifying emotion or emotions of the
particular piece. It is by no means necessary that
these emotions be the same as were the composer's,
the performer must think both "Bach" and "Cia-
connna," if he is to give the piece with effect. He
must unite his general feel of the composer to his par-
cular concept of the piece to be given.

II.
There is a prevalent superstition or tradition or con-
dition among performers that they "must give work by
living English composers if they want press-notices." With devilish cunning they not only give
these works—songs for the most part—but they plant
them in the programmes in such a mechanical routine
And in explanation of this frightfulness they say that
if they put them at the beginning people won't come
till they are over; and if they put them at the end,
persons will go before the end of the concert. I have
not yet verified the existence of the hidden hand in
British music. The "Daily Telegraph" is popularly
supposed to consult the war-map for the week before
deciding on the merits of foreign composers. Prac-
tical justice demands that whenever a singer does one
the ill turn of sticking his C. Scott, Dunhill, Ireland,
V. Williams, F. Bridge smack in the middle of his
programme, his concert should be judged on the sing-
ing solely of these composers. Music was im-
possible even in the possible part of concert.

ROSSING, and Laurel Crowns.
The sensitive ear was charmed with anticipation; 
Rossing's programme (Oct. 19; Wigmore) was wholly
uncompromising. His voice was at its best, in all its
exquisite variety. Through the opening group of
French songs from thirteenth to sixteenth century the
singer used the greatest possible diversity of
shading. In this single of range, this, at first sight,
so small part of his repertoire, he was far too inter-
esting to permit the critic to take notes. I mean
exactly that—the orchestration of the voice was so
subtle that one could not scribble and listen at the
same time, there was too much going on. The four
by six performer imagines, or rather does not imagine
but takes it for granted, that the scale contains thir-
ten tones and half tones, and that to sing consists in
hitting (or approximating) the note set down on the
page. It seemed to me that Rossing never re-
peated the same sound through all the six songs of
opening group. The simplicity of de la Halle and
Marot allowed an elaborate art of colour, and of recede
and approach. Plus ne sui ce que j'ai été " was
taken rather fast, but with a very personal interpre-
tation, and one might in time come to prefer Rossing's
speed to one's own concept of the tempo.
The Schumann, which would have been the high-
brow gem of a popular programme, sank into scale.
Both Schumann and Heine were in perpetual danger of "sentiment. " "Mes Larmes" grazed the danger.
There was a little too much fuss in "En Rêve." This
Schumann is "very queer in French." "J'ai par-
donne" was drama; one realised after a time that it
was "Ich grolle nicht"; once rendered in English as "I do not growl, when thou the heart me break,
I do not growl." We might almost lay it down as
axiomatic that a song must be sung in its original
language. It is probably impossible to sing even
Heine (the Kaiser's pet detestation) in German just
at present; but the perfect union of word and note is so
subtle and so rare a thing that, once attained, no
substitute is likely to give satisfaction, unless the
translator be a great technician, able to support treble
the technical difficulty which faced the original poet.
In this case the French sob was a shade too sobby.
Audience naturally move for vociferous the first
stage of the programme; which, however, made a
volute face into reality with the Rimsky Korsakov
group of songs. Di Veroli's accompanying had been
valuable all along, and showed particularly in "On
the Hills." One comes to believe that the mass of even so
good a public as Rossing's is bewildered by anything
unfamiliar. "Come see your garden" was perhaps
the finest of the four Korsakovs. The Aria from
Christmas Eve is great fun, drollery—magnificent
singing.

Note that the programme was arranged, built as
skillfully as a good play, first the suave subtle old
French music, then the florid and sentimental touch-
ing the popular heart, then the real, in Korsakov,
applause less excited but persistent, the determined
clapping of the connoisseurs who had paid their money
and were determined to get all the Russian music
they could.
Here Rossing executed a tour de force of pedagogy.
All but the feather-earred had seen the difference be-
tween the translated Schumann and the Korsakov.
The Christmas Aria was excellent, a model of how
an aria should be set, words and the notes perfectly
wedded. The encore was Moussorgsky's "Song of
the Flea," and with it the augmentation for climax,
for here one felt instantly the hand of the greater
master. The song is a satire, but the fullness of the great artist was there.

Moussorgsky has his place beyond all other Russians. You cannot compare Music since Beethoven with the early thin music, which is like delicate patterns on glass. Since Beethoven is the hero thought of music as of something with a new bulk and volume. Beyond all the floridity and pretence of Wagner are these Russians, and beyond them Moussorgsky, like the primordial granite. It was excellent to have the Schumann programme to give this sense of proportion (even though the Schumann was not given in the best possible condition). It was as if the singer had said, You like Schumann—well, here is the real thing, Korsakov. You take it. Then there is something beyond that—The Plan.

After the climax in the third group, the play worked to its end with four Siberian convict songs, eerie, dramatic (not in the bad sense), the rough material on which Moussorgsky built his achievement. In the "Escaped Prisoners" we had the peculiar Russian negation, sinister in the opening. Di Veroli gave an excellent frozen accompaniment to "Cold Winter." The audience does not get up at the end with the early thin music, which is like delicate patterns on glass. Since Beethoven is the hero thought of music as of something with a new bulk and volume. Beyond all the floridity and pretence of Wagner are these Russians, and beyond them Moussorgsky, like the primordial granite. It was excellent to have the Schumann programme to give this sense of proportion (even though the Schumann was not given in the best possible condition). It was as if the singer had said, You like Schumann—well, here is the real thing, Korsakov. You take it. Then there is something beyond that—The Plan.

Readers and Writers.

I was discussing last week the conditions of a free Press in this country; and I arrived at the conclusion that a free Press is only possible under special circumstances, namely, the association with it of some monopoly of interest, such as the special financial information of the "Statist," the clerical correspondence of the "Manchester Guardian," and so on. This brings me to the point which few writers dare to state in public (though they do it in private), namely, the small and decreasing amount of pure intelligence in the country. Pure intelligence I should define as displaying itself in disinterested interest in things; in things, that is to say, of no personal advantage, but only of general, public or universal importance. Interest (to turn the coin the other side) is the growing end of the mind; and its direction and strength are marked by a motiveless curiosity to know: it reveals itself, while it is still active, as a love of knowledge for its own sake. Later on, of course, it often appears that this motiveless love had a motive; in other words, the knowledge acquired under its impulse is discovered in the end to "come in handy," and to have been of use. But the process of acquiring this knowledge is, for the most part, indeliberate, unaware of any other aim than the satisfaction of curiosity; utility is remote from its mind. This is what I have called disinterested interest; and it is this free intelligence of which it appears to me that there is a diminishing amount in our day. Were it not the case, the fortunes of the really free Press would be much brighter than they are. Even an organ of free opinion would not need to discover a utilitarian attraction for its free opinions, but would be able, on the contrary, to command a sale on its own merits. Such, indeed, is the case in several European countries, notably in France, Italy and Germany. I am told that it is the case also in Bohemia (in which country there is not only no illiterate, but no un-read adult), and in the provinces of Yugo Slavia. In these countries, a journal of opinions can live without providing its readers with any commercial or specialist bribe in the way of exclusive utilitarian information; it can live, that is to say, by the sale of its free intelligence. Happy countries—in one sense of the word; happy if also tragical; for there existance is not always, at any rate, a paradise for the rich, a hell for the poor, and a purgatory for the able!  

To what is due this decline amongst us of free intelligence? There are several explanations possible, though none, I think, is wholly satisfying. One is the religious duty of perfection—might easily account for the diminution of our regard for one of the chief instruments of perfection, namely, intelligence. Why should we strive to set the crooked straight, since it is not only impossible but is no duty of ours? And why should we care how much intelligence the individual means when the end is of no value? As I have said, however, none of these explanations really satisfies me. My readers are at liberty to make their own guesses at truth.
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correspondence. It is an unusual thing to do to draw aside contrary, many live by being found out. The free
think it is the case that the free Press is more severely
with the "kept" Press it protests its freedom and sets
chicanery of all kinds, in every form of intellectual and
have been taken before.

As this is the last issue of the present volume I
take the liberty of recording here a few, only a few, of
the comments passed upon The New Age by its
readers, communicated in conversation or by corre-
spondence. It is an unusual thing to do to draw aside
the wing-curtains of the stage of the Press; and, in all
probability, the intimate implied in it will be a little
resented. Nevertheless, the risk shall be taken, as it
has been taken before.

"The Notes of the Week" are always the same.
They get monotonous. "You never say the same thing
in the "Notes of the Week"; their policy is always
changing."

"Too much about Guild Socialism." As the pro-
cessed organ of Guild Socialism, you do not devote
enough space to the subject."

"The New Age is much too much of a jingo journal
in these days." "The New Age is pacifist in disgnise,
and is probably run on pro-German money."

"Too trying to middle-class intellec
tuals." "Makes a pet of the working classes, and
sees no virtue in any other class."

"Improvisal." "Always dealing with piffling points
of practical detail."

"Puritan." "Always trying to shock decent people."

"Too much sameness about its contributors." "Your
contributors seem to be always in disagreement; no two
of them say the same thing."

"Atheist and blasphemous." "Too pietistic."

"Pro-Boer." "Imperialist."

"Written over the heads of ordinary people." "Too
elementary for words."

"S. Verdud (add every other regular writer) makes
The New Age intolerable." "S. Verdud (add every
other regular writer) is the only page I read the paper
for."

"Too much Art, Music, etc." "Not enough Art,
Music, etc."

"Nothing to read in it." "Too much to get through
in a week's time."

"Reviews always very harsh and unfair." "You are
obviously subsidised by one or two publishers."

"Too insular and chauvinist."

I am very grateful for the response made by our
readers to my recent appeal for direct subscribers. Of
the 1,500 indirect subscribers indicated in my balance-
sheet of a few weeks ago, no fewer than 1,500 have
now sent in subscriptions and most of them with an
accompanying note of a personally gratifying character.
Unfortunately, however the general situation has not
been sufficiently affected; and it remains to us there-
fore to adopt the course which is the only alternative
left to us. The price of The New Age to the indirect
subscriber will in future be sevenpence instead of six-
ence a week. Direct subscribers, on the other hand,
will continue to receive their copies at the old rates.

R. H. C.

Memories of Old Jerusalem.—II.

By Ph. J. Baldenepger.

Edited by MARMADUKE PICKTHALL.

A small, dark turban was put round the red
unironed turbash. The better-class wore socks reach-
ing halfway up the leg. Their temple-tufts* were very
still, unlike the curly ones of the Slnkâj. The Spanish
Jewesses, who were rather coquettish, wore an orna-
mented flat crown on the head, and their ruddy faces
knocked in a mass of well-plunged black hair and
stiffly together with the kohl-ed eyebrows and lashes, were reminiscent of their Oriental sisters. A white, unclosed Iârâ, with-
out a face-veil, distinguished them from Muslim and
Christian women. The Polish Jews were transformed
completely, all except the slippers inseparable from
them. They had a long oriental kafant over their usual
underclothes, and a rich fur surcoat trailing
almost to the ground. The everyday hat was replaced by a black velvet cap trimmed with long Siberian fur, put on over the inevitable sweat-cap. Their temple-
curls were very long and greased. Though we were
not on speaking terms with these Jews we knew their
faces, from their frequent visits to the Montefiore settle-
ment when they trailed across Mount Zion in slow-
moving groups. The man, absolute lord and master,
led the way, then came his wife some twenty or thirty
pieces behind, and then untidily dressed little Jankels
and Iezics.

Divine Service in the synagogue which opened on the
Horat el-Yahhâd was not surrounded by a wall of
fanaticism like the worship of the Christian and the
Muslim. We could there remark that the Law of
Moses and the Prophets were translated in outward
and visible signs such as the horn fastened on the
head or bound upon the arm with leather straps.
Every male member of the congregation, wearing a
black and white shawl over head and shoulders, kept
swinging the upper part of the body to and fro. We
had seen them knocking their heads against the wall
at the wailing-place, and shedding tears for the
destruction of the Temple. We should even have
pityed their forlorn condition if the Greek boys of our
school had not told us blood-curdling stories of their
trapping Christian boys at Easter to be sacrificed at
their feast. Absurd though they might always seem to
us, how could we be indifferent to dark hints and
alleged facts concerning some near neighbour who had
thus mysteriously disappeared? Jews were well versed
in sorcery, they told us, and as they could not act
actively used cabalistic means. The victim was measured
by his shadow towards sunset; and at the appointed
time was drawn into the net. I was never much afraid
of the Jews except at Purim, when with wild rejoicings
they celebrated their escape from massacre in the days
of Ahasherus. It was neither the Greek Light nor the
Standard of the Nebi Mûsâ, but "spirits" which en-
lightened them on this occasion. By the afternoon they
were so gay or excited that they had forgotten whether

* Sawâlêff. † Komzâb.
Haman executed Mordecai, or whether Mordecai was
pointed to the window. Then they pointed to another window,
shouting and yelling: "Da gickt er—da gickt er," till poor Théophile was half out of his wits and thought
his end was near. He had no doubt but that they were preparing for the ritual sacrifice. Nightmares and
other disturbances were the consequence of his visit; but happily the Jewish festival had passed away.
The usually timid Jews appeared to us as savages, after that; and we avoided the Jewish quarter on
Hamman's day, as carefully as we did the Christian quarter on Sabt en-Nur, or the Muslim quarter at the
Mōsam of Nebi Mūsā.

Most of the faces known to us from their constantly passing near the school were faces of Siknāj, perhaps
because the Spanish Jews appeared more ordinary to our boyish eyes. A list of pretty rosy-cheeked girls,
with long curly hair uncovered, full of life and fun, passed daily up or down the hill. We heard that those
who hid their hair had entered the bonds of marriage.

The Spanish Jewesses continued to show their luxuriant tresses even after marriage. Why this
difference between two sections of the same religion and race? The Sikmājī's dress was less picturesque
than that of the Yahudī. A simple gown, the same blue stockings as her husband's, and the inevitable
yellowish-brown shawl covered the head, shoulders and back, and hang down almost to the ground. The slip-
pers were perhaps the reason of the general tetchiness of Polish Jews. They seemed always irritated either
by the loss of their slippers, by hunting for them, or by the trouble of keeping them on their feet. Their
readiness to flee and hide themselves, to retreat when anyone approached, made them targets when they
went outside their quarter. Add to that their fidgetty behaviour, their continually moving arms, their clutch-
ing fingers, their hands held up as if in self-defence, and you have a picture of our Polish Jevusite, distinc-
tiable from afar. Even in disguise, he could not get rid of the timidity and tell-tale gestures, which have
been bred into him by centuries of persecution. Just beside the Dung-gate and below the Jewish quarter, a
small colony of Moors had taken up their quarters, giving their name (Bāb el Mughārah) to the gate. A long
yellowish-brown shawl covered the head, shoulders and back, and hang down almost to the ground.
the barracks in the Via Dolorosa, near St. Stephen's Gate. As the soldiers spoke Turkish only, and the people of Jerusalem spoke mostly Arabic, there was very little intercourse between the two. The soldiers marched out of the town for drill or shooting once or twice a week to the level ground about Mamillah or the plain of Rephaim. The principal exercises were performed in the vast courtyards of the barracks. We knew of the latter inhabitants, that is, the Jebusites, the name of the country, and his prisons as often as they flourished more than did the captives. Murderers in many cases being public custom excused the crime to some extent to their owner's name. He paid a visit to my father at the Zion School, with the result that the dog was offered as Hamshari (my compatriot), and, consequently, the Arabic word for soldier: 'askari was often changed into Hamshari, meaning Turkish soldier. The five gates of Jerusalem were guarded by them, a sentinel standing at each gate. Near the sentinel a customs officer sat on a low stool, to inspect goods brought into the town. Many articles had to pay a duty, and often the sacks on the camels were pierced with a sharp instrument to see that tobacco and other forbidden things were not smuggled in. The door-keeper closed the gate and locked it with a key by sunset, giving up the keys at the Seraia.* Rarely was a soldier seen outside the barracks except on duty, for they were considered as more or less forced into this service, and so desolate was their life. Their modern custom of visiting cafes and restaurants was not then in vogue; and how could they spend money when they had none? They amused themselves inside the barracks with Turkish games, and felt no need of other company. Their trumpets were heard all day long at intervals. In the evening, before their meal the companies assembled and saluted the Sultan with a mighty shout in unison: 'Allah yunsur es-Sultan!' We heard it daily in our school outside the walls, though half a mile away.

The Seraia (the Pasha's residence) served at the same time as jail and court of justice for the whole of the Mutesarrifate of El Cuds (Jerusalem). We were allowed to visit it on Ramadan evenings, when Muslim life is active all night long. The fast of Ramadan prevents all kinds of business in the daytime; the nights are passed in visiting and revelry. The Seraia then might be considered as a kind of Casino, where people went to spend a pleasant evening. Great oil-lanterns and lamps illuminated the whole building. Ambulant sweet-merchants offered delicacies to all-comers—Kurābiye—Halab (almond cakes in cream of sugar), knafieh and ma 'rūla, and other Turkish confections, with Roh' el Hallākām, Hallāweh, and Imlabbas for the young. Sometimes we were acquainted with a prisoner, who was very thankful to receive a visit and some eatables, as prisoners depend for food on their own means or the donations of the charitable. All kinds of vermin flourished more than did the captives. Murderers walked about with heavy chains on hands and feet. We then knew nothing of the law of Thār (revenge), which being public custom excused the crime to some extent in many cases.

The Pasha himself, supreme chief and master of all Jcubsites, was seen as little as possible outside the palace. By the purest chance we made the acquaintance of Zheyreah Pasha, Governor of Jerusalem. We were out for a walk, attended by a large black poodle, of the name of Mudīr, a pet for pleasure rather than for work, so by his appearance that his Excellency stopped to ask the owner's name. He paid a visit to my father at the Zion School, with the result that the dog was offered to him. In return, he invited us to visit him, his residence, and his prisons as often as we liked. We thus saw Bedawi prisoners of note, revolted chiefs of the Ta'ami tribes, and other fellāh—Shuyūkh,* who happened to be guests of the Government. We enjoyed these visits, which initiated us into the manners of the country, and were very grateful to the Pasha, more so because once or twice he ran back home. At last he was held back in durance by his new lord till he and the Pasha had alike forgotten us.

Views and Reviews.

MAN AND THE MACHINE.

III.

Miss Helen Marot's survey and criticism of existing conditions passes easily from industry to education, which is, and must necessarily be in modern States, the handmaid of industry. The ideal education even of Plato was designed to produce the perfect citizen, and he sought to achieve that end by a rigid delimitation of functions. But as the whole difficulty has arisen from this limitation of man to his functions, we have nothing to hope from any merely repressive system. When we reflect that the political destinies of most modern countries are largely determined by the judgment of the worker, it becomes a matter of some import that the worker should not be kept in his place, but should be put there. Perfect citizenship must be realised in the State of the worker; and in the modern industrial State the work by which the man gets his living must constitute the most important of his activities; and how he does that work, whether intelligently or unintelligently, become a matter of national concern. Miss Marot's contrast of 'the German way' with 'the American way' illuminates vividly the different ideals, although it emphasises the warning that Prussianism is not confined to Prussia. The German way, because it was the most perfectly organised, has produced the most obvious result in the lack of initiative, and particularly in the political incompetence, of the average German; but the phenomenon is not exclusively German, we should rather say that it is industrial, and not national. Professor Schneider, of Cincinnati, has recorded the opinion that 'we are rapidly dividing mankind into a staff of mental workers and an army of purely physical workers. The physical workers are becoming more and more lethargic. The work itself is not character-building; on the contrary, it is repressive, and when self-expression comes, it is hardly energising mentally. The real menace lies in the fact that in a self-governing industrial community the minds of the majority are in danger of becoming less capable of sound and serious thought because of lack of continuous constructive exercise in earning a livelihood.'

There is, even in this country, some dissatisfaction with the system of education, and particularly with the authoritative method. Mr. Caldwell Cook experiments with the Play way; Mr. Kenneth Richmond tries to educate for liberty; but both of them are preoccupied with literary culture, and seek the expression of the creative impulses mainly through the liberal arts. This is no disparagement of their method, but it is a limitation of their usefulness; for we are living in a labour-State and not a leisure-State, and for most of us the problem is not so much getting a living, but of living in getting a living, is the all-important problem. You cannot make repetition work interesting by writing roundels about it, nor save the industrial worker's soul alive by eliciting and training faculties that he cannot exercise in his work. It is in industry that he must find his salvation, not as a refuge for reality, for the necessary work that men have to do.

America, of course, is the home of educational as well as industrial experiments; and a very interesting...

* "God give the Sultan victory!" This is Arabic.
* "The Pasha himself, supreme chief and master of all Jcubsites, was seen as little as possible outside the palace. By the purest chance we made the acquaintance of Zheyreah Pasha, Governor of Jerusalem. We were out for a walk, attended by a large black poodle, of the name of Mudīr, a pet for pleasure rather than for work, so by his appearance that his Excellency stopped to ask the owner's name. He paid a visit to my father at the Zion School, with the result that the dog was offered..."
* "Long live the Sovereign!"—Ed.
* Government house.
* Arab sheikhs.
* "Padshamim choq yasha!"—"Long live the Sovereign!"—Ed.
account of them was given by Professor Dewey in his "Schools of To-morrow," published here, I think, by Dent. The experiment that has the most obvious bearing on the industrial problem is the Gary school system it does, to a quite extraordinary extent, enable the children to participate in the industrial activity of their cloistered community. They are an actual part of the repair and construction working force of the school building. They do the school printing and accounting. They are not being trained for industry, they are actually being trained in the technique of industry; they are doing actual productive work, under trade conditions, for use and not for profit, and the scheme is perhaps as perfect as any elementary school system can be.

But, after all, it is a laboratory experiment in industrial life. The Gary schools are not industry; they are a world apart; they represent, as all schools do, all the political phrase are not only the political ones assumed by some National Guildsmen. Control of industry is not to be obtained by the introduction of the system of representative government to industry; it matters little whether work is done at the behest of the capitalist, the State, or the Trade Union, the psychological effect is much the same. The mere election of supervisors, or of supervising bodies, will not alter the fact that the direction of Germany's technical problems of manufacture, keeping the financial administration in expert hands, can we claim more than that the policy of her soldier War Minister should have been submitted to a committee of the Reichstag for approval before it becomes law and before proceeding to apply it? The point was amply demonstrated in the waging of the war. The direction of our affairs was in the hands of a Civil War Cabinet, acting on the advice of experts. The direction of Germany's affairs was in the hands of soldiers. That sounds as though they had a better application of the functional principle than we. In the interests of democracy, therefore, it is doubtful whether we are justified in claiming more than that the policy of her soldier War Minister should have been submitted to a committee of the Reichstag for approval before being enacted. Did we not practically admit the inefficiency of our own system at the time of the Versailles Conference? You will, no doubt, remember the remarks of Mr. Lloyd George, on the principle of executive powers, which they seem to applaud. It might be worth pointing out that, while we have not practically admit the inefficiency of our own system, the direction of Germany's affairs was in the hands of soldiers acting on the advice of experts. It seems to me that this is a point of vital interest both from the Guild as well as the international point of view, and which we shall do well to watch during the re-shaping of the German constitution.

SIR,—It is obvious that this question of differentiation between German rulers and ruled is going to form the heart of negotiation for peace, and in view of condition of Germany, we have ignored his contention that Germany's internal administration had in many respects been actually more democratically efficient than that of the foremost democracies ranged against her, and that Germans were consciously averse to our excessive parliamentarisation of national affairs. If Germany should still prefer to leave the direction of her administration in expert hands, can we not then see that they shall first submit their administrative policy to the Reichstag for approval before it becomes law and before proceeding to apply it? The point was amply demonstrated in the waging of the war. The direction of our affairs was in the hands of a Civil War Cabinet, acting on the advice of experts. The direction of Germany's affairs was in the hands of soldiers. That sounds as though they had a better application of the functional principle than we. In the interests of democracy, therefore, it is doubtful whether we are justified in claiming more than that the policy of her soldier War Minister should have been submitted to a committee of the Reichstag for approval before being enacted. Did we not practically admit the inefficiency of our own system at the time of the Versailles Conference? You will, no doubt, remember the remarks of Mr. Lloyd George, on the principle of executive powers, which they seem to applaud. It might be worth pointing out that, while we have not practically admit the inefficiency of our own system, the direction of Germany's affairs was in the hands of soldiers acting on the advice of experts. It seems to me that this is a point of vital interest both from the Guild as well as the international point of view, and which we shall do well to watch during the re-shaping of the German constitution.

SIR,—In Mr. Robieon's valuable article on "The Re-organisation of University Education" there is one main point on which his decision seems to me, on his own
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Tcheko-Slovakia.

Sir,—Your correspondent, Mr. Leighton Warnock, should

be chary of accepting as "gospel" the various kinds of

"nationalist" literature turned out during the war for

propaganda purposes; in the future little of it will be

considered of historical value. "Les Slovaques" re-

commended by that indefatigable propagandist, M. Vladimir

Nosek, may be better than most—I have not read it—but works published in France of this type have,

as a rule, if anything, been worse than ours.

Mr. Watkin, in a recent book on the general ignorance about Hungary, and this applies, of

course, also to the Carpathian districts; so few people

have been there. Incidentally, when I was last travel-

ling among these beautiful mountains, I went through

a home of untrammelled research and the organ of

modern, and as a centre of illumination for all the professions, medi-
cine and law as well as teaching, though it may have
duties more definite and detailed with reference to the

last. To the point I feel strongly about is that it is just

because the University is not an "organ" or "part"
of the Teachers' Guild, just because teaching will take its

place as activities that the combative relationship which must exist between each University

and the educational life of the province which it serves

will be a source of vitality and inspiration.

E. TOWNSHEND.

FIGHTING OR KILLING.

Sirs,—Your correspondent [E. Watson] finds ample

support for his distinction between the combative and

the killing instinct in man in the works of anthropolo-
gists like Taylor and Frazer, but especially in the chapter

on "The Instinct of Pugnacity" in McDougall's "Social

Psychology." It will there be seen that, while the

combative instinct is a truth of nature, there is certainly no

distinctive instinct to kill. This is only the ultimate

and extreme form of such as the instinct to

express itself. Mr. Colvin, in his argument with Mr.

Wells, may be perfectly right in relying on "the com-

bative instinct in man which prompts him to fight for

all that he wants," so long as "all that he wants" does not

necessarily include the mere desire to kill, for such an

unmixed desire is nowhere to be traced. Though

McDougall instances peoples whose inter-tribal feuds are

curried to death, for no material benefit whatever;

under the influence of the "uncomplicated operation of

the instinct of pugnacity," yet this (Borneo) is "one of the few

few regions in which this state of things still

exists." The combative instinct appears to be excited to

its utmost limit by some social factor, such as the

preservation of social prestige or the duty of tribal

vengeance. Taylor points out that "even when we

find a strong distinction drawn between manslaughter

and regular war, which is waged not so much for mutual

destruction as for victory to settle a quarrel between two

parties." ("Anthropology," p. 223.) Then follows an

account of how the instinct of pugnacity is very gene-

rally satisfied by a sham fight started on some trivial

pretext, the fight consisting mainly of mutual insults

and endeavours to mortify rather than to kill the enemy.

The resentment of the beaten party may, however, lead
to a serious combat and culminate in wholesale slaughter.

Carlile's dictum that '"the ultimate question between
every two human beings is, 'Can I kill thee, or canst
thou kill me?"' is true, but it is the ultimate,

not the normal, question, and the extreme, not the normal,

expression of the instinct of pugnacity in man. The

evidence of anthropologists, such as it is, shows that

pugnacity is, while the desire to kill is not, instinctive

in primitive human nature. And this rather supports Mr.

Colvin's position that arbitration might satisfy only a part

of man's appetite.

On the other hand, neither does there appear any in-

stinct against the taking of human life. Any reader of

Frazier knowledge of primitive warfare knows that

manslaughter, but this is due not so much to an in-

nitive respect for life as to fear of an avenging ghost.

This note merely scratches the surface of a far-reaching

question, and brings to mind a number of views

but it may help us to avoid for ever, in our sociological

discussions, placing any reliance upon such hypothetical

instincts in the natural man as the desire to kill or an

inherent respect for human life. The combative instinct

remains to be reckoned with. The various kinds of

pugnacities to an emulative impulse is, as it ever has

been, the mark of development in social life, and

organisation.

V. AUGUSTE DEMANT.
pet and lover of the oppressed, who at the dinner given in his honour by literary admirers on his being sentenced for advocating in his prose poem, "Le triomphe de la domestique," the theory and practice of regicide (on the occasion of the Tsar's second visit to Paris)—was it not for advocating in his prose poem, Tailhade who proposed the toast, "A la Catalogne! A l'Arme! Aux Juifs Roumains!"?

THE INDIAN CASTE.

Sir,—In your notes of May 30, you say the following: "Analogies are usually unsafe, but the analogy between the circulation of the blood in the body and of the currency that is in circulation is close. Now, suppose that there were in the body an organ for the collection and distributing of blood, whose criterion of distribution should be, not the need of the whole, nor even the needs of the parts, but the advantage to itself, would not such an organ be diseased, a sort of cancerous heart? In permitting a Money Trust to be formed in the nation, solely on its own private profit, and both collecting and distributing currency with only that object in view, what are we doing, however, but establishing just such a cancerous heart in the body politic? The inept sociologist is not wrong with the Sibs and Tailhades when such a hidden organ has been formed. Their diagnosis will stop at symptoms, and their prescriptions at patent medicines.

The idea you have expressed form the kernel of the theory of Indian caste and the secret of its abuse. The various castes and sub-castes in India are so many organs of the national body. It must also be noted that India is made up of a number of territorial divisions—not one nation but a nation of nations—each being constituted on the principle of a common language. There are thus two principles of caste formation in India—the territorial and the functional. Each territorial population constitutes a self-contained nation, as it were, with its various functional castes, and presents distinctions of race and tribe for purposes of marriage and other kindred things, not only as between one nation but one common human nature.

This is caste and its distinctions. But now it is all a case of disease and disorder. The idea that an organ exists, "for the need of the whole," and "not for advantage to itself," has been forgotten, and the "inexpert" Indian sociologist labours under want of knowledge as to what is wrong. His diagnosis stops at symptoms, and his prescriptions at patent medicines.

The mistake is not the fact that the national organism is made up of distinct organs, but in the fact that these distinctions have lost their raison d'être in distinction of functions. What distinction is there in all that relates to caste? Does no constructive work, nor cares to understand in a spirit of sympathy and fairness the purpose and meaning of these distinctions. He does not therefore think of re-infusing what is lacking, viz., the function. In the light of this policy, sex distinctions may also be deplored when marriage has succeeded in ceasing to be the normal institution for man or woman. Since the Indians themselves do not care to understand and do not succeed in understanding their own position, and look upon the existence of these distinctions as a bar to social unity and political progress, it is no surprise that high-minded English gentlemen, like the Secretary of State for India, for instance, should include the presence of caste distinctions in the category of circumstances that make caution necessary.

N. SUBRAMANYA AIYER.

THE YELLOW BOOK.

Sir,—"R. H. C." says that the "Yellow Book" had no propaganda; "it did not aim at making any truth prevail, but flattered himself, that, all round, he and his writers did something towards making truth a little clearer. He would have meant "truth" as it revealed itself to us and made us want to write about it; he would have meant a keeping faith with vision—that is, with what we saw and heard and felt around us; and he would have said that when we did not write or paint at different degrees, as well as we could do it, we were bringing off our job. The propagandist, in his view, had, simply, a more direct one. The artist's job was subtle, indirect. If you had then murmured, "Art for Art's sake?" he would have been delighted. He would have said, "It puis? I thought life was one of the arts; I thought we learned to live by living, and that such things as we have been to writers passed on our discoveries in that way." . . .

Even in this propagandic age, I don't know who does more—or, being faithful to the vision, less. And, therefore, I accept without demur his view that his criticism was "the particular goodness of the day." Of course it was. What else is the criticism now? For we do not, I dare to say, even yet, "hold infinity in the palm of our hand," though assuredly no less. Believe me! I was diverted, and a triune-stumbled, to find myself so called: the age it makes one feel, all of a sudden! But, indeed, you cast some doubt on my complete survival; you hint that I have left my hand behind me. I am for the fable. No one could have resisted saying that of an argumentative survivor; I shake hands with you, Yellow-Booky, upon our common human nature.

Enough of me, who, tail or no tail, am so negligible. But I do keenly want to make it clear to you what sort of contributor Henry Harland felt at once to be "the game." My best way to show this to you, to state that, beyond all comparison, the greatest pleasure given him by anything he printed in the "Yellow Book" (apart from Henry James's stories, which I don't think he at this moment, are the propagandic chorus, and that I called in the "Little Review" article the bull-in-the-china-shop stunt—presented with that definition as I was by a brilliant youthful bull. Both of these are attempts at life, as our aestheticisms were—no more, though I think we can and will survive. I was divested, and a triune-stumbled, to find myself so called: the age it makes one feel, all of a sudden! But, indeed, you cast some doubt on my complete survival; you hint that I have left my hand behind me. I am for the fable. No one could have resisted saying that of an argumentative survivor; I shake hands with you, Yellow-Booky, upon our common human nature.

"The Book" has no ideas. May I refer you to the article by T. S. Eliot, in the "Little Review," for a remarkable and delightful study which was afterwards collected in the volume called "The Golden Age." I shall not easily forget his joy at the reception given to the book, which appeared while he was still "the Chief" to Kenneth Grahame; and this was long before his own success with "The Wind in the Willows." Thence should be enough, I do contende, to prove that Henry Harland was not looking for "the purely aesthetic, or the fashionable, or the foppish." I question not the manner and the becoming—those, indeed, he did look out for, blessed be his memory!

And Ideas? The "Book" has no ideas. May I refer you to the article by T. S. Eliot, in the "Little Review," for a remarkable and delightful study which was afterwards collected in the volume called "The Golden Age." I shall not easily forget his joy at the reception given to the book, which appeared while he was still "the Chief" to Kenneth Grahame; and this was long before his own success with "The Wind in the Willows." Thence should be enough, I do contende, to prove that Henry Harland was not looking for "the purely aesthetic, or the fashionable, or the foppish." I question not the manner and the becoming—those, indeed, he did look out for, blessed be his memory!

But when we talk of "early decay" and "a lamentable end" of the "Yellow Book," let us think in what relation we are talking. Was it such an early decay for a magazine, an English magazine, to last, in that expensive form, for over two years? Was it a lamentable end to die when we see, each month, upon the railway bookstalls, could and can and will survive. Come; the Yellow Bookworm who is Ethel Colburn may not have turned back nor (wholly) perished. And this one was the lowest of all the Yellow Bookworms. Let us be friends. We all want the same thing, though we go different ways about it. The younger generation must not lack the generosity that Henry Harland taught us so well, and not from any want of grateful malice in himself; he was the Yellow Dwarf! But always he could see, and always was rejoiced by, "Goodness." . . . So no more of calas-de-sac from you, and anything abusive that I may have said from my particular functional caste of a linguistic territory and the particular functional caste of a linguistic territory and the particular functional caste of a linguistic territory.

ETHEL COLBURN MAYNE.
Pastiche.

TWOPIENCE

(COLOURED AND DONE INTO VERSE).

"Tuppence!" he cried. "The little more—
And shall Trelawney die of want?

Art, Poetry, and Music, too,
Shall they all droop and end?

No, not while Ariglío
Has tuppence left to spend.

Let Copper Kings make trasts and rings,
It is their nature to:

Fear not, New Age, to print thy page,
I'll bring the browns to you.

"Forfend that Ezra's voice should crack,
And no more give forth sound,

In shrill staccato tones for lack
Of tuppence in the pound.

Shall Seiver shed his singing robes
And cease to tune his lyre?

Take tuppence, sir, at once and stoke
Your servant, sir, doth kiss
The verdict of poor-corninon-men
Thou Atheling, whose royal race
Shall Selver shed his singing robs
While men sat mute: take tuppence, lord,

As the organ-grinder grinds
His tunes, both sad and sweet,
Till in his hand the brie he finds
Hope pushes wide the Drama's door,

That we may look and see.

The editor hesitated.
Perhaps the proposal should
But you would have no objection to receiving help?" asked Mr. Golding.

The editor reflected. "It has not been for want of offers of help that the paper is penniless," he said. "But the biggest offers carried the biggest conditions, and even the smaller have usually had their sting."

"Of course, you would not submit to conditions," said Mr. Golding, indignantly at the thought.

"My terms have always been unconditional surrender," said the editor jocosely.

"Of course, of course," said Mr. Golding. "I was prepared for that. I should have been disappointed to hear otherwise. I perfectly understand that any help of mine would be given absolutely free of conditions on my part."

"The offers have sometimes concealed an attempt to influence the policy of the paper," continued the editor. "Preposterous! Disgraceful!" Mr. Golding exclaimed.

"Dear sir, pray believe I should be ashamed to intrude a suggestion now or at any time. I cannot be more emphatic than that, I think."

The editor agreed that Mr. Golding could not be. "Then," said Mr. Golding, "you must tell me what I can do. Don't hesitate. Your paper is my one public interest in life. Nothing you can ask in the way of personal sacrifice would be too much."

"My terms have always been unconditional surrender," he said. Mr. Golding hesitated. "Well," he said, "you understand that money is no object."

"Yes," said the editor politely. "Well, what I had in mind," said Mr. Golding, hurrying with modesty, "what I had in mind was to offer to read for you—manuscripts—proofs—anything, in fact, to help.

There! What do you say? I could put two afternoons a week at your disposal."