NOTES OF THE WEEK.

The democratisation of Germany is now an accomplished fact, but it remains to the Allied peoples to make it a permanent fact. With the abdication of the Hohenzollern family and of the rest of the ruling houses of Germany, the appointment of a Socialist as Regent on behalf of the sovereign people, pending the calling of a Constituent Assembly at which the future form of the German Constitution will be decided, and, above all, with the re-union of the Majority with the Majority Socialists, all the conditions we have laid down as required to assure us of the complete and irrevocable democratisation of Germany have been fulfilled. The consummation of the events of the last four and more years to which we, almost alone, have consistently looked forward, has been reached. The Revolution in Germany is taking place, if it has not already taken place; and Germany is henceforth with the free democracies of the world, or, at least, is preparing to join their company. At this moment of satisfaction it is necessary, however, for democrats everywhere to renew the pledge they have always made to themselves that Germany shall not suffer more from her democratisation than she would have been made to suffer had she remained militarist. That there are forces in the Allied countries which will be disposed to regard the democratisation of Germany as a fresh offence, to be expiated by additional punishment, we are all well aware. And it is, therefore, the duty of democrats to redouble their efforts and to insist upon making Germany as well as the rest of the world "safe for democracy."

With the exchange of the black flag of militarism for the white flag of military surrender, it is the convention that military hostilities should cease. May this convention always be respected. But, similarly, it ought to be the convention of political democracy that with the exchange of the black or the white for the red flag, political and democratic hostilities should also cease. The red flag must for us be as sacred a symbol as the white flag for the military army. But this connotes in the present instance not only that political hostilities should cease as between the German and the Allied peoples, but that, as far as possible, the military justice that would otherwise have been meted out to a still militarist Germany shall be translated in terms of democratic justice. The occasion is one that should call forth on the part of the Allied peoples a response equal in intensity, and, if possible, equal in its dramatic quality to that to the appeal to democracy which the German Revolution has just made. There should be no reluctance in receiving the returning prodigal son of Europe; but the peoples should go out to meet him. No excuse remains at this moment for any other course; but, on the contrary, every consideration of policy makes the way of generosity incumbent upon us. Militarist Germany has ceased to be a menace to the world, while, at the same time, a completely democratised Germany in which the German has prevailed over the Hun, has become for Europe, at any rate, an indispensable factor in the reconstruction of the continent. The relief derived from the disappearance of Prussianism is of little greater value than the assistance generosity incumbent upon us. Militarist Germany has ceased to be a menace to the world, while, at the same time, a completely democratised Germany in which the German has prevailed over the Hun, has become for Europe, at any rate, an indispensable factor in the reconstruction of the continent. The relief derived from the disappearance of Prussianism is of little greater value than the assistance Europe needs in the work of reconstruction from the new German democracy. As certainly as it was impossible for Europe to live with Prussianism in her midst, so certainly will it be impossible for Europe to prosper without the willing co-operation of the German people.

The fear of Bolshevism in Germany is less than that in any other country, save, perhaps, our own. To begin with, in Germany the Socialist Party is not as the Socialist Party here and elsewhere, one that has always been jealous of admitting educated men into its governing ranks. The Socialist leaders in Germany number among them half a score and more of the ablest men in Germany; and the party has almost a monopoly of the intellectual life of the Empire. Given such favouring circumstances, therefore, as the Allied peoples would be wise to provide for the new German Government, we need not anticipate for Germany the welter of chaos which the Bolshevist revolution in Russia has caused. In the second place, it is to be noted that the Bolshevist régime, wherever it is established, presumes the existence among the
proletariat of a considerable majority of the unskilled and uneducated manual wage-earners. And it implies, as we have often pointed out, not only the subordination of Capital to Labour, but the subordination of skilled Labour (including management) to unskilled Labour. But in Germany, it is obvious, no such disproportion between the ranks of the unskilled and the skilled workers exists as was to be found in Russia. On the contrary, the skilled proletariat in Germany are vastly superior in numbers to the unskilled, with the consequence that we may expect, other things being equal, that the German revolution will fall eventually under the control of the skilled workers who have everything to lose by Bolshevism. Finally, we are disposed to discount the fear of Bolshevism in Germany by reason of the very fact that Bolshevism has already performed its experiment in Russia. With the example of Russia before their eyes, the German people, unless driven madly into it, may be counted upon to adopt every precaution against the bloody orgies of the Bolshevist dictatorship of the unskilled proletariat. Under favouring circumstances, indeed, we do not see why the German Revolution should not be almost a model of order, and therewith provide Europe not only with relief from Prussianism but with a new hope for democracy.

To those who realise how much the so-called "luck" of England has depended on her nameless but remembered acts of friendliness to young nations, it will be a matter of far greater concern to expect, by generosity to-day the future goodwill of the new German nation. That we should sacrifice to Germany in the immediate present any of the interests of the other new nations of Europe nobody would think of advocating. Under favourable circumstances, indeed, we do not see why the German Revolution should not be almost a model of order, and therewith provide Europe not only with relief from Prussianism but with a new hope for democracy.

If the terms of the armistice are hard, there should be nothing surprising and certainly nothing humiliating to the new German democracy in the fact. In terms, they should remember, were designed to be imposed on militarist Germany; and from this point of view they could not be too severe in the interests no less of German democracy than of the rest of the world. That these smaller countries that German militarism has been defeated is as necessary to the future of Germany as it is to the Allies themselves. On the other hand, there stand President Wilson's letters and Mr. Lloyd George's speeches in evidence and promise that if before the inauguration of the Peace Conference the German people should give evidence of having established a popular government, the terms of the peace settlement itself will be a modification rather than a hardening of the terms of the armistice. We believe that this is now likely to be the case; but it will depend upon the spirit in which the Allies and the German people both accept the armistice terms and proceed with their constitutional revolution. On the side of the Allies, considerable is as the feeling in favour of supplementing a knock-out blow by means of a knock-out peace, the feeling against it is also considerable. It grows with the news of the spread of revolution in Germany. By the time that the Peace Conference is assembled, if all goes well, a new wave of sympathy will have arisen; and the common opinion of the Allied peoples will be disposed, after due precautions, to give the new German nation a fair start in life.

An appeal to this effect has already been made, we are glad to say, by Lord Robert Cecil. Addressing the American editors now visiting this country, he is reported as saying that the pacifists to be merely cant have come true. From the very first day of the war, we for our own part have never doubted that they would. Against a considerable amount of popular opposition and abuse we have been persisting in contending that though it was apparently and actually the capitalist governments and the capitalist parties who were employing these phrases concerning democracy, the freedom of small nations, and all the rest of it, these parties were really building better than they knew. The paradox has appeared in the fact that the professed democrats have for the most part allowed themselves to be placed in a seeming opposition to all their own ideals. And the pacifists, it appears certain, are now about to find themselves in another dilemma. For they cannot deny that it is by means of war that the democratisation of Germany has been effected, nor, therefore, can they, attempting to maintain what the war alone has won. Here, then, is another ground of inconsistency and opposition. Having opposed the general conduct of the war in the belief that its phrases were only cant, they must now oppose the capitalist parties because, in fact, their phrases have proved not to be cant. Having opposed the war, they must nevertheless secure its results. From these inconsistencies both of opinion and conduct we ourselves have been and can continue to be free. We have supported the war because it appeared to us the only means of democratising Germany and thus of making the world safe for democracy; and we shall do our best to profit by the victory in maintaining the democratisation of Germany and in extending democracy elsewhere. If in the former course we have been bound to appear as the allies of capitalism, in the latter we are likely to be under no such suspicion. For the truth is, as we have said, that the capitalists have, in spite of themselves, won a victory for democracy which only democracy can now put beyond all chance of reaction.

It is not the least interesting of the phenomena of this war that all the phrases declared by the pacifists to be merely cant have come true. From the very first day of the war, we for our own part have never doubted that they would. Against a considerable amount of popular opposition and abuse we have been persisting in contending that though it was apparently and actually the capitalist governments and the capitalist parties who were employing these phrases concerning democracy, the freedom of small nations, and all the rest of it, these parties were really building better than they knew. The paradox has appeared in the fact that the professed democrats have for the
bear the brunt of the next world-war if ever that should come about. But the next world-war, if unhappily there should be another, will in all probability be contained within the clauses and conditions attaching to the present peace settlement. At Versailles or wherever the coming peace conference is held, the seeds of the next war will be sown. The technique of the new war, with commendable frankness that Lord Robert Cecil now warns the peoples that their future destiny and that of their children and children’s children is immediately within their hands. Statesmen and Ministers are only the instruments to carry public opinion; and it is for public opinion to decide whether it is to control them like a good workman or bungle their future with them as a workman with tools he cannot or will not employ. The coming General Election will decide more than the issues of demobilisation; it will decide the character of the peace settlement and the future of the world.

***

No refinement of criticism is necessary to distinguish in Lord Northcliffe’s manifesto the parts written by himself from the parts supplied him officially or unofficially. When we observe an “organic whole” consisting of three “stages” which afterwards are to distinguish in Lord Northcliffe’s manifesto the parts written by himself from the parts supplied him officially or particularly. We manifest, moreover, is in such sharp contrast with the parts supplied him officially or particularly. We manifest, moreover, is in such sharp contrast with the term that were to be expected of the chief proprietor of the “Times,” that the Lypothese of inspiration is strengthened. By no juggler of ratiocination is it possible to reconcile the consistent policy of the “Times” with the policy implicit and explicit in Lord Northcliffe’s manifesto. Let us take, for instance, the moderate terms in which Lord Northcliffe speaks of the Peace Conference itself. Not only are the German people to be invited to co-operate in it, but their co-operation is assumed to be indispensable. In the same or an almost simultaneous issue of the “Times,” however, this moderate and sensible advice is discarded. We are warned that the generality of “reparation and guarantees” not only embodied “the primary purpose for which we drew the sword,” but that “it must never be forgotten even at a time when the chances of constitutional change in Germany” have become certainties. In other words, the attainment of the moral object of the war which was the moral conversion of Germany must not make us forget the secondary and ancillary objects which were reparation and guarantees. We are to substitute for the accomplished primary object the military objects by which it has been brought about. Lord Northcliffe, it is clear, has a world to conquer at home before publishing his views abroad. Let him take in hand the conversion of the “Times.”

***

The error continues to be made of confusing the immediate period of demobilisation with the still comparatively remote period of reconstruction proper. The two phases, however, are not only successive in point of time, but they are distinct and, in some respects, contrary in character. For at least three or four years after the cessation of hostilities, the work of Governments will be either unnecessary or negligible. It is, therefore, the conversion of the “Times” that we are warned of the moral object of the war which was the moral conversion of Germany must not make us forget the secondary and ancillary objects which were reparation and guarantees. We are to substitute for the accomplished primary object the military objects by which it has been brought about. Lord Northcliffe, it is clear, has a world to conquer at home before publishing his views abroad. Let him take in hand the conversion of the “Times.”

***

The coming General Election will decide more than the issues of demobilisation; it will decide the character of the peace settlement and the future of the world. But when, after a few years, that process of re-adaptation and re-education, of which Lord Northcliffe speaks, commences, the people will certainly have been fed, and will have recovered the state of mind to face the difficulties of change. For reconstructionists, therefore, the order of the day is to wait, to hide their time, and in the meantime to multiply their resources. Their opportunity is not during the coming period of re-settlement, but in the period that will follow it. If only they can restrain themselves from attempting to reconstruct without the world is crying for repair, their reward in a few years’ time will be leisure, responsibility, and power.

***

The conference to be held next week, at which Labour will decide upon its immediate electoral policy, and particularly upon its attitude towards the proposed Coalition, has induced Mr. Barnes to confide his views to the Press. Mr. Barnes is very candid, and he does not beat about the bush in announcing his own position. He has ceased to be a representative of the Labour Party; he has ceased even to be a delegate of his own trade union; he is, in fact, as private and unrepresentative a citizen as any ordinary member of the street. But in losing his representative character Mr. Barnes (and the same may be said of several of his colleagues) has forfeited not only the power but the right to continue to hold any office in the Government. He may become a civil servant after the manner of several of his predecessors, and thus a paid official of the Government; or he may retire into private life as a private citizen; but he cannot reasonably expect to continue in the Government, or even in Parliament, when his sole claim to represent anybody but himself has disappeared.

***

A gratuitous sentence of abuse and a profound misunderstanding of the prevailing situation are to be found in the course of Mr. Barnes’ interview. He observed in reference to the Conference shortly to be held that “of course, the Bolshevists will try to get the Labour members withdrawn from the Government” and he added that if they were withdrawn, it would “deprive Labour of any practical participation in the solution of the peace problems.” That it would do nothing of the kind, but the very contrary, we have already given our reasons for believing. We say, indeed, that the most effective participation of Labour in the solution of peace problems will be brought about by the independence of political Labour and not by its subordinate inclusion as a hostage in the new Coalition Government. As for the charge that it is the Bolshevists who advocate the independence of the Labour Party, it is absurd on the face of it. We believe that we were the first to oppose the acceptance of office by the Labour Party, as we have also been the first to advocate its withdrawal immediately upon the cessation of hostilities. Unless Mr. Barnes is prepared to believe that we are Bolshevists—in which case he can believe anything—Bolshevism with a mere piece of political good sense is journalistic abuse. It will not stand him in good stead in his constituency or in the country.
Foreign Affairs.

For one of the numerous examples of the supreme difficulty of the League of Nations, students of the subject may be referred to the speech delivered by Mr. Hughes last week. In many respects it was the ablest of Mr. Hughes’s orations; but, then, it is obvious that he had his heart in it! The purpose of Mr. Hughes’ speech was to protest at what he regarded as the infringing of the sovereign rights of Australia contained in the third of the fourteen clauses of President Wilson’s terms of settlement—terms which, as is well known, have now been accepted with only slight modification and addition by the whole of the Allies and dominates among the signatory Powers of the coming Peace Conference the establishment among themselves as far as possible of economic equality and of equal trade conditions. Without denying to any nation the right of setting up a tariff, it aims at abolishing preferences as between one nation and another and thereby at preventing the establishment or re-establishment of discrimination in trade or more or less or most favoured trade agreements. But the attempt at democratic justice between nations is obnoxious to Mr. Hughes, and for himself, he says, he will have none of it. The clause on which he insists “is intolerable; and, except as we shall not submit to it,” Mr. Hughes’ language is emphatic, and, as I have said, he obviously means it to be. Moreover, his attitude is common to a considerable number of people both in the overseas dominions and in the Allied countries. It is a claim, nevertheless, that is utterly incompatible with the League of Nations; and its assertion by Mr. Hughes is of more than tariff-importance, for it cuts at the root of the whole of the prospective peace settlement in so far as that is dominated by the League of Nations idea.

I am afraid that it is incompatible also with something much less than a League of Nations, namely, with the British Commonwealth. Let us suppose, for example, that the British Commonwealth in conference assembled were to declare in favour of President Wilson’s third clause, and that Mr. Hughes were then to protest against it as emphatically as he does now. Coercion would clearly be out of the question; but equally would be out of the question the democratic government of the Commonwealth as a whole. For if coercion is impossible—it is certainly not—and the Commonwealth—and democracy is to be made impossible by the refusal of a constituent nation to accept the common judgment of the Imperial Commonwealth, then plainly the whole fabric falls to pieces. As far as we are permitted to know, the fourteen clauses of President Wilson’s prospective agenda for the Peace Conference were actually before the recent meetings of the Imperial War Cabinet of which Mr. Hughes was a member. As far as we know, those clauses were then agreed to, for it is inconceivable that the Government suddenly endorsed them last week without having previously obtained the consent of all its members. Did Mr. Hughes protest on that occasion as he is protesting to-day? Or has he only just realised what was involved in the clauses? In any event, the incident is disquieting; and it is certain that Australia will be less jealous of her “sovereignty” than Mr. Hughes is in his present attitude.

We have our own difficulties, too, and cannot, therefore, be too hard upon Mr. Hughes. In the case of the clause referred to above, the Imperial Commonwealth has already been constrained to leave it open for the Peace Conference to interpret, without, however, it noted, withdrawing his own definition of the phrase. As Professor A. F. Pollard has pointed out, the “freedom of the seas,” in our sense of the word—meaning, that is to say, our freedom to do what we please—is incompatible with the League of Nations and contrary to our demands of the rest of the members of the League. They are to submit to this, that and the other restriction of their freedom of action, even in vital matters, but we are to reserve our freedom in what is certainly a vital matter to us but in what is also a vital matter for the rest of the world. And this, Professor Pollard suggests, is altogether unfair. The argument, it is clear, cannot be gainsaid upon logical grounds; but, all the same, I think that the case for the contrary will die hard. It will be urged that as the League of Nations is not yet in being, we are justified in keeping our Navy supreme; and though it may be replied that while our Navy claims supremacy the League can never come into existence, the answer will be that the League must be formed before our Navy is abandoned. Here, therefore, we are ourselves faced with the problem of Mr. Hughes and are disposed to meet it in the same way; nor do I anticipate that another solution will be found for it for many years to come.

A suggestion I had the opportunity of laying before some influential men has been made in a particular form by the “Vossische Zeitung.” It was that the Allies should require Germany to hold a General Election for the purpose of creating a representative popular Government with whom they could treat. The “Vossische Zeitung,” I observe, has now suggested a General Election in Germany for the decision of the question of the abdication of the Kaiser. But if my own suggestion was belated, that of the “Vossische Zeitung” is even more so. The clock has struck twelve and the Kaiser has abdicated. Some such striking event—or, as it is the fashion to call it, gesture—was necessary definitely to separate Prussia from Germany or, if you like, the Germany of yesterday from the Germany of to-morrow. To argue, as Prince Bulow did, that the Kaiser is necessary as a centre in Germany is to ignore the outstanding fact of the situation which is that the world requires the abdication of the Kaiser and that it is the world, and not Germany, of which the world is thinking. Germany, moreover, can get along very well without the Kaiser and, if it comes to that, without all the rest of the German kings and princes. The Kaiser was based not upon its Courts but upon its people; and from the removal of the kings we might expect a greater rather than a lesser unification of Germany.

The situation in Spain is unstable, and I am told that the Monarchy there is not as safe as it might be. Unfortunately, as everywhere else, the Left is less well-organised than the Right, and the Right is more well-organised than the Left. The power which would be sufficient were it united to establish a Republic in Spain is likely in its division to suffer defeat after defeat. The question, however, is one of academic interest only; for it is impossible that the Spanish monarchy can become a source of danger to the world in general. It is, in fact, a domestic question, in which the rest of the world has not no right, but any need to interfere. The “interference” of the world in any affairs of any nation is, I contend, a fundamental wrong. The world is dependent upon virtue of our common humanity, and a necessary doctrine of international law. As in the case of other ideal rights, however, the world’s wisdom is shown in the exercise of it; and in general the right is practical only when the need is urgent. Upon general grounds I am for the republicanisation of every nation. On practical grounds every case must be taken on its merits.

S. VERDAD.
The Influence of the War upon Labour.

Being the Second Chapter on Transition.

I.—A GENERAL SURVEY.

In the preceding chapters I have endeavoured, not without some strain upon the imagination, to discuss certain social and industrial factors in their normal aspects, disregarding, as far as possible, the conditions created by the war. The permanent situation is the situation in times of peace; war conditions are transitory and abnormal. It was for this reason that I stressed the historic origin of the new shop-steward movement, seeking to show that its germs were in the economic body prior to the war. But it would be foolish not to take stock of the effects of the war upon Labour, for these effects must persist for a generation: must create, in fact, a new train of circumstances. We can never revert to pre-war conditions: would not if we could: most certainly should not if we would. In this chapter, therefore, I shall try to state the position in which Labour finds itself after four years of war-organisation. This statement falls naturally into two main divisions: the formal or statistical results; the real or economic results, this latter being difficult and perplexing.

Such a survey must cover:

(a) The membership and funds of the Trade Unions.
(b) The financial position of the individual worker.
(c) The movement, if any, towards solidarity.
(d) Changes in the spirit of the rank and file.
(e) The influence of Labour upon Government.
(f) Relations between “skilled” and “unskilled” labour.
(g) Moral.

(A).—MEMBERSHIP AND FUNDS OF TRADE UNIONS.

There can be no doubt that the Trade Unions have considerably increased their membership since 1914. The Trade Union Congress of 1913 represented rather less than 2½ million members; the same Congress in 1918 represented 4½ million Trade Unionists. This growth is not only due to the accession of certain Trade Unions, notably the Amalgamated Society of Engineers, but to a definite increase in membership of the affiliated unions. Thus, the National Union of Railwaymen shows an advance from 273,000 to over 400,000, a striking fact when we remember the great depletion of railway workers throughout the United Kingdom who were urgently required, not only for line regiments, but to work the strategical railways on our various fronts. During the period of the war, the Amalgamated Society of Engineers has risen from 170,000 to 287,000. We can only grasp the significance of this if we bear in mind that, with a few exceptions, this great Union has steadily retained its craft membership, and has never admitted women. The “unskilled” unions have been very active. By amalgamation and propaganda, the Workers’ Union, the National Amalgamated Union of Labour and the Municipal Employers’ Association, whose combined membership in 1913 was only 176,000, now present an amalgamated front of over 500,000. The National Union of General Workers and the Dock, Wharf, Riverside and General Workers’ Union, who, in 1912, had a total membership of 153,000, are now united with a membership of 400,000. These figures, I think, indicate a tendency towards a definite increase in the strength of “skilled” labour, and a definite decrease in the proportion of unskilled and non-union labour in the vital industries of the country.

Women have joined some of these unions or alternatively the National Federation of Women Workers, whose distinguishing mark is neither craft nor skill but sex. Altogether, the number of women Trade Unionists has increased during the war from about 350,000 to over 700,000. Generally stated, the Trade Unions have become financially stronger. They have been debarred from paying strike benefits, and unemployment benefits have not been required in any appreciable degree. Some unions have raised their subscriptions; several have invested heavily in war-loans. It is, I think, true that in most cases the financial position is stronger than four years ago. Thus, in 1916, the income of the Amalgamated Society of Engineers was one-third larger than in 1913, whilst its accumulated funds have increased from £350,000 to £475,000. In like manner, the funds of the National Union of Railwaymen have advanced from £476,000, in 1913, to over £1,000,000 in June, 1918, the annual income in the same period rising by 36 per cent. In 1913, the Workers’ Union had an income of only £43,000, with funds amounting to £12,000; in 1916, the figures were £96,000 and £87,000 respectively. If we have regard only to membership and finance, it may safely be affirmed that, in the vital industries, the Trade Unions are stronger now than in 1913. But we have yet to consider the economic position which may disclose adverse factors, that more than counter-balance the formal position here stated.

(B).—THE INDIVIDUAL EARNER.

The increase in money wages has in most cases been absorbed by a greater increase in the cost of living, a decrease in real wages resulting. In the main and ancillary war industries, it would be difficult to resist the contention that real wages also have risen. That is to say, the family revenue has risen beyond the increase in the cost of family subsistence, due in part to the entry for the first time into industry of a considerable army of women—probably of more than 1,500,000, at nominal wages of more than double those previously received by working women. To these earnings must be added some millions of army allowances.

With stronger bargaining powers now possessed by the Trade Unions, it is not impossible that nominal wages may fall more slowly than the cost of living. Not impossible; but improbable. The delays and vexations involved in industrial readaptation must sooner or later lead to acute unemployment. Unless the several industries bearing the responsibility for the maintenance of the labour reserve, nominal wages will fall quicker than the cost of subsistence. Unless the grip of the State upon all profiteers who trade in life-necessities is strengthened and maintained during the whole period of demobilisation and natural food-shortage, the painfully acquired money or wage resources of the working class, as a whole, will be dissipated with certainty and rapidity.

(C).—SOLIDARITY.

The psychological and physical facts of the war have conspired with the logical development of Trade Unionism to bring us many steps further on the way to solidarity and industrial unionism. The sense of regimentation so essential in war, so penetrating in its effects, so destructive of particularism, could not fail to find its counterpart in industrial life. The example of the allied nations, throwing all their resources into a common effort for a common end, must inevitably teach Labour many lessons, not least, the dominant need for collective effort. Among these powerful influences, we have witnessed the emerging of the workshop as an industrial unit, for its own reasons demanding amalgamation. The results are of enormous importance. There are now in the United Kingdom about 1,100 Trade Unions, with a total membership of over 4,500,000. A fact that the number of unions is decreasing, while the membership is increasing. Amalgamation, or projects of amalgamation, is mooted in all directions; federations
or working arrangements (the precursors of amalgamation) are now frequent and of increasing importance. The formation of the Triple Industrial Alliance, finally consummated on December 9, 1915, is a red-letter event in the history of solidarity. It is significant that two of the three unions entering into this alliance—the Miners’ Federation and the National Union of Railwaymen—are practically industrial unions.

As I write, among the craft unions, proposals are now being discussed (a) for the amalgamation of 23 engineering and metal workers’ unions; (b) the amalgamation of 3 of the most important shipbuilding unions; and (c) the federation of all unions connected with the cotton industry. (We see here the reaction of the national or central union and the federal principle, which I discussed in the last chapter.) In addition to these projected craft amalgamations, I have already referred to (d) the amalgamations of general labour unions, who are now arming for joint action or mutual support between their 900,000 members, a class not long ago regarded as “unorganisable.” Nor does the movement towards industrial solidarity stop here. At the Trade Union Congress of 1918, it was agreed to appoint a committee to investigate the possibility of forming industrial unions with provision for craft organisation as an integral part of their structure.

Whether it be the spirit of the time or the increasing pressure of the workshop and shop-steward movement, it is evident that Trade Unionism is missing its forces and feeling its way towards unified control.

How far this solidarity will be reflected in politics it is difficult to foresee. So far, political Labourism seems to draw its inspiration from conventional formulae that have already done duty for the orthodox political parties. Nevertheless, if the Labour Party is to spread its activities over the whole electorate, we shall be safe in assuming that the new industrialism will impose its policy, and finally encompass the political application of its principles.

(D).—Labour in the Government.

Keeping in view the distinction, previously drawn in my chapter on “The State,” between the State and the Government, regarding the Government as the instrument of State policy, we may note that during the war there has been a large accession of major and minor Labour leaders to the administrative corps. Since Sir David Shackleton and other trade union officials joined the Labour and other Ministries, and particularly since 1914, many hundreds of the less prominent Labour men have taken an active share in Government administration, both at the centre and locally. There is a multitude of Labour Advisory Committees; a Labour representative sits with a Government representative on the Labour Exchange Committees, deciding all appeals against munition recruitment for the Army; Labour takes an official part in the administration of rationing, of allowances to disabled soldiers; it plays a considerable part in pensioning; it has many representatives doing responsible work in the Ministry of Labour. Official Labour has, in fact, secured “recognition” at the moment when its more progressive elements are threatening to repudiate it. In too many cases, the Labour men appointed to these administrative posts have found Government employment as a sanctuary against extinction. It is a sound generalisation that it is the reactionary or obese Labour officials who find themselves against the labour unions, the forces of reaction will have an easy triumph when the lean years arrive. The hope for Labour is in the growing strength of the movement for industrial solidarity, and the rank and file of those unions which pose as the aristocracy of Labour may in time see the wisdom of finding new and democratic leaders who will pursue a policy of greater insight and foresight. Such leaders will not be hard to find. It will be difficult to combat the old school who point to the immediate selfish advantages of a policy of exclusiveness; but the future is beyond doubt with the more liberal party, whose schoolmasters and missionaries are at work in every industrial centre—in the workshops, if not, as yet, in executive committee rooms in London.”

I will only add one sentence: We may find on analysis that the distinction between the “skilled” and “unskilled” resolves itself into relative degrees of industrial organisation, or differing intensities of effective demands.
November 14, 1918

THE NEW AGE

Evidence of the practical results of his material grind brought home to him more and more vividly every day, he had grown to disregard, if not actually to despise, the value of thought, whether in his own country or elsewhere. One of the grossest errors current throughout Europe in the nineteenth century was the reluctance to appreciate the overwhelming though sometimes remote power of thought, which resulted in the corresponding prepossession in favour of that immediate action which gave prompt and visible results.

Thus, it was only the few—and they were chiefly ill-adapted children of their age—who were systematic: and painstaking importers and exporters of thought during the hundred years preceding this war. Frequently, at great personal expense both of money and labour, these lonely and Catholic spirits plied their unprofitable trade in the teeth of opposition that was as bitter as it was blind. For not only was there an inveterate loathing of all unprofitable business enterprise during this period, but the materialistic populations of Europe, hypnotised by their sordid occupations and ambitions, also resented being wakened quite as much as any slumberer who insists upon sleeping the clock round.

The fact that false estimates of neighbours should have been made in these days will, therefore, surprise nobody. Nay, it might reasonably be questioned whether any nation understood even itself. The German emigres complained of being isolated; but who was not isolated at that time? Europe had become a system of pigeon-holes. The bulk of the Exports and Imports was, indeed, rising steadily in each country; but not a thought accompanied these goods in their transit. It was not a matter of clamant international human intercourse, but of silent, colourless, inhuman barter; it was not the relationship of men but of machines; not of voices but of invoices. And on this, if you please, it was intended, we presume, to build a durable and desirable community of interests.

The blank cartridges of ignorant abuse which each group of belligerents fired at each other in the early days of the war are the best proof of the state of absolute inertia to which mutual interest and sympathy had declined. Each might have forgotten that the other existed.

Now, no group of men were more responsible for this condition of things than the journalists of Europe. They abetted ignorance; they battened on it. Uncultivated, bigoted, and, as a rule, unscrupulous, their readers might outstrip them, if by any chance they were content to waste their time in the endless discussions of the day and in the perusal of the pages of the flourishing journal, of Europe. Only here and there in some dark corner of the Public Press could be found a sign of any acquaintance with his ideas, not a line of understanding of his thought, not a word of valuable instruction on the neighbour's mind, not a line of valuable instruction on the neighbour's mind, not a note of interest in the culture and the life of the neighbour.

In Germany, this miserable ignorance was shown not only by the most respectable journals. Journals like the Medizinal and Reisenzeitung, etc., abetted the ignorance most shamefully in their weekly and monthly columns.

In France, the most respectable journals had made in regard to British character, stamina, and solidarity in July, 1914. In England it was best exemplified by the outburst of indignation against Friedrich Nietzsche, which composed the leit-motif of articles in most of the fashionable newspapers during the early months of the war, and in the face of which Nietzscheans went about almost in danger of their lives.

Certain booksellers, either guided by or guiding the


Nietzsche in France and America.

By Zarathustrian.

If a League of Nations is to become a reality once the terms of peace have been settled, it is to be hoped that something after the fashion of the Medieval and Renais-

sance League of Cultures will also arise upon the polit-
journalists, actually set up in their windows "The Euro-Nietzschean War" and "The Mundo-Nietzschean War," in order to attract attention to certain war books they were selling, and there was nobody to object, because nobody "who mattered" really knew how ridiculous was the phrase. Indeed, to be some-one "who mattered" in modern European society, it was essential that you should know nothing whatever about such things.

Nietzsche, who wished that he might write his great work the "Will to Power," in French, so as not to have the appearance of giving countenance to German Imperialist aspirations; who called his nation's crimes. Not that we wish to imply that anything is adequate to exonerate and give clean consciences to hogs, deliberate suppressed, but simply that those aspects of Nietzsche which can tempt brutes deliberately to drag from his dignified obscurity, even in Germany, in order to pillory him as one of the chief causes of the war. And why? Because Bernhardi had quoted a line from him on the title-page of "Germany and the World War," and also in a speech in praise of a good war, culled from "Thus Spake Zarathustra," had doubtless been extracted by some enterprising penny-a-liner from the various popular collections of Nietzsche's epigrams, or from Nietzsche calendars. No more than that!

Hed England known and understood Nietzsche, there would have been little of that speechless astonishment at German methods in the early days of the war. For Nietzsche spoke the truth about his country, and was ruthless in his criticism of it. A certain enthusiastic and indefatigable English writer on Nietzsche was frequently accused by his fellow-Nietzscheans before the war of having given a drawing-room version of his master to the British public. It was asserted against him that he had toned the master down in order to render him acceptable to sensitive and lady-like ears. If he had always hoped to arouse, he probably never accepted this criticism as just; for, he argued, there is much in Nietzsche which though never intended to exonerate and give clean consciences to hogs, can nevertheless be twisted by hogs to that purpose. Accordingly, by giving it more prominence as possible to this expository Nietzsche than is customary in our opinion, we consider that he had saved the master from gross misinterpretation. We think we agree with him now. For, in view of what has happened in the war, it is pleasing to turn to this writer's works, and to find no title of evidence that Nietzscheanism, as it is there represented, can even be twisted into a justification for Germany's crimes. Not that we wish to imply that anything is deliberately suppressed, but simply that those aspects of Nietzsche which can tempt brutes deliberately to distort them for the purpose of their own justification, are severely and austerely protected from any such possible misinterpretation.

The two books under notice adopt a similar method in exegesis. Both of them, but more particularly the Frenchman's plain and lucid work, proceed without reserve, in literal quotation, and continuous narrative, graphically as possible. While "La Philosophie de Frédéric Nietzsche" reads like a running commentary on the German philosopher's work, it is full of such skillfully selected quotations interwoven with the text that the reader forgets the inverted commas, and is consciously seized with the continuous narrative. The account covers 345 pages, and it is difficult to think of any omission which might be called substanti-tial. Gabriel Huan, moreover, shows that he has gone more deeply than most writers into the background of Nietzsche's thought, and offers valuable and scholarly support to Nietzsche's estimate of St. Paul, for instance, which to one who has been separated from books for four years came as a gratifying and encouraging surprise.

It may be questioned whether the method of exposition adopted by Gabriel Huan is not, after all, the best. The point is important. For if we ask ourselves what it is we expect in an account of an author whom we do not know and to whom we require an introductory doubt whether one who prefers a narrative which, though obviously coloured and perhaps adorned by the mind through which the facts have passed, at least makes a more human, direct and vivid appeal than a bald though elaborate statement, rendered cumbersome by meticulous quotation, and in which the efforts to remain judicially impartial cause the prose to creak on every page.

On the whole, 343 pages of personal interpretation, whatever the errors of omission and commission may be, seem to us more satisfactory than the tiresome and endless to give a living portrait of an author's work the "Will to Power," and in which the efforts to remain judicially impartial cause the prose to creak on every page.

Even admitting that expository writing is perhaps the most difficult of any, it is yet governed by one elementary rule which it would seem fatal to infringe. This rule is that the exponent should not offer the results of his reading in the form of raw material, so to speak, but digested, assimilated and frequently converted into the terms of his own mind. Yes, converted into the terms of his own mind. Even this is better as a pedagogic method than the purveyance of the raw material of one's subject. Human nature is such that it prefers the human element, even in the teacher, than a strict adherence to actual texts. It learns more readily from one who observes this principle, and is more thoroughly inspired for original and individual research when taught in this way.

W. M. Salter, in "Nietzsche the Thinker," offers us an example of the latter method. The book is trustworthy, fair and scholarly; but with its notes it covers 525 closely printed pages, and it remains open to doubt whether it gives one the satisfaction one feels over the 343 pages of the Frenchman's work.

Nevertheless, it is some satisfaction to come across two works published respectively in France and America in the third year of war each of which is a sufficiently convincing independent piece of evidence divorcing Nietzsche from any direct or indirect connection with the spiritual forces behind Imperialistic Germany and her methods. And although it is difficult to conceive of two such careful students of Nietzsche as it is to arrive at a certain conclusion from the work of a writer, we are at least one step nearer a League of Cultures when it is possible in the midst of a bitter and devastating war, characterised by the grossest mutual misunderstanding and misinterpre-tation between the belligerents, for two such sympathetic appreciations of Nietzsche's work to have found their way into the publisher's lists of two of our leading Allies.
Readers and Writers.

Mr. Stanfield O'Grady's "The Flight of the Eagle" has now been published in a cheap "school" edition by the Talbot Press of Dublin (2s. 6d.). "The Flight of the Eagle" is not a romance in the ordinary sense; it is not an invented story, but an actual historical episode treated romantically. The period is Elizabethan and the story turns mainly on the careers of Sir William Parrett, an English "Lord-Lieutenant" of Ireland who appears to have suffered the usual fate of a popular English governor, and Red Hugh O'Donnell or Hugh Roe of Tir-na-nOg, a kind of Irish Parrett. In fact, the O'Grady is now Donegal. If any acquaintance with Irish history is ever to be made by English readers—and it seems almost hopeless to expect it—the means, I am co-witnessed, must be romances of this kind. History proper, as a rule, is carefully ignored by the average reader who must therefore have facts, if he is ever to have them, presented in the form of a story. It is only by this means, and thanks to Scott in the first instance, that the history of Scotland has penetrated in any degree beyond the border. Only by this means, again, have various countries and nations been brought home to the intellectual taste of English readers by writers like Kipling, and a score of others. Both as a story-writer and as the first and greatest of the Irish historians of Ireland, Mr. Standish O'Grady is qualified to do for Ireland what Scott after him did for Scotland. Scott, in the first instance, that the history of Scotland is to be essentially read by writers like Kipling, and a score of others. Both as a story-writer and as the first and greatest of the Irish historians of Ireland, Mr. Standish O'Grady is qualified to do for Ireland what Scott after him did for Scotland. Scott, in the first instance, that the history of Scotland is to be essentially read by writers like Kipling, and a score of others.

In the September "Strand," an interesting account of Meredith as a publisher's reader appears. It is by Mr. B. W. Matz, a present member of the publishing firm of Chapman and Hall, for whom Meredith "read" from the year 1860 onwards. At the time of joining the firm Meredith was thirty-two—old enough, therefore, to know his own critical mind; and he had already written three novels, "Richard Feverel" being among the number. In spite of this, however, Meredith appears to me to have made as many mistakes in his judgment of manuscripts as the most ordinary "reader." Mr. Matz is anxious to assure us, both in the interests of his firm and in the interest of the tradition of Mr. Meredith, that the novelist took considerable pains with the manuscripts which were brought home to the intellectual taste of English readers by writers like Kipling, and a score of others. Both as a story-writer and as the first and greatest of the Irish historians of Ireland, Mr. Standish O'Grady is qualified to do for Ireland what Scott after him did for Scotland. Scott, in the first instance, that the history of Scotland is to be essentially read by writers like Kipling, and a score of others.

In the September "Strand," an interesting account of Meredith as a publisher's reader appears. It is by Mr. B. W. Matz, a present member of the publishing firm of Chapman and Hall, for whom Meredith "read" from the year 1860 onwards. At the time of joining the firm Meredith was thirty-two—old enough, therefore, to know his own critical mind; and he had already written three novels, "Richard Feverel" being among the number. In spite of this, however, Meredith appears to me to have made as many mistakes in his judgment of manuscripts as the most ordinary "reader." Mr. Matz is anxious to assure us, both in the interests of his firm and in the interest of the tradition of Mr. Meredith, that the novelist took considerable pains with the manuscripts which were brought home to the intellectual taste of English readers by writers like Kipling, and a score of others. Both as a story-writer and as the first and greatest of the Irish historians of Ireland, Mr. Standish O'Grady is qualified to do for Ireland what Scott after him did for Scotland. Scott, in the first instance, that the history of Scotland is to be essentially read by writers like Kipling, and a score of others.

In the September "Strand," an interesting account of Meredith as a publisher's reader appears. It is by Mr. B. W. Matz, a present member of the publishing firm of Chapman and Hall, for whom Meredith "read" from the year 1860 onwards. At the time of joining the firm Meredith was thirty-two—old enough, therefore, to know his own critical mind; and he had already written three novels, "Richard Feverel" being among the number. In spite of this, however, Meredith appears to me to have made as many mistakes in his judgment of manuscripts as the most ordinary "reader." Mr. Matz is anxious to assure us, both in the interests of his firm and in the interest of the tradition of Mr. Meredith, that the novelist took considerable pains with the manuscripts which were brought home to the intellectual taste of English readers by writers like Kipling, and a score of others. Both as a story-writer and as the first and greatest of the Irish historians of Ireland, Mr. Standish O'Grady is qualified to do for Ireland what Scott after him did for Scotland. Scott, in the first instance, that the history of Scotland is to be essentially read by writers like Kipling, and a score of others.

In the September "Strand," an interesting account of Meredith as a publisher's reader appears. It is by Mr. B. W. Matz, a present member of the publishing firm of Chapman and Hall, for whom Meredith "read" from the year 1860 onwards. At the time of joining the firm Meredith was thirty-two—old enough, therefore, to know his own critical mind; and he had already written three novels, "Richard Feverel" being among the number. In spite of this, however, Meredith appears to me to have made as many mistakes in his judgment of manuscripts as the most ordinary "reader." Mr. Matz is anxious to assure us, both in the interests of his firm and in the interest of the tradition of Mr. Meredith, that the novelist took considerable pains with the manuscripts which were brought home to the intellectual taste of English readers by writers like Kipling, and a score of others. Both as a story-writer and as the first and greatest of the Irish historians of Ireland, Mr. Standish O'Grady is qualified to do for Ireland what Scott after him did for Scotland. Scott, in the first instance, that the history of Scotland is to be essentially read by writers like Kipling, and a score of others.

But it will be said that we dismiss personal preference as a criticism of art, that there is either nothing left or only some "scientific" standard which, again, has no relevance to aesthetics. This, in fact, is the common plea of the didosynerats, that, inconclusive as their opinions may be, anything but universally valid, no other method within the world of art is possible. I emphatically dissent. I am of opinion that a "final" judgment is as possible of a work of art as of any other manifestation of the spirit of man; and that there is nothing in the nature of things to prevent men arriving at a universally valid (that is, universally accepted) judgment of a book, a picture, a sonata, a statue or a building any more than there is to prevent a legal judge from arriving at a right judgment concerning any other human act. And, what is more, such judgments of art are not only daily made, but in the end they actually prevail and constitute in their totality the tradition of a race. And, however much I am willing to agree, is not scientific; but as little, I protest, is it merely personal. Its essential character, in fact, is simply that it is right; right however arrived at, and right whoever arrives at it. That the judge in question may or must have studied the history of the art-work he is judging is a matter of indifference. Neither his learning nor his natural ignorance is of any importance. That, again, he is or is not notoriously this or that or the other is likewise no concern of mine.
A Reformer's Note-Book.

SINGLE-TAX.—The tenacity with which the Single-tax proposal sticks to life is a proof that it contains an element of reason; but the fact that its adherents do not increase in numbers is evidence that it also contains elements of unreason. The element of reason in it is the perception involved in the proposal that land somehow or other differs from other forms of capital. The reason lies in supposing that this difference is economic for formally it is political. Land is a form of capital that is at once an amenity and an instrument of production; it can be both simultaneously or either alternately; and this superability of these two aspects of land really gives to land an advantage over other forms of Capital. Again, it is the fact that the system of land-tenure, whatever may be the economics involved, has a political significance beyond that of the tenure of other forms of Capital. To own land and to own a mill are not socially the same thing; Economically, they may very well be indifferent; they may produce, that is, equal incomes; but the superiority of land over other capital as a possession is undoubted. But this is what we mean when we say that over and above its economic utility Land has a social or political value. It is the mistake of the Single-taxers, however, to confuse this social value with economic value, and to conclude wrongly, in consequence, that it can be dealt with by economic means. They propose, in fact, to compel landowners to pay for the amenity of land by taxing it economically. On economic grounds such a proposal is altogether unfair; for it is to single out for taxation a particular form of Capital because everybody values it as an amenity. All the arguments for Single-taxing land are as applicable to other forms of Capital as to land itself. For instance, it is said that land rises in value in consequence of social improvements that cost the landlord nothing. Very true, but under the operation of Supply and Demand it is not only Land that is liable to windfalls of increment value but most other forms of Capital. The popular education provided by the State is responsible, we may say, for the increment of circulation of our daily newspapers—would it on that account be expected that newspapers should be taxed? And if not, why not? Similarly with other forms of Capital, the law of Supply and Demand bloweth whither it listeth, and none can tell what form of Capital will next enjoy a windfall of increment. The proper method of approaching Land is not different in its economic aspect from the methods proper to dealing with private capital (including private wealth) in general. They are two: taxation of the income derived from it and taxation of its capital or market value. These means, applied uniformly to all forms of Capital, would include Land, of course, in its scope, but as one among many, and not, as proposed by the Single-taxers, as one by itself. Politically, on the other hand, the problem of land must be solved by political means: that is to say, by legally determining the modes of land-tenure. If land were nationalised, and afterwards chartered to an Agricultural Guild, its amenities would be socialised. By this means the amenities that now confuse the Single-taxers would be eliminated as matters of contention.

THE ARMY.—The Army not only revealed the unorganisation of the nation industrially, but also a national poverty of ideas. When it was discovered that our small professional army would be unequal to the task before the nation, instead of sitting down for an hour or two to consider how a large army could be raised with the minimum amount of difficulty, our statesmen succumbed to the parrot cries of the Press. In the first instance, everybody of military age and fitness was invited to join the Army without considering the question of his relative national utility in one place or the other. Nor was it considered for him. The result of this organisation of the nation to laissez-faire was demonstrated in the need that immediately arose for the recall to industry of many of the volunteers for the Army. In the second instance, it cannot be said that Compulsion was worked with much more regard for industrial needs. In the case of some industries the general average of age was well below the military age; in others it was above; with this consequence that the former industries were liable to be depleted of men, while the latter were comparatively unaffected. This, of course, would have been of no great concern if the former industries as compared with the latter had been of less or of only equal national importance. In fact, however, the industries manned by young men are usually of high economic importance, while industries manned chiefly by men over military age are usually luxury-industries. Thus it came about that flat compulsion, had it been applied as it was originally meant to be applied, would have drained the necessary industries of labour and have left the luxurious industries full; and this was only avoided by the grant of a considerable number of exemptions. The third device to be suggested for recruiting was recruiting by occupation. But this unfortunately was made impossible by the unorganisation above referred to. Had there been in existence occupational registers in each of the great industries nothing would have been easier than to have required of each industry, in proportion to its economic value to the nation, its proportional quota of men. Since no such registers existed, the means could not be applied. On the reasonable assumption, however, that war is always a possibility, the nation ought to see that in future we are always prepared in time of peace, for the recall of men to industry in case of need. It is not, of course, suggested that the nation should be permanently organised for war; but to be organised as if war might break out is manifestly the duty of a democracy. The means have been indicated. Assuming that there is a small permanent professional Army, the rest of the citizens should be required to be registered as members of one or other of the great national Guilds—industrial, civil, or State. Each Guild would then be required to keep a classified register of its members showing at any given moment their age, general fitness, and also their relative value in industry to which they belong. Further than this, each Guild would be required to make a return of the number of men it could provide in case of need without impairing its own efficiency beyond the degree commensurate to industry as a whole. And, obviously, some of the Guilds could dispense with more men than others with fewer men at a pinch. Finally, it would be for the Guild Congress to decide on the requisition of the State for such and such a number of men, the proportion to be drawn from each Guild, and to make arrangements for proposing to or obtaining the larger army as otherwise carrying on. Such an arrangement would have all the advantages which we have had to forego during the present war on account of unorganisation. The Army, under these circumstances, could be expanded or contracted like a concertina without producing the national disorders that have recently been engendered.
Music.

BY WILLIAM ATHELING.

Van Dieren, Tinayre, Rosing's All Russian Programme.

Miss Helen Rootham has a voice clear, pure, largish, rather too cloistered to be convincing in Serbian folk-song as given at her Serbian Van Rood recital. The songs were interesting but appeared to possess neither the wildness nor energy of either Russian or Gaelic traditional melodies. The concert might have had some aesthetic interest had it been devoted wholly to the works of Van Dieren. There is in his instrumentation a closeness of workmanship which deserves examination. He still suffers from having had an unfortunately blatant introduction two years ago. One examination. He still suffers from having had traditional melodies. The concert might have had of-performers who seemed much more at home in the

messages to deliver, with

some aesthetic interest had it been devoted wholly to the original. It was rather like

a prelude to the ballade is exquisite,

twiddle-twiddle, scrabble-scrabbles, becomes tiresome. Faure's "Nell" was well sung, but vilely, vilely accompanied. As a singer is more at the mercy of his accompanist in this modern French stuff than anywhere else, I prefer to postpone further discussions of Tinayre until I can hear him to better advantage. The public should welcome a recital of old French songs by him. But this modern school with its eternal twiddle-twiddle, scrabble-scrabbles, becomes tiresome. Lamento was dull. Cézanne excellent in "Sitting on Stone." Sauret

Tinayre until I can hear him to better advantage. The music and played the piano he has only himself to thank for missing what was probably the most serious Russian concert ever attempted in London. Rosing's voice, especially the lower register, was in excellent condition, and I have already said enough about his art in these columns to omit discussion of it in the few lines that remain to me. He attempted to give, so far as possible in one afternoon, the music portrait of Russia's subjectivity ("soul" is, I think, the term used). He succeeded admirably. Items: Five folk songs from the splendid collection by Philipp, harmonised by Korsaloff. Rather "Gregorian" feel to "Red Sun." Chantey, in "Sitting on Stone." Satiric in "Bright Swallows." The next four groups illustrated Oppression, Love, Suffering, Gaiety and Satire, admirably. Kalinov, full of race quality. I think we may call the "Ancient Mound" great art. Rubenstein showing as really a Russian in "Prisoner." During Blechmann's "Convicts" one realised author of the last movement of the Quartet in G major performed also on Monday.

Tinayre.

M. Yves Tinayre is a charming and delightful singer. He began (Wigmore, Oct. 29) nervously. Dr. Pepusch's Cantata Alexis is a little too late to join good words with good music, but Mozart has, to all appearance, cribbed without stint. Tinayre keeps carefully to the words. Weble also was a little too late and wrote long notes for "the.

Th. Ford, Attey, Dowland are a different boiling: early enough to find good verse their contemporary. Here we had Tinayre charm to advantage. Attey's setting of the alba, "On a Time," is the fine fruit of an age erucde in the perfect taste of its medium. Tinayre made an effective change of matter in turning to the Dowland. It is seldom that one can correct the misprints of the programme from the clearness of a foreign singer's enunciation. One did in Tinayre's singing "Fine Knacks." Excellent as he was in the old English he was still better in the old French encore. For all its virtues, the modern French school of song writers will not hold its own when sung with really good art of good periods. It glows by comparison with modern Italian and modern English settings. Faure's "Nell" was well sung, but vilely, vilely accompanied. As a singer is more at the mercy of his accompanist in this modern French stuff than anywhere else, I prefer to postpone further discussions of Tinayre until I can hear him to better advantage. The public should welcome a recital of old French songs by him. But this modern school with its eternal twiddle-twiddle, scrabble-scrabbles, becomes tiresome. Lamento was dull. Cézanne excellent in "Sitting on Stone." Sauret
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that the "difference" between this music and the usual, was that we were having unenlightened, or to the real, that it was not cooked up for a concert hall. (Rosing is lucky in his accomplish, Di Veroli.)

Came then three masterpieces, but in especial we note in the oriental quality of Moussorgsky's "Voire de Sorotchinsky," the light that never was on sea or land, the Corderide-Keats ambition, the casements upon seas forlorn. Moussorgsky has always some mastery to distinguish him in whatever company he is found.

Nevstieff's "Poor Wanderer" is excellent, but from it one comprehends the Russian desire for foreignness, for French neatness, and even German upholstery. Russian music is not all of it. It has a greater place in world-music than is yet accorded it. The Moussorgsky "Trepak," the drunk dying in the snow in defrium, is a marvel. His "Goat" in gorgeous satire, the Borodine "Spes" excellently made, good "facture." The imitation of the old man in the "Goat" was capital. Rosing has "got" his audience. He need have no fear of their refusing from now on to take the best he can give them; and let us hope it last half the next programme will be given up to Moussorgsky.

I stop for reasons of space, not because I have no more to say of the Russian music.

**Views and Reviews.**

**Pecuniary Pacification.**

It has fallen to my lot during the war to review many of the suggested schemes for international government, and the readers of this journal may remember that I have given them very full treatment. My attention has been drawn to another one, published by Messrs. Hodder and Stoughton, under the title: "The Great Plan: How to Pay for the War": the author being Mr. A. E. Stillwell. It is a very attractive scheme, as attractive as a mining prospectus or a General Election address; the world has only got to do this thing, and it is done, a proposition which, I think, no one will deny. But all these schemes, Mr. Stillwell's no less than the rest, assume the very point at issue; they assume that there is a general agreement of the world in favour of peace, a general agreement and that apart from the war between classes which In made, good credit-mongering that has been done during the war. That class-war certainly, is perplexing every statesman. That class-war certainly, was that the "difference" between this music and the usual, was that we were having unenlightened, or unenlightened, or to the real, that it was not cooked up for a concert hall. (Rosing is lucky in his accomplish, Di Veroli.)
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and until they have settled their differences, or compounded their felonies, there will be no peace of the world to maintain.

Mr. Stillwell does not apprehend such a conflict; all the world, he assumes, is in favour of his solution of its problem; and nothing can be simpler than his plan. The Governments will have Bonds issued to them equal to their expenditure on the war; with these they will immediately discharge their debts to one another, and will issue national currency to the amount of the residue with which they will pay off all national war debts incurred. In other words, they will have to alter their present systems, and instead of issuing currency against their gold reserves, issue it against their war expenditure. That such a currency may be vastly in excess of the requirements of possible business does not seem to occur to the author; and he regards the rise in prices equivalent to the inflation of the currency with equanimity. He assumes that if only we have enough to spend, we shall be able to pay everything we owe, and buy everything we want; but it is possible to have too much to spend, and have so much money that we cannot buy anything with it, and that, I think, is the most likely conclusion to this suggestion of coining our debts into money. As the author suggests that this currency should be gradually withdrawn as the Governments pay; to the Congress of the self-governing States and provinces of the world, it would be difficult to find a more simple or easier way of settling the issue of the war, indeed? an actual driving into a liberal evolution the whole of the world can understand. In 1886, Stepniak wrote: "The transformation of the Northern Colossus from a gloomy centralised despotism into a vast union of self-governing States and provinces, the only form into which a free Russia can mould itself will drive into a liberal evolution the whole of Central Europe."

The Russian Revolution, at the moment of its occurrence, seemed of secondary importance to the war; but the subsequent progress of affairs in Austria and Germany suggests that it may have been an event transcending the issue of the war, indeed, an actual determining of the same issue. In 1886, Stepniak prophesied: "The transformation of the Northern Colossus from a gloomy centralised despotism into a vast union of self-governing States and provinces, the only form into which a free Russia can mould itself will drive into a liberal evolution the whole of Central Europe."

In Austria, first, which otherwise will be unable to withstand for a year the great attractions of a free Russian federation on the masses of her Slavonic population; in Germany, next a Russian dictatorship will be unable to keep its hold, surrounded as it will be on all sides by free States. With it will fall the reign of brutality, encroachments, and, perhaps, the endurable military terror now crushing and ruining all Continental Europe. The process is taking longer than our patriotic Press expects, but no longer than any student of revolutions would expect; and the addition of Austria and possibly Germany to the area involved in this disruptive preliminary to reconstruction constitutes at least as formidable a problem as the military one of conquering the Central Powers. It is admitted that our victories are principally due to the failure of civilian moral, the military situation being far less desperate than the political; and if we are to think more of victory than of vengeance," as Lord Milner suggested (under penalty of having to impose govern their military force upon the largest proportion of European people), we shall at least have to understand the Russian revolution, instead of merely denouncing it because it put us at a military disadvantage. These two brochures at least help us to correct some of the impressions derived from the hasty reading of the hasty reports of journalists. It was assumed, for example, that Russia could have continued the war after the revolution; Mr. Farbman gives good reason to believe that if it were true, it was not because it could not continue the war. The word "exhaustion" was certainly used at the time, but few people understand what the word means in this connection. Russia began the war with a larger army than any other belligerent, certainly; but with an enormously inferior system of transport relatively, an enormous disadvantage, a small, inadequate industrial system, and no adequate means of replacing the imports that she used to receive from the Central Empires. The Army (to say nothing of the people) used leather, for example; but Russia does not produce leather in any considerable quantities. She exported hides, which were tanned in Germany and Austria; and the Russian leather industry was based on the leather re-imported. Still more formidable was the mechanical problem; at the time when her machinery (insufficient for her needs, at the best) was being over-worked, it became increasingly difficult and finally impossible to effect repairs and renewals, because she could not import leather in any considerable quantities. The railways suffered similarly (the transport problem of Central Europe, and not only there, will be the prime difficulty confronting all schemes of reconstruction); and without the means of the World Bond Issue, we may justly ask why we should be saddled with the whole burden of a worldwide inflation of currency now, while posterity will reap the benefit of a currency commensurate with its commercial needs.

A. E. R.

Reviews.

From Autocracy to Bolshevism. By Baron P. Graevenitz. (Allen & Unwin. 5s. net.)

Russia and the Struggle for Peace. By Michael S. Farbman. (Allen & Unwin. 5s. net.)
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A University will in general fulfil its teaching function (so far as that is possible by direct instruction) the better in proportion as its activity in research and discussion is great — in proportion, that is, as its teachers continue to learn. I trust I am not doing Mrs. Townshend an injustice when I say that her attitude towards the teaching profession suggests following that conception of education as instruction which underlies existing educational arrangements, and which it was the main purpose of my articles to combat. Education is at least the development of accomplishment which makes higher things possible. When we declared that no discussion of the problem of the Guildsman's pay could contain anything so monstrously wrong. Mr. Hobson has been so commendably frank in his criticism of our proposals that he will forgive us if we reply that we are only just "recovering our breath" from the shock of realizing the perils to democracy—to say nothing of the public peace—which are involved in his own position, on the other hand, involves no more in itself than the belief that to dissociate the two functions which a University performs (on my own admission) are not educational at all. Institutions which are centres of research and the "organs of national thought," has to do more direct a routine teaching function than they have to those of medicine and law. In order to be untrammelled, they must be equally dissociated from all. And from this Mrs. Townshend concludes, I suppose, that the University could be better receiving its charters direct from the State, and controlled in the public interest by it alone.

Between this principle and the materialisation which I tried to explain there is a material difference. It turns over a familiar matter of controversy and even of friction in Universities. Every college at present performs the two functions which we may call broadly research and teaching. They are different, and the claims of one may be more urgent than the claims of the other. But the marvel to me is that we have any teachers at all. Rut the marvel to me is that we have any teachers at all. I do not for a moment suppose she believes them; but the charge of preaching the business of a Guild propagandist to other people is a sole and unique form of the old myths in a peculiarly subtle form.

Sir,—While we are grateful for "S. G. H.'s" commendation of our editorial labours in our book "The Meaning of National Guilds," we are afraid that small chance exists of our being able to relieve that unhappiness to any extent (or, alternatively, to add to it), by a discussion of the differences between him and ourselves; for those differences raise issues so large and so interesting that, if they were not dealt with, not all the pages of a single week's New Age sufficed to contain our letter. If we touch only upon a few of these, and that lightly, it is because we are anxious to compress our reply.

We owe an apology to Mr. Hobson, and we would desire to begin by making the admission as handsomely as possible. When we declared that no discussion of the problem of the Guildsman's pay could contain anything so monstrously wrong. Mr. Hobson has been so commendably frank in his criticism of our proposals that he will forgive us if we reply that we are only just "recovering our breath" from the shock of realizing the perils to democracy—to say nothing of the public peace—which are involved in his own position, on the other hand, involves no more in itself than the belief that to dissociate the two functions which a University performs (on my own admission) are not educational at all. Institutions which are centres of research and the "organs of national thought," has to do more direct a routine teaching function than they have to those of medicine and law. In order to be untrammelled, they must be equally dissociated from all. And from this Mrs. Townshend concludes, I suppose, that the University could be better receiving its charters direct from the State, and controlled in the public interest by it alone.

Between this principle and the materialisation which I tried to explain there is a material difference. It turns over a familiar matter of controversy and even of friction in Universities. Every college at present performs the two functions which we may call broadly research and teaching. They are different, and the claims of one may be more urgent than the claims of the other. But the marvel to me is that we have any teachers at all. Rut the marvel to me is that we have any teachers at all. I do not for a moment suppose she believes them; but the charge of preaching the business of a Guild propagandist to other people is a sole and unique form of the old myths in a peculiarly subtle form.
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cute means by which such a claim might receive economic sanction. No wonder that in his chapter on "Inter-Guild Relations" our critic declares that "it is prudent to anticipate and avoid even a semblance of a struggle between the Guilds, and also that "as the raison d'être of the Guilds is primarily economic, and as nothing is more mankind so easily as the consideration of its material interests and property, we may do so without the active operation of economic 'pulls.'" Mr. Hobson is not content merely to expect them; by his proposals he goes out of his way to provide for them. He asks what would happen if the Agricultural Guild, discontented with a Guild system which restricted their pay to 65 "guards" while the engineer obtained 100 (£3 as, against £6 in English) received the reply from the other Guilds 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." He "not only asks the question but answers it" in his own way; and we will do so in ours. In any decent social democracy what would happen would be a row, in the course of which the whole Guild system might come down in ruins, as it would deserve to do.

Mr. Hobson claims that our suggestions betray the opinion that the Guilds cannot be trusted to arrange these matters for themselves. But by his proposals lie designed to avoid "the active operation of economic pulls," then we accept the charge. But it is a caricature of the collective contract, and unhappily carried with some fullness in Chapter VIII of our book, to suggest that they remove the control of pay from the Guilds. Quite apart from its representation on the Guild Congress, which Mr. Hobson seems to put no account, each Guild will of course have the vital function of dividing its share of the communal product (a share proportionately equal to that of all the other Guilds) amongst its members on whatever principles it may democratically determine. In view of this proposal, which is one put forward by the great majority of guild propagandists, we claim that for Mr. Hobson to accuse us of extinguishing Guild control is to adopt his own phrase, "quite frankly, deadly nonsense."

There are other points we should like to take up, but even in the interests of the purity of Guild doctrine we cannot ask for further space in which to do so. May we be allowed, however, to correct a mis-statement of Mr. Hobson's when he says that we would not have "the Guilds engaged in foreign trade without the permission of a joint committee of the Guild Congress and the State"? On p. 327 we say explicitly that "international barter will be a function of the Guilds." The joint committee which is for the conduct of foreign affairs, "since it is impossible to separate economic from national problems in foreign relations, and since the connection between them will become even more intimate in a democratic State."—C. E. Bichhoefer.

"[S. G. H.] replies: 'I am glad that Messrs. Bichhoefer and Reckitt have corrected their glaring misstatement, and note that they definitely abandon Guild autonomy.']

NATIONAL GUILD THEORY.

Sir,—It is now six or seven years since the National Guild theory first appeared in the columns of The New Age, and I think the Guild writers are to be congratulated on the success which has attended their efforts, but I want to ask if the time has not now arrived for an expansion of National Guild theory.

The more we consider the practical application of the theory, the more we realise that, as it stands, it is an idea of limited applicability. It can be applied to the services, to railways, coal-mines, etc., but it is not exactly applicable to the productive industries. For some of us were thinking primarily of its problems that we hesitated in the early days to give it our support. But of late certain ideas, not part of the original theory, have found their way into the discussions of a joint committee, and its proper place in our propaganda, would supply this want. The elements are here and accepted by us, but they need bringing together and presenting as the solution of the problem.

First among these ideas is that of the Collective Contract which Mr. Paton proposed at the last Guild Conference. This idea is one of the first importance, and I do not think it has been given the prominence it deserves. It is, in fact, the logical conclusion of an analysis of the family economy. It is not content merely to expect them; by his proposals lie designed to avoid the mediaeval idea of the Just Price, which is a natural development of it. These two ideas, the Collective Contract and the Fixed Price, should be run together as the upper and nether millstones between which capitalism will be ground.

In reply to Mr. Kerr, may I refer him to the articles now appearing.—A. J. Penty.

THE DECLINE OF FREE INTELLIGENCE.

Sir,—May one, as invited, shoot a few arrows in the air?

My first shaft shall be that we have all become too much of specialists in a world of keen competition to spare the time and energy for the apparently non-productive exercise of free intelligence as defined by "R. H. C." Secondly, that the portion of the bad habits inculcated in us by our kindergarten educators. The mites of Majorca—wan't it?—had no full meal until they could bring it down from the top of a high pole with a stone from a sling. We as children, however, have our meals thrust upon us—and in a half-digested condition to boot. Thirdly and obviously, that the ex-halflaps papers with their facile and futile "ideas" are to blame. And my fourth and favourite shaft is that this decline of free intelligence is due to a universal belief in the necessity for full and free mental effort as an end rather than as a means. The free intelligentsia are popularly supposed to be a race apart, men born with a fully developed and logical mind. Many there be who keep the body fit, by systematic exercise, simply for the sake of the things they cannot get (present company excepted) who believe that the mind could and should be expanded, elasticised, and vitalised to a degree far exceeding the ideal of the physical culturist?—H. H. Mytton.

CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS.

Sir,—A point which does not appear to have been brought out distinctly in connection with the conscientious objectors is that in the case of the purely Military Service Act the only logical condition of exemption is that of an ability to make a useful contribution to the war effort as an end rather than as a means. The free intelligentsia are popularly supposed to be a race apart, men born with a fully developed and logical mind. Many there be who keep the body fit, by systematic exercise, simply for the sake of the things they cannot get (present company excepted) who believe that the mind could and should be expanded, elasticised, and vitalised to a degree far exceeding the ideal of the physical culturist?—H. H. Mytton.
Pastiche.

PREMATURE PEACE.

Once more we walk the busy street
To laugh, to trick, to buy, to sell,
And there once more the vampires meet
With easy jest that all is well.
While they may goad the poor and cheat
A world that should have done with hell!

So, one by one, we all return
To where the false god reigns supreme,
And in his bitter service learn
Never to be—yet still to seem—
Wise, virtuous, free, and so to earn
The best of both worlds. Thus we dream!

Cant, hollow phrases for our speech,
For deeds—to be as others are
Or better—to outgrow their reach,
And force their homage from afar,
While they may practise what we preach,
Is this the peace we claim from war?

And all the while, through street or lane,
A throng of silent spirits steal,
whose grief the grave could not contain,
Nor flaming scars decay conceal.
They are the Dead that died in vain;
Thers the wounds that will not heal.

D. FIELD.

NEUTRAL NOTES.

THE FLY IN THE GLASS.

It was a Hampstead train, full, but not packed. On
my left sat a little man looking very much like a tailor.
(Why, by the way, should trades create their own
insufficient marks of their profession, emphasised the fact
by wearing an expression unnecessarily stern. The little
man was merry, with a mirth that flavoured of other
than natural sources. His mirth, shy at first, tried its
wings at home before venturing into the outer world;
and all the while, through street or lane,
A throng of silent spirits steal,
whose grief the grave could not contain,
Nor flaming scars decay conceal.
They are the Dead that died in vain;
Thers the wounds that will not heal.

There was in his merry face a curious flash
of conveying to the ladies opposite, by means of many
eloquent gestures, his request that they should grant
of the minister. He had read the Bible as well as you!

M. De M.

THE CARELESS SPIRIT.

The little bright fairy
Never singeth "Ave Mary,
For in the wood both brave and dim
What needs he of chant or hymn?
But every flower shall be his bed,
And he shall sing
The lay of every living thing,
And on the moss shall fleetly tread:
But since ye be not fairy
On thy knees sing "Ave Mary,"

The steadfast violet
Shall upon his brow be set,
But he shall rest upon the one
That blossoms white,
The hawthorn, tree of dear delight,
But shivering misers, thin and wary,
The lay of every living thing,
And on the moss shall fleetly tread:
But since ye be not fairy
On thy knees sing "Ave Mary,"

The carefree spirit
Never singeth "Ave Mary,
For in the wood both brave and dim
What needs he of chant or hymn?
But every flower shall be his bed,
And he shall sing
The lay of every living thing,
And on the moss shall fleetly tread:
But since ye be not fairy
On thy knees sing "Ave Mary,"

Ruth Pitter.