

# THE NEW AGE

A WEEKLY REVIEW OF POLITICS, LITERATURE, AND ART.

No. 1382] NEW SERIES. Vol. XXIV. No. 18. THURSDAY, MAR. 6, 1919. [Registered at G.P.O. as a Newspaper.] SEVENPENCE

## CONTENTS.

	PAGE		PAGE
NOTES OF THE WEEK . . . . .	285	MUSIC. By William Atheling . . . . .	295
FOREIGN AFFAIRS. By S. Verdad . . . . .	288	RECENT VERSE. By Stephen Maguire . . . . .	296
TOWARDS NATIONAL GUILDS. By National Guildsmen . . . . .	289	LETTERS TO THE EDITOR from An Ex-Subaltern, N. Subramanya Aiyar, R. B. Kerr, M. F. M., S. S., S. H., W. K. Scudamore, C. R. W. Nevinson . . . . .	297
THE CIVIL GUILDS. I--THE CIVIL SERVICE. By S. G. H. . . . .	290	PASTICHE. By Ethel Talbot Scheffauer . . . . .	300
WE JEWS. By a Modern . . . . .	292	PRESS CUTTINGS . . . . .	300
READERS AND WRITERS. By R. H. C. . . . .	294		

## NOTES OF THE WEEK.

THE Industrial Conference which was held last Thursday has in all probability fulfilled the two objects the Government designed for it. It has certainly thrown no light on our general economic and industrial situation, nor has it revealed the existence of any constructive policy in the mind of the Government. But it has for the time being enlisted public sympathy—whatever that may mean, and we do not deny its potency—on the side of the State and the mineowners against the miners; and it has also, we imagine, “averted the threatened stoppage without conceding the men’s demands”—an object which the “Times” quite openly admitted was first and foremost. If there were any likelihood that economic facts could be overcome by artifices of this kind, much might be said for the adoption of the policy of expedients; and, again, if it were a wise object to gain time in the certainty that time is our friend, the temporising of the Government with the miners might be allowed to pass for statesmanship. But economic facts are chieftains that winna ding; and sooner or later the practical, even more than the theoretical, problems involved in the present industrial unrest will insist on being met face to face. Everybody is aware that the present national situation hangs by a thread; a growing number of people are convinced that something drastic must be done; and, in fact, something drastic must be done. Evasions and temporary expedients are all very well for transitory difficulties; but, even in the short run, they are useless against fundamental facts.

\* \* \*

We have examined before, but in view of the Royal Commission now appointed to report on the matter we may examine again, the demands of the miners. Roughly speaking, they are three in number and they concern respectively wages, hours and the question of national control. It is obvious that in the minds of the men themselves the importance of these objects is in the order indicated. The first question is that of wages, the next is that of hours, and only in the third place comes that of the nationalisation of the industry, followed, it will be observed, by a very feeble and almost inaudible demand for a share in control. Is it only prejudice on our part that sees in this order the

very reverse of the proper order? Are we wrong in believing that in putting wages and hours before control the miners are putting the cart before the horse? It is undoubted that in the order of their experience, the problem of wages precedes even that of hours, while both still more certainly precede in point of actual visibility the problem of control. But cause and effect are not uncommonly experienced in their reverse order; and in the case of the sequence now before us, it appears to us certain that, whatever the brute actualities may be, the effective approach to a solution of the difficulties is not from wages and hours to control, but from control to hours and wages. In other words, the decision rests ultimately with control, and not with the conditions derived from it. Though for the present wages and hours, as conditions of the industry, may be or may appear to be settled, sooner or later whoever exercises control will re-determine the new conditions established. The wages thus paid and the hours of labour thus agreed upon may for the moment appear to be satisfactory; but in the event that the control is either left where it is or is transferred elsewhere than to the miners themselves, the loaded dice of possession will operate to rob the new wages and hours of all their apparent advantages.

\* \* \*

Without prejudice to the findings of the Commission in the matter of wage-schedules and the like, we may take it for granted that under any probable conditions the effect of an increase of wages must be the raising of the selling-price of coal; in other words, a diminution of the purchasing-value of money-wages. For the alternatives to the increase in the selling-price of coal are such as nothing short of a radically different system of control are likely to bring about. The increase of wages, if it is to be real, must come from somewhere; and since, if control remains where it is, it will not come from Rent, Interest or Profits—these being, of course, the prerequisites of Capitalist control—it must come from the consumer in the form of increased prices. There is, in fact, while Capitalist control remains, no escape from the vicious circle with which the public and the miners ought now to be familiar. Given the retention of the system of rent, interest and profits, all increases of wages are inevitably reflected in prices which of themselves instantly nullify for the mass of

the population the advantage of higher nominal wages. There is no escape, we repeat, from the circle thus kept in motion, save by dealing with the one question of control which the miners, like most other people, prefer to keep in the background. We shall see, however, what we shall see. The issue of the Royal Commission, as far as we can judge, will be a compromise with the miners' demands in the matter of the 30 per cent. increase of wages—sufficient, that is to say, to make a strike unreasonable, and, therefore, improbable—and a compromise at the same time with the other questions involved. In sum, and as will be discovered in practice after a few months' trial, neither the miners nor the public will be any better off, while the mineowners assuredly will not be a penny the worse.

The proper humanitarian considerations that have led to the miners' second demand for a reduced working-day are obviously not an economic argument, but an appeal ad misericordiam. And they have quite wisely been supplemented by the explanation that a reduced working-day is the only means known to the miners of absorbing their unemployed. In this form the appeal, as in the case of other industries, is really to statesmanship; for it proposes to solve the problem of unemployment by the simple process of "making the work go round." In short, as an economic argument, it belongs to the general category of restricted output for the sake of making work. We have nothing, we confess, to oppose to such an argument except to say that while its intentions meet with our approval, the means it proposes are entirely inadequate. That unemployment is certain to increase, that before very long unemployment will be the chief cry from one end of the country to the other, may be accepted as a truism. That, again, it would seem that unemployment can be absorbed by a policy of *ca' canny* in the matter of hours on the part of the employed is likewise obvious. But once more we encounter the problem of control; and the actual fact is this, that the reduction of the working hours of human labour does not necessarily result in an increased demand for *human* labour; but it may, and probably will, result in an increase of *mechanical* labour. The supposition of the miners (and not of them alone) is that the demand for human labour is fixed, or that, at any rate, it is subject only to slow changes. They, therefore, conclude that if the hours of labour of the men now employed are reduced, let us say, by one half, the demand for labour will be increased proportionately; in other words, that twice as much human labour will need to be employed. And this, no doubt, would be the case in an industry in which mechanical power could not for any reason be employed. But this is very far from being the case with the mining or any other modern industry. On the contrary, the development of modern industry is all in the direction of the substitution of mechanical for human power. The demand of the miners for reduced hours may, therefore, very well be the precise stimulus required by the mineowners for the increased employment, not of human but of mechanical labour. And so long as they retain control, there is nobody to say them nay. We predict as a consequence of the success of the men's demands an immediate apparent proof of their contention that a reduction of hours will diminish unemployment. But let them not be misled by their temporary success. In a year, in two—at the outside, in five—the mineowners will have discovered a mechanical substitute which will undo all the work of reduced hours and re-create the very problem of unemployment which the miners are now endeavouring to solve.

The diminuendo of emphasis laid by the miners on their series of demands represents, in all probability, the diminuendo of their conviction. They are powerfully convinced that higher wages are necessary; they

are a little less firmly convinced that a reduced working-day will solve the question of unemployment; they are lukewarm, in spite of all their protestations, on the question of nationalisation; and as for the "joint control with the State" which Mr. Smillie rightly regards as manifesting a "progression in thought," they appear to us to be almost ashamed of making it, so small is their faith in it. There appears, in fact, to be a distinct division in the miners' camp on the subject; for whereas "joint control" appeared in the full text of the Miners' Manifesto, it was not only dropped from the ballot-paper, but Mr. Brace and several others among the miners' spokesmen in the House of Commons ignored the addition and demanded that "the mines of the country should belong to the State and should be controlled and managed by the State." Something, it is obvious, is very wrong here, for either "joint control" is desirable, in which case Mr. Brace and the rest are behind the times, or it is designed merely to tickle the ears of the Guild groundlings. We should like to see the point cleared up. In any event, however, we are prepared to say that nationalisation, under the probable conditions of its problematical adoption, is anything but the solution of the difficulties of the case. Nationalisation without the "joint control" so feebly demanded would, in fact, we believe, have the opposite consequences of those now expected of it by the miners themselves. Let us take, for example, Mr. Brace's own conditions of nationalisation, and inquire what follows from them. In the first place, he says, the State in taking over the mines must pay full compensation to the present owners; in other words, the State is to pay the capital value, not only of the plant and material assets, but of the goodwill of labour which is clearly included in the market price of the mines. And to this preposterous sum of money, the generous Mr. Brace is willing, in the second place, to add the guarantee of "dividends." We need scarcely remark that under this arrangement, nationalisation and State Capitalism are identical terms; and we are left wondering whether a strike to transfer Labour from the frying-pan to the fire is worth the trouble it would involve. But this is not the only objection to naked nationalisation; for even the "Times" observes that the status of the miners will undergo no improvement in the process. On the contrary, it is certain that it will be degraded by just the difference between the State and the existing mineowners. Against the latter, the miners are free to strike with a good moral conscience; there is always, at any rate, the chance that public opinion may support them. But against the State what hope have the miners that they will ever be "right" in striking? Exposed to the same pressure on behalf of "compensation" and "dividends" their rebellion will be mutiny to be suppressed by all the forces of the Crown. We could continue the case against Nationalisation without joint control far beyond the patience of our readers. It has, however, been all said on many occasions before; and we need only refer our readers for the rest to the literature of the Guilds.

The mineowners, it appears, have come to the same conclusion, though by a different route and with quite other motives. "Nationalisation," these self-sacrificing patriots are made to say in the "Times," "is not in the interests of the public." The interests of the public, it seems, are much safer in the hands of the existing mineowners than in the hands of the State; but, if there is to be any change, then they are safer, again, in the hands of the mineowners and miners jointly than elsewhere. We may recall our warning that, at the first alarm of National Guilds, the existing Capitalist régime would offer itself as a partner with the monopoly of Labour in the Trade Unions; and here the Capitalists are, most unmistakably, fulfilling our prediction. For what other intention does their offer reveal than the intention of uniting their monopoly of

Capital with the Trade Union monopoly of Labour, and of using the double monopoly for the purpose of extracting maximum profits (and perhaps wages) from the public consumer? Such a joint monopoly, it appears to us, must have all the disadvantages for the public of the two elements of which it is composed: the element of the Syndicate or Trust, and the element of Syndicalism; and in all certainty if the State is unable to counteract the evils of one or other separately, it cannot hope to counteract them when the two parties are united. A greater menace to the community could scarcely, in fact, be conceived than the "joint control" proposed by the mineworkers. Submission to the plan would involve us in the joint profiteering of owners and miners to their common gain (perhaps), but to the loss of the community at large for certain.

\* \* \*

It is probably too soon to put forward with the expectation of practical discussion the proposals made by national guildsmen for the joint control of the mines between the State and the workman (including, in the latter, all the labour, manual or managerial, necessary to the conduct of the industry). And it is too soon, no doubt, for the reason that the Miners' Federation possessing, as it does, a monopoly only of the manual labour employed in the mines, is without the confidence in its own managerial competence which the inclusion in its ranks of skilled control would alone justify. There is a good deal of sense in this attitude; and though we regret the fact upon which it is based, we have no wish to see repeated in this country the disastrous experiment of the Russian Bolsheviks, who hoped to be able to improvise managerial competence out of the ranks of the untrained proletariat. At the same time, the disunion between the miners and the salaried management ought not to be regarded as an insuperable obstacle to the creation of a Miners' Guild. In any event, the existing salariat would undoubtedly be "taken over" by the State if the mines were nationalised. Moreover, under those circumstances, they would need to work in harmony with the proletariat Miners' Federation. What is to prevent the salariat and the proletariat coming together *before* the creation of State control is a fait accompli, and undertaking jointly the responsible control of the industry on behalf of the nation? The case is clearly one for as much and more consideration as the parallel case of the joint control offered by the mineowners. For, in the later contingency, the existing salariat and proletariat would need to co-operate for the profit of the mineowners; whereas, if the joint control were instituted on behalf of the State, the same two classes of Labour could co-operate for the public advantage. We have no expectation that at the forthcoming Royal Commission this form of joint control under the auspices of the State will be seriously examined, in spite of the fact that the "Times" announces that "Guild Socialism" is included in the terms of reference. The modesty, not to say the timidity, of the mining salariat is such that they are disposed to shirk responsibility even more than the Miners' Federation itself; and, until events force them into a choice between the Guild and State Capitalism, they prefer to remain satellites of the capitalist system. Events, however, if we are not mistaken, will shortly force the issue not only upon the salariat of the mining industry, but upon the salariat as a class in every industry.

\* \* \*

It is astonishing that such an able and, we believe, sincere man as Mr. W. L. Hichens can misrepresent "Guild Socialism" as he does in the paper he read last week at the Society of Arts. He allows that there is a difference between Syndicalism and National Guilds in that the latter recognises the supremacy of the State and proposes, in place of the absolute control of the workers under Syndicalism, the joint control of the

industry by the workers and the State; but he at once disallows his admission by contending that a national guild would be as menacing a monopoly as any Syndicalist union. "To substitute for competition" (of which, by the way, Mr. Hichens knows very well that there is less and less in all the great organised industries), "a series of democratic monopolies is to court certain disaster. . . . If the worker is right in his dread of the domination of the capitalist, the community is surely equally justified in hesitating to submit itself to the tender mercies of a number of democratic industrial monopolies." The confusion of language no less than of thought is plain upon the surface. Unless Mr. Hichens has a private and prejudiced definition of "democratic," his use of the word destroys his whole argument. For what has "democracy" or the community to fear from "democratic" control—or even from a "democratic" monopoly? The very wording of the phrase implies, it is true, the existence of a monopoly, but denies that it is the uncontrolled monopoly of any class in particular. The monopoly exists, but it is democratically controlled. But how, it may be asked, is this control to be exercised and how sanctioned? Like many other critics, Mr. Hichens is under the impression that because the Guild is to be autonomous as regards the disposal of its labour, it is to be a dictator in all affairs connected with its industry. Nothing of the kind—or why should the Guild be described as "national"; why propose to licence it by "charter"; why insist upon joint control? If, in fact, the community is to have no control, national guildsmen are either Syndicalists or something even more absurd. They do not mean what they say. The fact, however, is that they not only say, but they mean, that the community shall exercise joint control with the Guild, and in precisely those matters in particular concerning which Mr. Hichens, like any other sensible citizen, is apprehensive, namely, price, quality and quantity. To allow the Guild to monopolise, let us say, the mines, and to profiteer with the nation's property would, indeed, be to court certain disaster. The experience of the conduct of the mineowners, and our forecast of the probable conduct of the mineowners and miners in profit-sharing co-operation, are conclusive on this point. But, in contradistinction from these various proposals, guildsmen insist upon the community retaining control over prices (at least, of not allowing prices to be fixed by any Guild by itself), and over both the quantity and quality of the chartered production. Democracy need not fear that its control would, at the worst, be less than it is at present!

\* \* \*

The outcry raised last week against the re-imposition of Government control on new capital issues is only a hint of what must be expected later. State expenditure is at this moment little less than it was during the most costly period of the war; and it shows no signs of diminishing. On the other hand, now that the war is over, normal industry can do with the money that has hitherto been spent unproductively (save for the interest!) on the war itself. In plain terms, the financial classes see their way to a greater return for their capital in private industry than in State-investment. Unfortunately for them, the State needs the money; nor is the State able to compete with private speculators by the offer of more than five or so per cent. An unrestricted resumption of free capital would, therefore, have the effect of leaving the State without the means of raising a loan save by the offer of an impossible rate of interest. What is to be done? Industry must be started again, and it cannot be resumed without credit. Government, too, must be carried on and credit is equally necessary to this function. A levy on capital, either in the form of forced loans or in that of an out-and-out writing-off of a part of the war debt, appears inevitable. Germany has adopted the latter plan; and France proposes to follow suit. It is only a matter of time before something of the kind is forced on us,

## Foreign Affairs.

By S. Verdad.

I do not flatter myself that my article on "The Secret Treaties" was of much public value; but the fact that, with my consent, it was reprinted and distributed by the War Aims Committee gives me surely a right to regard it as not, at any rate, displeasing to the official view. In it I said, on authority not only public but private, that the "secret treaties" as they existed in the circumstances of their signature could not and would not be interpreted as binding on the Peace Conference; that, in fact, they were provisional and conditional understandings which represented rather the worst to be feared than the best to be hoped. Mr. Balfour, I remember, was much more explicit than I had any right to be; for in the House of Commons debate of about the same period he affirmed that the secret treaties were as liable as any other matter to be thrown into the melting-pot of the Peace Conference; and that, as regards ourselves, we were quite agreeable that it should be so. The defect of one of the chief signatories—Russia—made the matter even more easy to dissolve. If the secret treaties were liable with all their original signatures upon them to be revised, and, in fact, tacitly abandoned, at the Peace Conference, how much more were they bound to be submitted to the same process when they no longer bound one of the original parties? A four-legged stool to begin with, was the fact that the treaties now stood on three legs to make no difference?

\* \* \*

In spite of all that has been said, both by and in the name of our own Government, Italy, it appears, is insistent that the "secret" treaty signed with her by France, Russia and our unfortunate Sir Edward Grey shall be honoured not only in the spirit (which is reasonable), but in the letter, which is—impossible. Many apologies have been made for the particular treaty in which we undertook, in return for Italy's support, and in conjunction with our Allies, Russia and France, to bestow upon Italy territories that belonged to none of the signatory Powers. I made, I agree, an apologia myself, on the ground that the welfare of Europe was of more importance than the welfare of this or that territorial corner of Europe. But I repeat, all the more strongly since I defended the original treaties, that the terms of the Italian treaty are out of date and preposterous. Things have *not* turned out as it was expected they would when the treaty was drawn up. Contingent upon a certain conclusion of the war, they cease to be applicable to the actuality that has arisen. And Italy, in insisting upon the original terms, shows herself (or, rather, some of her statesmen) to be unable to appreciate the new circumstances and to adapt herself to them. Worse still remains. Not only has Italy declined to abandon the terms of the treaty, but she has declined the process, to which every other question is to be submitted, of arbitration. It is probable that she would accept the arbitration of the Five Great Powers; but under the circumstances, such an arbitration is out of the question, since three of them are co-signatories with herself, and, therefore, interested parties. Yugo-Slavia has deferred, therefore, to the arbitration of President Wilson; and it is President Wilson's arbitration that Italy has declined.

\* \* \*

Of course, there are enormous questions behind the questions which are agitated in public. One requires, in foreign politics in particular, to read between the lines rather than in the lines themselves. Italy, like France, is tottering on a perilous edge; and desires, at the worst, to have something to show for her expen-

diture. What would Italian public opinion say if a crushing debt had on the credit side only the restoration of the Trentino? Again, what would Italian public opinion say if Italy had disposed of the menace of Austro-Germany only to be exposed to the menace of the Adriatic power of Yugo-Slavia? We must recall these difficulties if we are to judge Italy fairly. Nor, again, ought we of necessity to take the protestations of the new Yugo-Slav politicians *au pied de la lettre*. That there are splendid idealist statesmen among them I do not doubt who have met some of them; but Balkan politics are a school of amateur Machiavellianism in which more is often learned of chicanery than of honesty. Italy may well be excused for fearing what certain politicians in Yugo-Slavia may attempt. What, however, passes my comprehension is that Italy should fear that these baser sort should ever succeed! But now set against these considerations what Italy has to lose by a pedantic insistence on the terms of the secret treaty. That she will ensure the enmity of Yugo-Slavia goes without saying; and, moreover, to that enmity she will give the cutting edge of a moral justification. For there is not the least doubt that, even if all the signatory Powers are wrong, Yugo-Slavia is right in repudiating the treaty signed without her consent. Never, I am convinced, will the Yugo-Slavs consent to be bound by it. War may be resumed; the whole peace of the world may be again endangered; but Yugo-Slavia will treat as any open and active enemy the Power that insists on the fulfilment of the secret treaty.

\* \* \*

In the next place, Italy will certainly make, if not an enemy, a luke-warm friend, of several of the Great Powers. America was not a signatory of the secret treaty; is America to be compelled to be a party to forcing it upon Yugo-Slavia in contradiction of the very principles President Wilson went into the war to maintain, and in support of the very principles he went to war to destroy? The self-determination of people as nearly as possible ethnographically, and the abolition of secret treaties—these were among his explicit objects. Does Italy expect America's support in denying them to Yugo-Slavia? In the case of both France and England, I am not disposed to say what is the official view of Italy's action. Also, we must allow that Yugo-Slavia has sullied her hands, *after* coming into court, by making demands, in lieu of arbitration, equal in intemperateness to the demands of Italy. Yugo-Slavia, in fact, goes in peril of alienating some of the goodwill she won by her submission in the first instance. Nevertheless, it cannot be a matter of gratification to France and England that a treaty their Governments have more or less openly regarded as suspended should now be forced upon them. The action of Italy, in other words, is at best a little embarrassing officially. Finally, I have no doubt about public opinion both in this country and in America and in France; it is almost uniformly unfriendly to the attitude assumed by Italy. In all the journals I have read I find but a single opinion, namely, that even if Italy be right in the text of her demands, she is wrong in her manner of enforcing them. On the whole, therefore, I do not see what Italy has to gain by clinging to the secret treaty; but I see clearly what she has to lose. She will not gain any indubitably Yugo-Slav territory, still less any political or economic strength in the Adriatic. She will not ensure herself against war or increase her powers of resistance against aggression. She will lose, on the other hand, the prospect of friendship with the rising power of Yugo-Slavia, and the cordiality of friendship with her existing Allies. Is the secret treaty worth it? Let the dead bury their dead. The wise course for Italy is to accept the arbitration of President Wilson as the alternative to the arbitration of war.

## Towards National Guilds.

THE International Conference of Labour has cried for the extension of the Labour Exchange system internationally. One could almost credit the leaders of Labour with seeing nothing wrong with the commodity status of Labour except that it is not well enough defined. How Nietzsche must writhe to see what good Europeans the Labour leaders are becoming; their attitude, indeed, must undergo great changes if it is not some day to be said of them that they led nothing but retreats, that the leaders of the wage-slaves spent their lives forging rivets instead of files.

We do not mean that the mobility of Labour is of necessity a bad thing, bad in essence; bearing in mind the special conditions of modern production, it may be a necessary thing, and when a necessary thing is a bad thing the evil lies deep indeed. In a developing system of industry, when almost any day may see some new secret of motive power revealed, some new process or product of utility discovered (at present, of course, something, good or bad, for which a demand can be created) some new and superior system of organisation, like the centralised electric power scheme, the ability to divert labour-power is an enormous economic asset to somebody. Mobile Labour would at once whittle down the difficulties of seasonal trades almost to zero; the problem of seed-time and harvest would disappear. Conditions of war have already, in fact, provoked the mobilisation of Labour to an extent hitherto unimaginable. Convertible Labour, it may be hazarded therefore, would be an economic gain to any sort of production, profitable, superprofitable, or even serviceable. Shall we, then, oppose a step towards a more efficient economy in any system, and, withal, a necessary step? Simple yea or nay may well cause misunderstanding, and our first reply to the question must be questions in return. For what particular system of production, we ask, is mobility of Labour demanded; for the superprofitable? For whose benefit is it desired; for Capital's? By what means is it proposed to effect it; by breaking up families, by turning labourers into a nomadic sub-species, by the further de-humanisation of Labour following from its conversion into an actual chattel, two degrees worse than an embodied commodity? By the harshening, in short, of the slave condition of the wage-earner? We can anticipate the inevitable replies. If the mobility of Labour is necessary, and we won't dispute it (thereby showing that any objections we may propose are dependent on great evils); if it cannot be effected without entailing the consequences outlined; and if there is any conceivable workable system whereby it can; then the conditions stipulated for fulfilment in return for the mobility of Labour are the inauguration of that system.

The Guilds, we are certain, could guarantee liquid mobility of Labour, and could regulate it by human considerations. What is more, they could, by a better distribution of "contracts," achievable at present only by rings and trusts, give greater stability to Labour, without holding society to ransom by restricting the output of necessaries in order to increase Profit. Young Guildsmen, humanly well-educated, technically capable, eager to excel in something more than one monotonous machine process, thirsting to know more of their country than their native village or town, will, when needs and uses qualitatively supplied are the foundation of production, give Labour almost mercurial mobility and a mood in ratio to which Labour's present sullen acquiescence will be as a thunder-cloud to a clear sunrise. They will hold it in esteem and honour to become, by qualification and experience, "honorary members" of more than one Guild.

A navvy so intelligent, and so interested in his job as to exercise his mind in discovering by reason and experiment exactly the sort of shovel, the length,

weight, and area of blade, that enable him to fill a cart in the shortest time, with the most complete satisfaction, is a good and efficient navvy. A carter who discovers by means of research, as carters do by nature, the pace, form of harness, weight of load, etc., that fit his horse for the maximum of daily work; without causing it to show the least sign of fatigue on the following days, is a man worthy of responsibility both for the horse and for himself. But the scientific manager, experimenting on the man as if he were the shovel, or the horse, solving by trigonometry and mechanics the problem of how to yield the maximum of profit from the minimum of labour-cost, reduces the human status of Labour to that of an automatic tool. The labourer suffers from no illusions as to the aim of all this science. Speaking in profits and labourers, it is the greatest return from the least possible number. In the event of the worker's failure to stand the pace set by the schemes of the scientific manager, he joins the unemployable, and the effect is a mild system of sabotage, secretly conceived and furtively practised. The scientific manager is no better placed; he also is faced by the fear of being supplanted should he fail to mechanise the worker. But is it not obvious that if the elimination of waste had for its object to raise the status of all producers, to heighten the dignity and enjoyment of work, and sublimely to satisfy human needs with the best quality of product, the two distrustful parties would be both mutually helpful and friendly disposed? Who, then, is at the bottom of this fear and misgiving that exists between them? Capital, in all truth! The bottomless pit into which management must never rest from pouring an ever-widening stream of profits at Labour's expense, on pain of banishment if it fail. Labour, on the other hand, is suspicious lest it give too much assistance; does it not remember only too well a time of scarcity with practically no distress, and times of over-production with much?

Scientific Management is the natural development of Capitalist production, scientific because applied to industry from without; applied from within it would demand an entirely different name, since it would have become an entirely different thing. Within the wage-system, Scientific Management is the pre-ordained fate of the sub-human super-producing automaton, born and reared on the National Eugenic Labour Farm; a being whose every human consideration is subservient to the standard of superprofitable efficiency, meriting attention only when attention promises a higher return of profit than the same outlay on, say, machinery. Virtue must be completely denied the labourer, for how can there be virtue without responsibility? Virtue, we might almost define, consists in choosing the highest line of conduct deliberately and responsibly; it can serve God; it can serve humanity; it cannot serve the enemy of both.

Mere nationalisation with bureaucratic control provides no remedy whatever, for where is the scientific manager, in his most objectionable form, more ubiquitous than in the State Departments? Obstinate opposition by the worker, with a view to veto, does not help us; it fills him with resentment and more or less slumbering volcanic rage at his own impotence, and his unconditional acceptance, on the contrary, would make us nearly despair of him. Management is degraded by a philosophy which, alongside its false appreciation of the relationship of producer, commodity and consumer, regards Labour, and, therefore, the labourer, as an instrument of production, matter improvable by experiment. And, finally, Society is disgraced and dishonoured by the triumph of material interest. There is a prospect, not intended by the philosophy of the primacy of things.

There is light, however, and we hope that the Miners' Federation and the N.U.R. will see it. The



sooner Management and Labour accomplish a separate and permanent peace (and we believe they will, and soon) with the determination to carry on industry in the interests of producer and consumer, the better will it be for England and the world. Labour will then reveal, we are certain, economising devices yet unheard of, and will reveal them joyfully. Its present necessity positively to check itself to avoid their discovery is a proof in itself that the world is ready for a higher economy than wavery. Labour has tasted power and independence, and never again, we are sure, will industry run smoothly until privilege and responsibility, and the co-operation of Management are added unto it.

NATIONAL GUILDSMEN.

## The Civil Guilds.

BEING THE SIXTH CHAPTER ON TRANSITION.

### I.—THE CIVIL SERVICE.

IN the foregoing chapters on Transition, I have dealt with the organisation of production, having previously considered the relation of the producer to the consumer. It is an integral part of my argument that production and consumption, being economic processes, fall within the ambit of Guild activities; that, accordingly, the Guild organisation must embrace and provide for every stage of manufacture and distribution from the raw material to the consumer's door; that all these functions must be prescribed in the Guild charters, and that so long as the Guilds act within the spirit and letter of their charters, but subject to developments that involve public policy, the Guilds may pursue their work without State intervention, although, of course, with State representation upon the governing bodies of the Guilds. This representation is based upon the hypothesis that the State is trustee and owner of the material assets. It cannot be too often repeated that the only monopoly possessed by the Guilds is the monopoly of their own labour. Every asset from the machinery to the looking-glass in the typists' room must in principle be vested in the State.

The withdrawal from the State of the economic functions, coupled with the fact that State policy and administration is an affair of citizenship, implies that the State has a non-economic rôle to play, none the less, but rather the more, important because it is almost exclusively concerned with the spirit, with conduct, with the finer shades and attributes of social life. It must, therefore, be guided by the moral and spiritual needs of the community, internally and in its external relations. Thus, education, so far as the humanities are affected, is obviously a vitally important State responsibility. Equally, the public health of the community, both preventive and curative, falls under the jurisdiction of the State. Since law is founded in conduct, in the rights and relations of individuals and groups, each to the other, it follows that law, in inception and application, becomes a State function. Nor can the State, no longer trammelled by economic "pulls," afford to disregard a perverted Press, a potent instrument not only of information, but of education. All these activities may be said to be spiritual, in the true sense of the word; hence my reason for contrasting the spiritual State with the economic formation of the Guilds, culminating in power and authority in the Guild Congress. The logic of this is plainly that Citizenship means the pursuit of the spiritual, whilst Guildsmanship is the application of social principles to the material. The measure of our civilisation will be found in this: that on all the finer issues of life, conduct and faith, the Citizen dominates the heart and the imagination of the Guildsman, subduing his selfish or sectional desires to the enduring truths known only to the spiritually minded. It is my belief that this can only

be attained by an enfranchised democracy. He who becomes a democrat to grasp power is a recreant; the essence of Democracy is that power shall be distributed amongst all men, that they may live richly in the full light of truth, discovery, the arts and graces. In other words, the conquest of Nature by Democracy is a material means to a spiritual end.

The chief administrative arm of the State is the Civil Service, whose business it is to give effect to the mandate of the citizens expressed through Parliament. Associated with the Civil Service, but perhaps motivated differently, are the Medical, Educational and Legal Guilds. These are sometimes described by Guildsmen as the "Spending Guilds." In truth, however, the term is not happy. After all, a doctor, where health is concerned, is a productive agent; a teacher, where education is concerned, is a productive agent. They have each acquired a certain skill for which there is effective demand and of a social value no more easily valued than labour, without its commodity basis. For that matter, the Distributive Guild would be purely a spending Guild. The real distinction between the Civil and Productive Guilds is found in function and in their different relations to the State organisation.

If we keep steadily in view the basic fact of Guild organisation, namely, the monopoly of labour, whether intellectual or manual, it will not be difficult to arrive at an understanding of the rights and driving force of the Civil Guilds. Certain distinctions between these Guilds at once suggest themselves. Thus, the Medical and Legal demand a training not required in the Civil Service proper. Again, the training in the Educational Guild is peculiar to itself. On the other hand, the Civil Service not only demands a long training in social problems, but exercises unique power by reason of its direct attachment to the State. The difficulties and dangers inherent in any bureaucracy, however wisely governed and sympathetically administered, cannot be ignored. This is certain: the Civil Service must take on the colour of the Government, which in its turn depends upon the State, acting through the medium of Parliament. But this said only half is said. If I left it there, there would be an assumption that the Civil Service must be essentially servile in its relations with State and Government. Public policy must be obeyed; that is fundamental to the present or any future Constitution; but the rights and liberties of the Civil Service are not founded in subservience; they can only be finally asserted in function, in the faithful discharge of duties. These functions inhere in the nature and quality of the work assigned, which confers, at one and the same time, responsibility and liberty. The Civil Servant who does his work to the satisfaction of his group or department, who acts in the spirit and letter of his contract with the State, is entitled to the complete rights of citizenship, precisely as though he were a miner or engineer. The day has gone for ever when admission to the Civil Service differentiates the Civil Servant from his fellows, as though he belonged to a privileged corporation, paying for the privilege by the sacrifice of his political rights. The segregation of the Civil Service is a first step to the Pretorian Guards and cannot be tolerated. Democratic safety proscribes privileges, social or financial, to the Civil Servant or to any class. In pay, leave, pension or social consideration, he has no higher claim than his fellow workers.

With certain important reservations to which I shall refer, we may take the recent Report of the Machinery of Government Committee\* as the basis of our approach to the Civil Guilds in general and the Civil Service in particular. The review in this Report of the constitutional position is sound within the limits assigned to it by the terms of reference. But, as I shall show

\* Cd. 9230. Price 6d. This Report was signed December 14, 1918, and issued in January, 1919.

later, it takes no cognisance of the human factor, of the voluntary associations and "Trade Unions within the Civil Service: treats the personnel as pliable tools, ready to respond to any and every behest made either by the State or the hierarchy: is apparently unconscious of any movement or tendency towards democratic control. When we come to consider the claims of the Civil Servants, we shall see how grave an omission this is. Nevertheless, the Committee has proceeded on sound lines. "Upon what principle are the functions of Departments to be determined and allocated?" asks the Committee. They answer: "There appear to be two alternatives, which may be briefly described as distribution according to the persons or classes to be dealt with, and distribution according to the services to be performed. Under the former method, each Minister who presides over a Department would be responsible to Parliament for those activities of the Government which affect the sectional interests of particular classes of persons, and there might be, for example, a Ministry for Paupers, a Ministry for Children, a Ministry for Insured Persons, or a Ministry for the Unemployed. Now the inevitable outcome of this method of organisation is a tendency to Lilliputian administration. It is impossible that the specialised service which each Department has to render to the Community can be of as high a standard when its work is, at the same time, limited to a particular class of persons and extended to every variety of provision for them, as when the Department concentrates itself on the provision of one particular Service only, by whomsoever required, and looks beyond the interests of comparatively small classes. The other method, and the one which we recommend for adoption, is that of defining the field of activity in the case of each Department according to the particular service which it renders to the community as a whole. . . . We think that much would be gained if the distribution of departmental duties were guided by a general principle, and we have come to the conclusion that distribution according to the nature of the service to be rendered to the community as a whole is the principle which is likely to lead to the minimum amount of confusion and overlapping."

I do not know whether the Committee were guided to this conclusion by the writings of Señor de Maeztu. Here, at all events, reached on empirical grounds, is the acceptance of the principle of "the primacy of things," a declaration of the functional principle, a confession of faith in social values having precedence over personal interests. Nor will any Guildsman fail to note that this is the Guild principle that workers of every degree shall subordinate themselves to the primary purpose of the organisation. Concurrently, however, we must consider the human beings who constitute the organisation and prove beyond cavil that liberty, far from being restricted, finds wider scope in a society where duty faithfully done confers life and confers it abundantly.

On the functional principle, we can now see the whole range of activities of the Civil Guilds. The Committee suggests the following:—(i) Finance, (ii) and (iii) National Defence and External Affairs, (iv) Research and Information, (v) Production (including Agriculture, Forestry, Fisheries, Transport and Commerce), (vi) Employment, (vii) Supplies, (viii) Education, (ix) Health, (x) Justice. Much of this, from the Guild standpoint, is transitory. Thus "Production" would be the business of the appropriate Guilds, whilst Employment, on the Guild hypothesis, is a purely Guild affair. The proposed Department of Supplies is the obvious sequel to the Ministry of Munitions. Its purpose, as proposed, is (a) to eliminate competition between Departments for labour, material and services; (b) to ensure that the prices paid and the conditions imposed under Government contracts for various

classes of work should so far as possible be arranged upon uniform lines; and (c) to secure economies in the use of technical staffs, such as contracting, accounting, costing and inspecting sections. Obviously, nine-tenths of the work here adumbrated would be absorbed by the Guilds. So far as "Research and Information" is technical, it would be superfluous under a Guild system; so far as it is social and political, it might prove valuable when we come to consider the Press; so far as its Research is confined to pure science, its value would be incalculable. But that presupposes a close connection with the Universities.

So much for function: the thing to be done is *the thing*; man must do it at his peril; it is imperative. Thus, by the sweat of his brow does man win his bread, and, in consequence, win also the rights, liberties and amenities that accrue in an enfranchised society. We must be careful, however, not to tear function into social fragments; the distribution of personnel is a problem in itself and may be solved irrespective of function. For example, whilst it is obviously sound both in principle and policy to adopt the functional principle, it by no means follows that there must be as many Guilds as there are functions. If we accept the division of functions laid down in this Report, we are not, therefore, compelled to divide the personnel into as many Civil Guilds. There are many functions, some barely related, in the productive Guilds. One engineer may make locomotives, another automatic machines, another motors; yet they all properly belong to the Engineering Guild. In like manner, our Civil Service, by appropriate sub-division, may administer finance, home and foreign affairs, research and information, and, on behalf of the State, have its representatives on the Education, Medical and Legal Guilds, as also on the Productive Guilds. We are accordingly thrown back upon the necessity of definition. What, then, is a Civil Servant? I think he is one employed directly by the State to transact State business. Unless, therefore, he has a special technical affiliation—doctor, teacher, lawyer, civil engineer—and if he is definitely employed by the State, he may be correctly defined as a Civil Servant and be eligible as a Civil Guildsman. The distinction between him and, say, a doctor lies in this: the doctor must pay allegiance to his profession, which, in its turn, negotiates as a unit with the State, whilst the Civil Servant has no such divided allegiance, save in so far as his Guild protects him in the conditions of his employment. The distinction, if subtle, is vital. The Civil Service cannot, in the nature of things, exercise absolute control; the Medical Guild, once organised, can control medical policy and practice within the terms of its charter. The same can also be said of the Education Guild. In the case of the Civil Service, the State adopts it as its daily medium, acting through its departments at first hand; in the case of the professional Civil Guilds, the State defines its policy and terms in their charters. The practical difference would, therefore, seem to be that the charter of the Civil Service Guild, whilst giving protection as to terms of employment, must necessarily ensure pliability of service and provide for unforeseen contingencies; the State must have direct contact with its own executive officers, who, in addition to routine duties, are always faced with the unexpected. On the other hand, the professional Guilds can plot out their work in advance and meet the State, through its Government, in a corporate and not an individual capacity.

We can arrive at no clear understanding of the rights and duties of the Civil Service until we apprehend the rôle of the Treasury in administration. That raises constitutional and practical problems, significant and decisive in the future governance of Great Britain.

S. G. H.

## We Jews.

By A Modern.

1. "THE Jewish character: Energy forms the basis of all. The aims are direct, immediate. Every Jew, including even the most diminutive and insignificant, displays a determined desire to effect his purpose, which latter is always mundane, temporal, momentary" Thus Goethe reflects, and he deals with essentials. But the great thinker was too withdrawn and comfortably disposed to deal with every aspect of the Jewish character. Certainly he has sized up the obvious with precision. But then, what shall we make of the Jewish tragedy? Or is this merely a delusion, or an imposture?

2. But suffering is general, and if we are to consider suffering only, then we must consider tragedy, and not the Jewish tragedy.

3. But the claim of the Jews to a special tragedy of their own is a unique claim, and its justification is deeper even than is claimed. It is their tragedy which gives profundity to their lives; and in their hopes, baffled but eternal, of the re-attainment of their fabled pre-eminence is the sustenance for their broken frames.

4. Israel, magnetised by the visions inspired by the Bible, believing implicitly in its truth, grown absolutist as regards the material facts, is stirred with a longing for a renovation, cannot but be moved to emulation of his past state. Viewing, as he does, the confidence, the indomitable aspirations of his national seers, he cannot credit that he is destined never to regain the pre-eminence the Bible declares he once had. He is resolute in his assertions of his immortality.

5. The most lucid and sincere critics have found it difficult to credit the material truth of the Biblical assertions and proclamations; though, certainly, they have expressed unbounded admiration for the profound poetical truths expressed. Our gratitude is due to Matthew Arnold, that felicitous diviner of the essential, for his apprehension and exposition of that faith in the abiding which characterises the Old Testament religion. Although he kept his distance from rabbinical speculation, he was only too ready to appreciate Hebrew inspiration.

6. The value of their morality was realised with such an intensity by the Hebrew seers that they created an original beauty to express it. Where the poetry of other peoples expresses the limitations of being, poignant grief or defiance, or despair, the Jewish poet begins a new attempt, undismayed. The Indian poet dilates: "Life is tremulous like a water-drop on a lotus-leaf. The company of the good, though but for a moment, is the only boat for crossing this ocean of the world." To take an illustration from Shakespeare—let Falstaff ply his wit as he will, the dominant note in Shakespeare is reached by the expression, "Life is as tedious as a twice-told tale Vexing the dull ear of a drowsy man." But the Jewish seer strikes a new attitude—nay, this is speaking too coarsely—he reaches out further than the courage and strength of other poets will permit; he aspires more confidently.

"The Lord is the stronghold of my life, of whom shall I be afraid."

"Only for God doth my soul wait in stillness,  
From Him cometh my salvation.  
He is my rock and my salvation.  
My high tower, I shall not be greatly moved."

"Strive, O Lord, with them that strive against me,  
Fight against them that fight against me;  
Take hold of shield and buckler  
And rise up to my help."

The Jewish poet puts a certitude into existence which no other knows; he expresses a faith which no other poet feels.

7. Now, if at the present day Israel cannot express the certitude his seers expressed, if he is dispersed among the nations, and his yearning for Zion be an impotent thing, that is a tragedy. Yes, but it is a tragedy which permits re-adjustment when it is fully perceived.

8. That the expression of such certitude was ever a national expression, I find it hard to credit. Was the original history of the Jews, as a series of emancipations, really very different from the history of the comparatively modern movements for emancipation? The prophets and psalmists with their inward communings and wrestlings are they *individuals*, whose story has been magnified into the national story, by that intensity with which the Hebrew people seize on their literature as the Word of God? I imagine the problem of the discovery of God must have been as vexed then as it is to-day.

9. In their wavering we can detect the uneasiness of our ancestors. Occasionally the knee may have been bowed to Baal, occasionally an "Ausgleich" achieved with mundane powers, occasionally other aims were subordinated to immediate practical purposes. Theirs was not entirely the chivalric concentration on an abstract "good" and "evil." They tolerated what appeared inevitable, but they infallibly reverted to their determination that nothing should be an obstacle to the mind.

10. Since human potentiality is vast, it can be expressed only within limits. The limits each sect, each people, places upon itself, unless harmony can be established with the impulses meeting them, leave their marks in suffering, in Tragedy. But the Jew is oblivious of the marks scored on him.

11. For me, the doctrine that man is born to sin, and that the world is a vale of tears, is suggestive of, and is as stimulating as, the painted windows in churches; the doctrine is that of souls as static as the saints and virgins on the glass. The Jewish aspiration towards a splendid future is the aspiration of a more potent people than own such doctrine. The Jew's faith in man's ultimate supremacy over all debasing and humiliating influences is a vindication of man's potentialities.

12. There are two forms of tragedy by which man may be oppressed, the one arising from his disharmony with his material restrictions, the other from his inability to establish the rapport which he seeks with the Eternal. The one, for the Jew, is the lesser tragedy, which he sweeps aside. Thoreau speaks of it: "When, in the progress of a life, a man swerves, though only by an angle infinitely small, from his proper and allotted path (and that is not done unconsciously even at first; in fact, that was his broad and scarlet sin—ah, he knew of it more than he can tell), then the drama of his life turns to tragedy, and makes haste to its fifth act." It is the tragedy of Fate, and Karma. The other—is the Jewish tragedy, which transcends cosmic restrictions, and is precipitated at the silence of the Eternal. "Return, O Lord, how long?"

13. In this resides the essential Jewish tragedy, distinguishing it from the tragedy of common human sufferings. All other tragedy is trivial.

14. The limitation that creates this tragedy is an inhibition affecting an action of the *soul*. The Jew is certainly not inhibited by his intellectual limitations in practical life—he tolerates and they serve him. But in his spiritual outlook he is weighed down by centuries of traditional interpretations.

15. The Jew has a firm grasp of life; it is in the expression of it that he is halting. He is taught by the Bible that Israel shall be a kingdom of priests and a holy nation. "Achad Ha'am," an able spokesman for the Jewish view, in expatiating on the idea of Israel as a nation of priests, says: "The idea of Israel as the Supernation might be expanded and amplified



into a complete system. For the profound tragedy of our spiritual life is perhaps only a result of the failure to justify in practice the potentialities of our election." And he argues that the requisite is "some firm resting-place for the people, in order that it may have the opportunity once more of developing its genius for morality and fulfilling its mission as the Supernation." Here is apparent the Jewish misconception, that their spiritual election can be a material election. It is a misconception which has animated them throughout their history.

16. The average Jew does not realise that a nation of prophets and priests cannot be a nation in the usual sense of the word. Prophets and priests cannot form a nation.

17. This inability to interpret himself impersonally is the inhibition from which the Jew suffers. In the intellectual sphere, where he claims predominance, he is constricted; he is unable to stand aside and watch the evolution of events without his intervention.

18. However, unlike the Hamlet inhibition, this is rather an incentive to action in accordance with the world's views, than a hindrance. But it is not fulfilling the Jewish mission.

19. The decision of spiritual claims is not made in the practical world. Yet Zionists are now attempting to apply the touchstone of the practical to their claims. They should leave that to their enemies.

20. Let the elusive anti-Semite adopt what criterion he will, his standpoint is a material one; he judges the Jew for his material acquisitions, as though these do not appeal to him as well.

21. The anti-Semite explains many evils by postulating the Jew as cause. Says the Chief Rabbi: "Verily it is ample time for all to know that it is not Israel that has exploited the nations; it is the nations who both morally and materially have exploited Israel." But this is another story.

22. Also, this is as it should be. For what more gratifying proof is needed, as Blake has pointed out, of the superiority of the Jews, than the adoption by other peoples of their great propaganda? Perhaps Israel's dispersion was not merely a Divine whim, but a Divine plan. If so, the suffering of the wanderer must be endured.

23. Properly considered, their tragedy is the *raison d'être* of the Jews. Remove that, reduce them to ordinary nationhood, and three-quarters of their pretensions must be dropped. I heard recently one of the Jewish delegates to the Peace Conference declaim pathetically that when he had to go to Paris he was held up for want of a national passport; he, a native of Palestine, while all the representatives of the lesser nations were accommodated. What the Jews desired, he said, was national rights and the prestige of nationality. Well, let them have their passport—but they may have to exchange their superiority for it.

24. We Jews should beware lest too much parading of superiority prevent a proper manifestation of it.

25. I have attended no gathering of Jews for the discussion of Jewish matters at which the superiority of the Jews over all other races was not enunciated by the least as well as by the most educated. This arrogance is all the more remarkable when the status of the speakers is taken into account.

26. Jewish dignity is the dignity of being. All attempts to demolish it are futile.

27. The Jew never entirely subordinates himself to any pursuit. What he engages in, he tries to do thoroughly; but usually he has a margin of energy. He preserves an open mind (or, rather, an attitude uninfluenced by any forces), with regard to the chief goal of man. Although at times this open mind may be narrowed upon impossible hopes or filled with ambitious dreams, the revolution of time tempers the extravagant and impossible conceptions, and what is left, best of all, is the Open Mind.

28. The Jews a Nation: I cannot sympathise with assertions that the first need of the Jews is a national home. The Jews maintain the open mind with regard to everything, and strict nationalism, I am afraid, would put a bound to that.

29. The Jew is the sardonic surveyor of man's uninspired endeavours. Let him set up a nation for himself and his advantage is gone; he has the restrictions of nationality to heed. Only his detachment from nationality can preserve his superiority; when he has its duties to fulfil, he is no longer free to step beyond them.

30. If he wishes to set up a national home, merely for the sake of comfort, and with no pretensions to a nationhood of prophets and priests, well and good. But in that case one of the chief arguments for nationalism is gone.

31. The conception of the Jews as a people, if not as a nation, is an appealing one. A people single in its disregard and contempt for all assertions of finality, superior to all forms and conventions, is, in spite of all calumny, an heroic people.

32. Jews from various countries, though stamped with the national characteristics, featured like the natives, foibled like them, inclined like them, and inducing such antipathies as may be induced by them, are yet exalted by their own high origin. All superficial appearances are of no value in the face of their consciousness of the greatness of Israel.

33. I recently attended the performance of a play in Yiddish, in which the principal figure, personated impressively by Muscovitch, was Elisha ben Evioh, an historic Jewish freethinker of the Roman era. What struck me was that Elisha was made to hold a monthly conversazione at his home, where the élite amongst his friends congregated, and they drank wine and recited poetry. Elisha, the superior man, was repeatedly depicted as about to read aloud from Homer. Luckily for the success of the play, he never actually did so, for it will never do for the superior Jew to read Homer before any audience, least of all an audience of Jews.

34. As of this Elisha, so of many other Jews who have been stirred to reach beyond their race. The complaint is of ancient standing, of the faithlessness of Judah's distinguished sons, who would fain forget their "election" and seek a Nirvana among those who shelter them, thence to beckon their fellows. The complaint is not gently uttered, since the community views their separation with dread of the consequences.

35. Let Elisha ben Evioh stand mephistophically aloof from his fellows; let Jacob Epstein, seeking scope for his imagination, try to enlarge the boundaries of theological freedom, as in the following words he says he wishes:—

"Religion to-day is without symbolism; it is too abstract for the non-philosophic mind of the plain man. Judaism, the most intellectual of all religions, needs a more vivid and impressive representation of its ideals. The average Jew without concrete images has distorted and perverted ideas about the Deity. His anthropomorphism projects a Theus on to Reality from his narrow, low-planed experience, which cannot in any way correspond with the ideas of perfection and goodness. He has to spin like a spider his godly macrocosm out of his mundane microcosm from himself, as it were. A synthetic externality, the work of a sculptor or painter, does not provide him with a reinvigorating stimulus, a revivifying sensation. His worship in time deteriorates into a dull, mechanical, monotonous, lifeless routine. Thus it is that to-day that the synagogue finds itself emptying. The young generation of Jew gets no artistic uplift out of his service. The bare walls are mute with indifference; the prosaic Ark presents no appeal, the unadorned rostrum delivers no message."

Let Dr. Levy seek a new purge for humanity. The penalty for sundering from the race is sure. Yet the strong will embrace the penalty.

36. To Jews, everything may be transient, save the

Jewish consciousness. Hence, compromise with others is an abomination to them, which bears the seed of tragic punishment. In their repudiation of those who desert them, they add their wrath to God's.

37. Is it to be wondered at that those who go forth in bitterness are bitter indeed, while those who go forth gladly are still more irreconcilable? The saying has been recorded of Christ: "O, Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wing, and ye would not."

"Behold, your house is left unto you desolate."

38. The claim to spiritual supremacy in the world is the most ambitious claim yet formulated; but it is justified (though not exactly in the sense claimed) by the workers, artists and thinkers evolved by racial circumstances. If faith can move mountains, then it may also animate and sustain a people through all vicissitudes.

39. The Jew may be imitative and fashionable and follow national customs with great precision. Thus somewhat subordinating his traditions, he ceases somewhat to be a Jew. But he is especially Jewish only when he pierces customs, standing aloof from convention, and marks merely the essential, while smiling at the superfluous. In all great catastrophes the Jew decides.

40. Heine: "I see now that the Greeks were only handsome youths, while the Jews were always men—powerful, indomitable men—who have fought and suffered on every battlefield of human thought."

## Readers and Writers.

SEVERAL of my readers have kindly inquired whether my recurrent absence from this column is likely one day—that is to say, before very long—to be permanent. I sincerely hope that this is not the case; for not even my most indulgent reader is more pleased to discover me here than I am to be here. Readers, I revel in this column of mine. And if it were within my choice to do nothing but this, I should fill not only a page, but several a week. Fortunately, or unfortunately, the choice is not always mine in the matter, any more than it is that of my colleagues. We have to confess our humanity in the first place that disposes us to share most of the ills that are going; and, in the second place, if I may whisper it, there are other people to be considered besides us old 'uns. The purpose of THE NEW AGE is not only to instruct and inspire and amuse and annoy its readers; but it has a duty to writers as well. And I, for my part, gladly stand aside or even lie aside when a more promising performer begins tuning up his noble instrument. Justice to my readers compels me to avow that we old stagers are missed when we fail to appear; but justice to our writers equally compels me to deny that THE NEW AGE is any the worse for our occasional absence. I am exceedingly pleased that this should be the case, for it is a guarantee that THE NEW AGE is an institution and not an accident.

\* \* \*

The number of casualties amongst us is, however, discomposing. I shall not enumerate them all, but I may record here the recent deaths by the prevailing disease of two of our old friends, Mr. Stephen Reynolds and Mr. Gilman, the artist. Mr. Stephen Reynolds was the better known by the fact that his contributions to THE NEW AGE have always been in writing, while of Mr. Gilman it may be said that his personal interest in the paper was his most effective contribution. I knew him well, as I did Mr. Stephen Reynolds; and of both I conceived a high admiration. Mr. Reynolds, much to my regret, abandoned the cultivation of a powerful, simple and common-sense lite-

rary style, for the organisation under Government auspices of the inshore fisheries, thereby, to my mind, devoting to a class what was meant for mankind. No doubt, however, he made the only choice open to his nature; for if it is hard to kick against the pricks it is no less difficult for an artist to decline to follow his strongest bent. The most intimate fact about Mr. Stephen Reynolds is that he loved the inshore fishermen. My meaning is quite literal. And when I used to pray him to resume his writing and to let the fishermen do their own business, his jealousy for his protégés was positively fierce. It is impossible not to regard him as another of the many sacrifices the arts have had to make to economics; not, you understand, to his own economics, but to the needs of a chosen class. Many more such sacrifices will, I fear, have to be made before the economic problem is solved and artists of human sympathy can return with a good conscience to their own calling. What a curse it is that the economics, the gross, material problems, of the world should have been so vilely handled by the merchant caste that every artist and thinker is driven to concern himself with them. Why could not our "captains of industry" have conducted their affairs without distracting attention from the sublime affairs of life? Why was Stephen Reynolds forced to hawk fish? What might he not have made of an English style which he had only begun to master?

\* \* \*

Messrs. Cecil Palmer and Hayward will shortly publish a monograph on another old friend, recently dead, of THE NEW AGE—Mr. Cecil Chesterton, the late editor of the "New Witness." Mr. Cecil Chesterton was one of the earliest writers for THE NEW AGE, and, if I am not mistaken, he was the author of the "Notes of the Week" during the first six months of our existence. He could not have been, twelve years ago, more than about twenty-seven or twenty-eight, yet he wrote with all the mastery of a man of political affairs of fifty. Mr. Cecil Chesterton may be said never to have grown, but to have been born the writer he was. Except in opinion—and very little in that—his writings in the last year of his life were indistinguishable from his writings in the first years I knew him. Their style was uniform. I see that the monograph is to deal with him as editor of the "New Witness," debater, journalist, poet, wit, politician and soldier. This is a little too formal for my liking; and I should prefer that someone should treat of him as a journalist simply. For it was as a journalist—or, let us say, since he would never sell his pen or his opinions—as a publicist, that he best deserves to be publicly remembered.

\* \* \*

It is perhaps fitting that I should have drawn attention to the continuation in the current "Quest" of the Editor, Mr. G. R. S. Mead's articles on "Immortality." Mr. Mead, as my readers know by this time, is not the credulous, anti-psychological, or even idle researcher into the problem of the survival of the human personality after death; but a man and a scholar as difficult to convince as here and there one anywhere, and an indefatigable student to boot. What Mr. Mead has not read in the way of evidence, and what doubts he has not required to be overcome, is scarcely evidence, and are scarcely warrantable doubts. What is his conclusion after thirty or forty years of intellectual resistance to the promptings of all our hearts? It is that "after full reasonable scope has been given to various very necessary secondary or adjunctive hypotheses [such, for example, as telepathy and other possible powers of the incarnate soul] certain factors remain over which are quite inexplicable on any other supposition than that of a surviving personality." I do not say, of course, that Mr. Mead's assurance is complete, or that the evidence he has in mind is conclusive. At the same time, it should be observed that a tentatively affirmative attitude towards the question

is clearly indicated in the mind of one of the most competent persons to speak upon the subject. At the very worst, the gate of immortality is open, and not closed.

\* \* \*

If I were "H. M. T." I should amuse myself by writing a sketch to illustrate the difficulties encountered by a discarnate personality in establishing to us mortals the fact of its existence. Despite our hopes that survival may prove to be a fact in nature, there are, as Mr. Mead observes, "many repressed complexes at work" in us "which unconsciously influence our judgment." In no problem is the "personal equation" more important. Thus it comes about that at the same time that we wish to believe we take such precautions against belief in survival as would create scepticism concerning any other matter subjected to the same resistance. Survival, almost alone among the phenomena of personality, is subjected to such an examination as would do credit to the devil of Negation himself. Nay (to be a little rhetorical), it is usually the people who will swallow anything as evidence upon other matters who demand most peremptorily the evidence of evidence upon the matter of survival. Circumspice. To return to "H. M. T.'s" omitted subject, how, for instance, would our hypothesised discarnate personality evade the Morton's fork opposed by strict materialist logic to its demonstration? Consciousness, it is told, is *invariably* accompanied by metabolism. No metabolism, no consciousness. Being, however, without a metabolism (*ex hypothesi*), our forlorn soul is driven to such expression in the metabolism of some still incarnate personality, whereupon it is met with the argument that such metabolisms are no evidence, since they may belong, not to an independent and discarnate personality, but to the personality whose physical body is in use. How shall our soul escape the fate of non-existence between these two perilous prongs? If direct communication is barred by the one, and indirect communication is denied by the other, the delivery of our poor soul's message will be even more uncertain than the service of our earthly posts in war-time. "H. M. T.'s" "ghost" would needs retire sceptical, if not of itself, of the existence of intelligence in our incarnate world.

R. H. C.

## Music.

By William Atheling.

THE main new point I had to make in connection with ROSING'S performance on February 8 was the impersonation by voice. Gestures, acting with the arms, legs, etc., are no concern of the music critic. They may be superfluties, additions, or camouflage, but this variation in the character of the supposed singer is part of the art of singing. One sings instead of playing a flute, oboe, recorder, or trombone, because the voice is capable of various modulations and variations, consonantal and vowel changes, etc., not possible on the most sensitive brass or wood-wind.

The Gretchianinow "My Beloved Country" was clearly produced. It is very "Russian" in its draw and quick beat, and the accompaniment is of interest. The folk songs collected by Philipoff and harmonised by Korsakoff are excellent; the Kalinnikoff "Ancient Mound" was suave and finely shaped to its conclusion; Bleichmann good, Dorgominsky of less interest. Moussorgsky's "Steppe" mounts out of whatever company it is sung in; the "Orphan" is on the dangerous borders of uncontrol, and a song almost impossible to sing without spoiling. It was not spoiled. Rosing was at his best in Hopak and in the encore "Hoi my Dneipr," and gave the "Goat" better than any time previously. The Glinka "Joys of Journey" is a three ring circus tour de force, perpetuum mobile

virtuosity; the singer retired apparently to ingurgitate a little realism before the final Drinking Song from Igor.

I regret that I was prevented from attending: the Rosing performance, Feb. 22; the PHILHARMONIC STRING QUARTETTE's first performance of Stravinsky's Three Pieces for String Quartette, Feb. 13 (next performance March 27); ANNE THURSFIELD's song recital, Feb. 21; and TINAYRE's recital of new French songs, Feb. 19—all of which promised considerable interest.

LAMOND'S BEETHOVEN (Wigmore; Feb. 10). By way of preface and apology I would point out that the second row of the stalls, whence one views the instrument's underside at an upward angle of 60 degrees to treble and 30 degrees to bass, is *not* the most advantageous position from which to judge a master pianist's larger structural treatment. Certain unifications and certain constructive qualities which I noted at Lamond's former recital were certainly present in his Beethoven, but less audible to me; still, ardent students who bring scores to the concert and turn pages of same (audibly) might, when finding themselves so under the scenes, turn their attention to other technical details of execution with quite as much profit as is to be had from ferreting in the "text." The piano is an instrument played with both hands and feet, and Lamond's pedalling in the opening Fantasie and later was worth the professional pupil's close attention.

(I write this, of course, out of malice, as I cannot read a score fast enough to follow the player and annoy my fellow-auditors simultaneously.)

To hear Beethoven played by Lamond is to hear Beethoven under test conditions. The programme contained (I do not say consisted of) three sonatas. He was playing the Appassionata as an encore when I was dragged off to an appointment. The C minor, Op. 111, has a fine later manner romantic movement opening. The construction is questionable, and there are trivial repetitions in the Allegro con brio. Lamond displayed brilliance and mastery in his graduation of the high trills.

The Sonata in E flat, Op. 31, No. 3, is early, and full of classic remains. It is a tenable opinion, and a perfectly proper opinion, that all that is good in Beethoven is classic remains. One is dealing with a great musician, one should not be too flippant in anathema. Lamond is a fine player, and Beethoven has an eminently fair chance against the most carping critic when Lamond presents him. Whatever was wrong was Beethoven and not Lamond. The Scherzo was given with rich 'cello tones. The Menuetto was exquisite, and the best part of the afternoon, until the encore Appassionata; but does the Menuetto movement in this sonata hold its own against the fine work of Beethoven's predecessors? Did the thickening and making heavier of music by Beethoven compensate for the loss of the earlier finesse and precision? The hearer must decide for himself. There is no papacy and no Mr. Leo Ward in this department.

The presto con fuoco is full of senseless repetitions, and Lamond was very clever in playing the Ruins of Athens variations immediately after the Sonata, as its opening rather supplies or suggests what the fourth movement of the sonata might have, or ought to have, been. This statement is probably an exaggeration, but in criticising the arts one must sometimes make an overstatement in order to express or suggest anything at all.

The Rondo, Op. 51, No. 2, has an exquisite opening, and is not over important.

Any real criticism of a player of Lamond's magnitude would have to consist in purely technical marks bar by bar. He showed maestria in performing the Waldstein, notably in the softs after fortissimos, crafty diminuendos, sweeps into the final conclusion. I don't know that one can say more. Here is the thing done as it should be. Beethoven is Lamond's composer;

every man has a right to his own gods. Another careful auditor leaves the hall saying, "Beethoven makes Chopin seem rather inadequate"; which is to me like saying that St. Paul's makes Santa Maria Miracoli seem inadequate. I can think of things in Chopin that no other composer could have written so poignantly; I can think of no single quality of music in which some other composer is not more intense than Beethoven. These are matters of personal predilection.

FERNANDE KAUFFERATH, the Belgian 'Cellist (Wigmore, February 11), opened with firm, sure tone, not very large, but seeming to carry to the back of the hall; on moving forward one found that there was a whole range of subtle effects too faint to be perceptible to the whole audience. The piano was not always quick enough in effacing itself, but Mme. Kaufferath is the ideal 'cellist for a small hall or for those in the front seats. She has a firm tempo, all sorts of precision and discreet fingering; she is more than a fine musician. I dislike the metaphysical term "soul," and "temperament" is too often used to describe musicians who neglect their notes in careless and unlaudable raptures. The Bruxelloise is the meditative type of musician, thinking apparently more of the music than of the audience. This is a fault in the right direction. She has what, in the coldest terms possible, we must call emotional grip and vividness of an unusual sort, and a musical comprehension both firm and delicate. There was no nonsense, no sentimentality. The Faure was exquisitely done, the Bach and Lalo were equal to it; the Davidoff not good enough for its company; the greatest resonance attained in the Boellmann, with fine extase in conclusion. An unusually sensitive musician and worth hearing . . . only this question of "big tone." . . .

Rosing's next recital Moussorgsky, Æolian, March 8, at 3.

Kennedy Fraser concerts, Æolian, March 4, at 8; and (assisted by Rosing) March 15, at 3.

## Recent Verse.

L. A. COMPTON-RICKETT. *The Divine Drama and Poems.* (Kegan Paul. 3s. 6d. net.)

Interest is the price heaven must pay for earthly attention; and Mr. Compton-Rickett is not able to pay it. His pitch is very high; in fact, it is above space and time; and most of his divine characters have an allegorical significance which is not uninteresting to the mere student of theosophy; the level of his poetry, too—or, rather, of his verse—is elevated and sustained. But what matters it all, unless the interest is kept and our poor human attention mastered? Mr. Compton-Rickett either flatters or ignores us in assuming our sustained attention over so long a "divine drama." He has not fully understood the nature of the brute with which he is dealing. Otherwise, he would have realised that nothing is more difficult or demands more resourcefulness on the part of the poet than the creation of a verse-drama upon an exalted theme that can be so much as once read. After only a few pages of the "Divine Drama," the remark is provoked that it is a grown-up children's pantomime; after a few more, that when the gods get together they appear to have a dull time. Since to make virtue attractive is the office of the high didactic poet, we can only conclude that Mr. Compton-Rickett has so far failed.

Turning to the "Poems" mentioned in the title, we feel ourselves to be more at home. Here, for the most part, is nothing but prose, prose occasionally walking, that is to say, pedestrian prose, and prose sometimes trotting, or, at most, cantering; but always prose. Here, for example, is prose pedestrian:—

The April morning trees sag leaflessly  
Beneath a petulance of gust and gleams;  
Slow from her flowery toilet April streams,

Grieved that her boisterous brother March should die,  
And yet about the bosom of each sigh  
Is where all wild and tender fragrance teems,  
Dropped from the heaped-up sweetness of her sky—  
The far-off music in a face of dreams.

Despite the imagery, the passage has not a wing lifted in it. And here is prose trotting to a measure of which Mr. Compton-Rickett is too fond. It occurs in, at least, four of the poems.

Come to a land in the sunshine beholden  
Blissfully robed by the blue-flowing sea;  
Life, the all-giver, and Morning the golden,  
Blow on the breath of a wind that is free;  
Lightly they blow upon leaf-dipping laughter,  
Gustily frolic and dimple the dale,  
Puff at the vessel and following after  
Make for the seaman a prosperous gale.

Any writer as good as our author could continue like that ad infinitum; but he would travel alone. In the foregoing passage the predominant vowels are the long "o," and the long "i." This is interesting, for Mr. Compton-Rickett in a later poem recalls the fact that, as a child, he was fond of repeating the phrase: "O olden Time! O olden Time!" The sound association has probably some affinity with the author's psychic rhythm; and it is a fact that the combination is very frequently in his verse. What does it mean, this preference for certain vowel sounds? Answer: nobody knows—as yet! The "Forward bound" is a long narrative poem which is open to the objection brought against the "Drama": it fails to keep our interest. It contains good passages; in fact, we can say that the parts are as good as the whole is not. Here is an average specimen:—

He with staring eyes  
And blowing wreaths of briny hair relaxed  
His vigil at the tiller, for the Sun  
Blazed and dissolved itself in liquid light,  
Dancing the eyes asleep upon the wave;  
And boisterous darkness leaping from his brain,  
Calm came and hid him from the uncalm sea.

It is impossible to get excited by such writing; and perhaps the explanation of Mr. Compton-Rickett's defects may be deduced from his verses of welcome to Mrs. Besant. Mrs. Besant is a wonderful woman, but she is neither a Sibyl nor a Muse. She will never inspire Mr. Compton-Rickett to fly.

CHARLES GRANVILLE. *Poems of Nature and War.* (Dryden Publishing Co.)

Mr. Granville's war-songs are poor, though obviously sincere and personal. They are pathetic rather than poetic, and would induce tears rather than the contemplative reverie proper to poetry. On the other hand, his poems of Nature have usually a poetic impulse, which, however, seldom carries the poet beyond an opening phrase or two. Let us consider a few examples. The first poem, "A June Morning" will serve as one.

As the night my sleep be measured—  
That the dew-starred morn  
May find me wide-eyed walking  
In ways forlorn.

So far, so pretty good; but now see how it continues.

Of man, where all Spring's promise  
Fulfilment shows.

The word "forlorn" expresses regret; but does the absence of men on a dew-starred morn move Mr. Granville to regret? And "promise" and "fulfilment" are too banal altogether. The third verse of the same poem opens beautifully:

All in the pearly morning  
I will make haste.

But then instantly the inspiration drops and we are down to

To gem my soul's drab garments. . . .

Here is another example.

When dark falls,  
And great Orion a mailed arm outreaches  
For his celestial lanthorn, the ghostly moon.

Followed by this :

Wherewith his course to lighten  
Along the infinite obscure steeps. . . .

Surely that is a drop with a thud to the commonplace. Mr. Granville, you will see, is like an aviator of ten years ago, he can get off the ground, but he cannot keep off the ground very long; and the reason is that he will not wait after the first inspiration for a second and a third, but must needs fill up with poor invention. We cannot easily forgive him the non-fulfilment of his many promises. A passage from "To the Future Generation," written "lest they forget what we have gone through," illustrates the same carelessness :

and long sought  
Peace hovers on outstretched wings  
Protectingly as birds in May  
Over their broods, with whisperings  
Of joys to be.

The image thus conceived was worth perfecting; but it contains, as written, a great deal of rubble. "Protectingly," for instance, is quite superfluous. It is implied already in the hovering of outstretched wings. "Whispering" is not *the* word, it is only a substitute for the right word; and "joys to be" is a general phrase which should have been a picturesque particular. Of the many little poems contained in the volume the same may be said: they all need working upon to be made as good as they ought to be. Here is one—the second verse of which is mixed.

You in the dark of death  
Quietly sleeping;  
I in my shuttered room  
Silently weeping.

Quickens your being in God—  
You unawaking—  
Or does my heart alone  
Live on—and breaking?

And here is another.

Ripe were the hazel nuts  
That dropped upon my spade;  
The wood was gay in death  
With hues that autumn made.

And now the winter bleak;  
Snow upon trench and mound;  
Yet souls of dead men blow  
Like spring flowers all around.

The first two lines of the first and the second two of the second verse are all that there is of the poetic in the poem. STEPHEN MAGUIRE.

## LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

### THE TASK OF RECONSTRUCTION.

Sir,—It seems to me strange that, in spite of the present industrial situation, no one has yet recalled to the memory of the nation that the defeat of Germany was to be followed by a new world, based presumably on different principles to the old.

And yet officers like myself, now once more civilians, find ourselves being forced into a false position of antagonism with those men whom we had the privilege to lead into battle. Regretfully we see that the leaders in politics and industry have nothing to propose as a remedy for the present discontent, except an attempt to graft new branches on to a dead tree.

For such, I suggest, is our present economic system. When Capital and Labour are blaming each other, is it not possible that the fault may lie with neither, and that it is ingrained in a system of which both are victims?

To point to only one weakness in it. Although the most modern machinery is fool-proof, our economic

machinery is far from being even moderately rascal-proof. The case for Capital is prejudiced by owners, who treat their workmen as slaves; the case for Labour is prejudiced by workmen who demand high wages, but try to do as little work as possible in return. The conscientious and sincere members of both classes, and the community, suffer in consequence. Cannot this be changed?

There are those calling themselves National Guildsmen who profess to have a plan—perhaps it is a bad plan, but at least it represents an attempt to dig at the roots of the problem, instead of scratching on the surface, which only seems to result in fresh difficulties.

That we have been, and still are, the victims of an economic system we have inherited, is surely not too terrible a thought to face? Clever men are needed from any and every class to devise a new system, and the manner in which it can replace the present one with the least friction.

There is no question of Revolution, or Bolshevism—only of Re-organisation. A giant task? Yes, but we have been at last forced back upon bedrock in the social, no less than in the international, field, as Mr. Benjamin Kidd foretold.

We have to choose between the ethics of the individual, or class, efficient in its own interest, and the ethics of Renunciation, of the self-sacrifice and subordination of the individual and the class to the Ideal—between the Darwinian theory and the Gospel of Christ.

Unless these years in which we have shared with our men many hardships, and disappointments, and triumphs, are to go for nothing, there can be only one answer.

AN EX-SUBALTERN.

\* \* \*

### PEACE AND FIRST PRINCIPLES.

Sir,—In the notes on "Foreign Affairs," published in your issue of November 7 last, I find it observed that "in these formative days it is first principles that are all-important." Never was a more opportune statement made. There is the Peace Conference sitting, and the history of the future is being shaped at it. To be reminded of the importance of first principles now is to be reminded of no mean thing. The principles on which the world's politics have been so far based have not brought us near the millennium. These principles are, as we know, the principles of competition between nation and nation, class and class, sex and sex, or "free trade," as the expression goes. By "free" is evidently meant "regardless of the rights and the interests of others." This is the cult of individualism, national individualism, class individualism, and sex individualism, so many manifestations of the same cult. But it is individualism all the same. This individualism, or mutual competitiveness between unit and unit in society, is certainly not a constructive force. It is clearly a destructive one. It cannot breed mutual confidence. It cannot conduce to love. Any peace edifice built on such a foundation cannot last. The faulty foundation has to be dug out and wholly removed, and a new one laid in its place. And that new one is the implanting in men's minds of the consciousness that each nation, weak or strong, ignorant or enlightened, has a right to its own land and to its own home market, and that within each nation, weak or strong, the several component classes have an equal right to live through mutual exchange of their respective products. The fact has also to be remembered that, corresponding to the two large divisions of human kind, man and woman, there are also two vast divisions of service, family service and social service, and that it is only by entrusting one of the two to man and the other to woman that the organisation of humanity on stable lines will be possible. The saddling of woman with social duties is as hostile to the best interests of mankind as the entrusting of family duties to man. Each is a vast field, is as honourable as the other, and requires the full-time labours of one entire sex. It is the misuse of mutual relationship in the commerce of nations that is the ultimate cause of all modern wars. It is its right use extending down to the commerce of the home that offers the only cure.

I have read with great interest "A. E. R.'s" article, "Women in Parliament," in the same issue of THE NEW AGE. His objection is only to particular social duties being taken up by woman, such as membership of the highest sovereign body of the Empire. On any lesser



councils, "A. E. R." would have no objection to women being invited or encouraged to sit. This does not, however, seem to be a scientific or a consistent position to take. If the scientific principle of division of labour is to be applied to the sexes, it cannot permit man or woman to trespass on each other's province. Woman may be trained, and be of great value, to assist man in his social duty. But woman undertaking duties other than those of the family and the home, independently and without reference to man and to the necessary neglect of the family, is a violation of sociological principle, and cannot lead to orderly life either of family or home. For if the sexes in a family cannot agree to restrict themselves to separate fields and live as one in a bond of service to each other and of common service to the universe at large, how can nations be expected to confine themselves to their respective territorial limits and live in reciprocal service and without mutual aggression as one great organism of humanity? Sex is nature's distinction, and the distinction is not without purpose. And the sacred marriage-contract between the sexes, with the responsibility for each of the two great functions, family and social, solely and solemnly undertaken by each sex, is the heaven-ordained union of one to the other. If the sex relationships are wrong, the entire superstructure of society can be no less so. From part to whole, i.e., family to nation and from nation to mankind, must order proceed in logical sequence, though, of course, it is equally true that disorder above must mean disorder below, disorder in the nation producing disorder in the family, and disorder among nations meaning disorder between classes in a nation.

Travancore.

N. SUBRAMANVA AIYAR.

\* \* \*

#### PRODUCTION.

Sir,—Your writer of "Notes of the Week" says in your issue of December 26, "Productivity is increasing by leaps and bounds beyond the capacity of the world's consumption to absorb." Doubtless your writer means manufacturing processes when he uses the term "productivity." So many people, however, are under the delusion that agricultural productivity is rapidly increasing that I beg to put before them the bald historic facts. The simple truth is that about four times as much can now be produced from an acre as could be produced six hundred years ago, and the production has hardly increased at all since the eighteenth century.

No man has written so exhaustively on the history of agriculture as Thorold Rogers. On page 476 of "Six Centuries of Work and Wages" he says, "The average produce of the fourteenth century in prosperous years, and when low prices prevailed, was under 11 bushels of all kinds of grain." The average crop of wheat, barley, and oats in England and Scotland to-day is about 35 bushels an acre.

On the same page Thorold Rogers tells us that good land well manured would produce "from 40 to 48 bushels of different kinds of corn" in the eighteenth century. In the twentieth century it will do exceedingly little better.

Even to-day such figures can only be got by applying scientific methods. In Western Canada an acre of wheat does well if it produces 20 bushels: the average from year to year is more like 15. Even this is only possible where the land has not been exhausted by cropping. A good farmer told me the other day that North Dakota is only producing about 7 bushels to the acre: that is to say, it is behind the fourteenth century.

It is worth remembering that all raw materials of an animal and vegetable character are governed by the same natural laws as food products. Cotton, flax, jute, wool, indigo, and so on are agricultural products; and the amount of any of these which can be produced from an acre has been practically stationary for generations.

There is no more poisonous delusion than the popular belief that science is making it possible to increase the essential things of life in constantly increasing quantities. No mediæval superstition of magic or witchcraft was more devoid of any foundation. R. B. KERR.

#### RE-INCARNATION.

Sir,—The byways of THE NEW AGE are littered with the remains of those who have ventured to disagree with "A. E. R.," and I, protesting at his maltreatment of the theory of re-incarnation, only escaped with my life because, I fear, I was deemed unworthy of the coup de grâce. And thus, according to the ethics of martyrdom, it is plainly my duty to raise my voice again.

"A. E. R." suggested that I accused him of "not knowing what he was talking about," but I quite definitely accused him of practising the "gentle art of misrepresenting the issue." And to verify the accusation it is only necessary to compare the actual meaning of the term "re-incarnation" with the articles "A. E. R." has written on the subject. Moreover, "A. E. R." demanded proof that the soul existed as a function (without structure) on the ground that such proof was necessary before he could consider the subject of psychic phenomena at all. Yet, when discussing "Man and the Machine," he wrote that the "real difficulty in dealing with a man derives from the fact that he is something more than his functions, something more than the sum of his functions." And, therefore, one must deduce that "A. E. R." merely because he disliked the theory of re-incarnation, was inviting advocates to waste their time attempting to prove that the soul was a function without structure when it was unnecessary to prove—to "A. E. R.," at least—that the soul was a function at all.

The admission that "A. E. R." holds man to be "something more than his functions" is not easy to reconcile with his emphatic declarations of disbelief in life after death, in the soul, and in re-incarnation, and it becomes difficult to argue on these terms.

However, as far as I know, "A. E. R." has not announced that he does not believe in God—indeed, there are indications that he regards the Most High with tolerance—and therefore I must suppose we are on common ground for a moment. There is no God but God.

And I believe, with "A. E. R.," in the forgiveness of "sins"—with the exception of the sin of not doing the best one can. For the rest, it seems that there can be no sins in God's sight, for He must know all, and therefore, to Him, justice and forgiveness must be synonymous.

But here our ways seem to part, for "A. E. R." conceives God to be capable of plucking up struggling, hoping humans and casting them away, like vegetables, to expire on a dustheap, and I am convinced that the Lord Almighty is above such unhandsome behaviour.

"A. E. R." says that he has no need of an after-life, and is, in fact, agreeable to dying at any minute. So am not I. I should be much grieved and annoyed if I thought I should die yet, and I doubt if threescore years and ten will take the edge off my appetite for life. I do not fear Death—dying is the unpleasant part, and that we must suffer, whether we are on the road to immortality or to oblivion—but I, most emphatically, do not wish to be extinguished. I want to continue in the train of the Sun-born virgins questing for Truth. I desire to serve my generation, and, in spite of its immeasurable remoteness, I want to attain perfection. And to annihilate me at this callow stage would be criminal. And what of our friends who have died in Flanders fields? If death is the end for them, then God is not, and we of high spirit should have committed hari-kari over their graves, reviling an unclement universe which could generate such virtue only to deny it achievement.

I am prepared to believe that some human beings are ready for annihilation, or, rather, for some utterly impersonal state of being, but in return I expect my own point of view to be treated justly.

"A. E. R." says that belief in an after-life indicates failure at adaptation to environment, and he also throws out dark hints about Professor Jung's opinion on believers in "sich."

But, on these terms, the great majority of humans past and present have not become adapted to their environment, and, if annihilation is one of the laws of the universe, a prodigal waste of various kinds of effort on humanity's part and a waste of energy and material on the part of the universe has been going on since man appeared in the world. And what "A. E. R." says of the government of England applies to the government

of the universe—"One that provokes the question, 'Cui bono?' fails in its first duty."

Not one-hundredth part of the faculties the individual acquires at the cost of infinite toil and pains is communicated to the race, and, if he perishes at death, then his efforts have been in vain.

What is there in mortal life that can be looked upon as lasting? Races and families dwindle away. Our life-work only endures until the day after to-morrow, and is then derided and torn down by the hungry generations that trample over our dust.

But if we are loyalists, we must believe in the innate justice of the laws of the universe. We must believe that all promise shall be completely fulfilled, that our highest hopes shall be satisfied, that all the riddles shall be solved, that, seeking perfection, we shall reach it, that with our last breath as individuals we shall glorify God's justice.

Now, the majority of us at least die protesting at death, refusing death, triumphing over death, and therefore we have foundation for believing we shall not be denied an after-life.

And since our unwillingness to relinquish our individuality proves we are not fit to lose it, there is reason for believing we retain it until we can relinquish it consciously and willingly.

And, logically, the best reason for believing in re-incarnation is that we are not fit for anything else.

Doubtless, "A. E. R." will shrug his shoulders and make a fresh demand for "facts" and definitions. But can "A. E. R." prove that the mass is of more importance than the individual? That the human race in the aggregate is progressing at a satisfactory speed in a visible direction? That we are more intelligent, more full of loving-kindness, less cruel, less bloody-minded, than the ancient civilisations? Are the arts generally better understood and better treated? Are we really less callous to mental and spiritual and physical pain? And, chiefest of all inquiries, does belief in an after-life make a man a more complete and useful being? I deny it.

"Rest, rest! Have I not all eternity to rest in?" "The night cometh when no man may work!" should be the rallying cries of mortals convinced that they have but a few years in which to develop themselves to completeness; they should be known among men by their agent of high seriousness and inexorable purpose. People who believe they have all eternity before them are justified, to some extent, for a spendthrift attitude toward time, but for apathy in unbelievers there can be no excuse.

I deny, however, that unbelievers show more energy than believers. There are isolated cases of zeal in both extremes, but among unbelievers "A. E. R.'s" attitude is very prevalent—that life is "really very interesting if one does not take it too seriously"—and, I am pleased to think, this attitude quite disposes of the idea that unbelievers are better adapted to their environment than believers.

"A. E. R." is always full of surprises. At the close of his recent series of articles he made several impassioned appeals for recognition of life as the "Everlasting Here and Now," and indicated his belief that human beings had powers which, if cultivated, would enable them to perform miracles, to move mountains, to renew life within themselves. In fact, "A. E. R." generally set forth that it was our bounden duty to set up as magicians. I'll not say "Nay," but it is bewildering to find "A. E. R." finishing up by remarking, with an air of complacency, that he is "no magician."

No. But he ought to be.

And, in conclusion, what would "A. E. R." consider to be proof of re-incarnation? And what, exactly, does he mean by "travelling clairvoyance"? M. F. M.

\* \* \*  
"WOLF! WOLF!"

Sir,—For a contrite member of that order of humanity in quasi-dissolution known as the capitalist class there is bewilderment in prospect if, groping towards enlightenment, he seeks direction from those by whom he and his are shortly to be excommunicated. To bewilderment will be added a sense of disillusion. Imagining the prospect entirely different to reality, he will expect to get something ponderable if indigestible in

exchange for what he has absurdly regarded as his birthright. Instead, he will get the sum of his own impressions and a portentous bundle of irreconcilable theories which will stimulate and perhaps exhaust his cerebral capacity, but which will not kindle faith.

He has, of course, bowed to the verdict of newly made history, has also, one hopes, purged himself of his vicarious iniquities, and is eager to lift his eyes to the Ark of the Covenant. But he encounters no one who can tell him where it is, or, rather, he is given so many different and contrary itineraries for reaching it that he has no idea which to choose.

The neophyte must put up with the results of his past indifference to and ignorance of conditions precedent to revolutionary processes, under stress of which forms of doctrine diverge, develop, and converge again in obedience to events. But, for the moment, he stands, a rather pathetic object, like a dog which watches sheep running after each other and has no humour to bark at or herd them because he smells wolves in the distance.

It is a hard case for the dog, but I am wondering whether it won't be as bad for the sheep. S. S.

[The bearing of our correspondent's observation is a little uncertain. What are the "wolves" the good capitalist dog smells, and whose menace to the "sheep" he apprehends—of course, on their behalf no less than upon his own? And what has become of his function as "dog" since he is now driven to seek direction from the distracted sheep? With all respect, we venture to say that the dog's day is over when he can no longer bark for fear of the approach of "wolves."—Ed. N.A.]

\* \* \*  
SUBSTANCE AND NAME.

Sir,—Mr. Philip T. Kenway's letter in your issue of February 20 is an interesting example of a national characteristic. He considers the controversy between Mr. Cole and "S. G. H." "barren." Evidently Mr. Kenway is indifferent to idea, to personality, and to psychology. The difference in point of view between Mr. Cole and "S. G. H." is as vital as that between Hervé and Jaurès. Just the difference between life and death. I only hope that "S. G. H." will not pay that or any other penalty for the sincerity of his convictions. S. H.

\* \* \*  
THE ART THEATRE.

Sir,—With reference to the attempt to define "Art" in the article on the Art Theatre in your last issue, surely "Art" is the formation of symbols which may convey emotion, or cause emotion, to the spectator. When the emotion felt is approximately the same as that which is intended to be felt, the "Art" is good in proportion to the number and exactitude of the auditors who "appreciate" the work of Art. I fail to see where "creation" comes in. Surely "Art" is only reproduction, or imitation of emotion, and one cannot "create" emotion any more than one can create Energy. There is only one emotion. W. K. SCUDAMORE.

\* \* \*  
ART NOTES.

Sir,—In your notice of the Lithographic Exhibition at Heal's, your contributor "wonders how many of these people really cut their stones, and how many simply send drawings to a workman." Really, your contributor should apply more frequently to his art advisers, not only for æsthetic clichés, but for a few technical hints on various processes; otherwise he will be wondering at the next etching exhibition whether artists cast their own copper plates or send them to a foundry; but perhaps his art advisers are not quite so strong in their knowledge of craftsmanship, processes, etc., as in their Slade scholarships? My advice, as an artist, to Mr. Dias is not to rush in where other critics fear to tread, and to leave processes alone.

This sort of bluff may impress little coteries of "Intellectuals" and art circle parasites, who, no doubt, are as ignorant as himself; but, really, it is time that your critic should know that your paper is read by members of the public and by "men of some cultivation," who, unlike your critic, would instantly know whether a lithograph was worked direct on the stone or merely transferred from a drawing on paper, and the difference in the methods employed between wood-cutting and lithography. C. R. W. NEVINSON.

## Pastiche.

### THE DEAD MEN'S WATCH

(Over the Peace Conference in Paris).

In the white and delicate city, where pleasure mates  
with art,  
There are ghosts walking, and they are sick at heart.

And there are those walking that drowned in the deep  
seas,  
With the sands in their thick hair and the weeds about  
their knees.

And there are those walking that never will be found  
By the bird in the air or the worm under the ground.

Thunder clamoured and flame flew, and where God's  
creature went  
There rose but a little smoke from the grey earth foully  
rent.

And they that are not, in their thin and piteous hosts  
Walk the streets by daylight, the grey, unheeded ghosts.

And fear is in their faces and horror in their eyes—  
For he that dies in vain, a double death he dies.

And they whisper one to another, and they murmur  
their dull pleas :

"What if the peace of the old men should be a toothed  
peace?"

"What if the peace of the old men be made with tooth  
and claw,  
By the strong according to his strength, as in the  
crimson law?"

"Brother, we gave our only life the crimson law to kill,  
And spilled the iron chalice out upon the tortured hill.

"Go, sink upon his shoulder, and whisper at his ear,  
And knock at the heart of each old man, that he may  
wake and hear :

"And glide into his secret sleep and dog his feet by  
day,  
For we have died to make the peace the old men live  
to slay.

"Scavenger birds have watched for us upon the desert  
plains,  
Our bones are bleached in endless snows and washed  
with mountain rains.

"And we have laid ourselves to sleep in lands we never  
knew,  
Where strangers' feet go over us and red siroccos blew.

"But we said to one another, deep in our dreaming  
hearts :  
We die to make an end that men may barter death in  
marts.

"That never again a rich man batten upon his scarlet  
gold—  
Nor the cold silks of his women run blood from every  
fold.

"Our sons ploughing the broken fields where we have  
moaned and lain,  
Shall never hear the rattling drum summoning up the  
slain—

"Summoning up the living men with the seal upon their  
brows,  
And Death behind the trumpeter, beckoning from his  
house.

"Choked with high words and wrapped in hate and  
weaponed with a lie,  
So we went forth in all the years, helpless to live or die.

"But now they make a peace for us, that the world  
may have rest,  
And the sun storming up the east and shattering down  
the west,

"Shall rise upon a newer world that has forgot to kill :  
For this we fought and died, my brother—who remem-  
bers still ?

"But now the old men make the peace, busy, with  
crafty eyes,  
They carry stones for the temple and build in cunning  
wise :

"And fear is in our hollow eyes, and fear eats at the  
heart,  
And plucked us out of our cool graves and thrust us  
in the mart.

"And we must walk the city streets and watch, early  
and late,  
Lest that the peace the old men make should be a peace  
of hate."

ETHEL TALBOT SCHEFFAUER.

## PRESS CUTTINGS.

Even assuming (and I for one strongly dispute it) that the fear of capitalist domination is justified, will the alternative proposals of the Syndicalists and Guild Socialists who denounce wage slavery provide a practicable solution? The Guild Socialists propose to divide the industries of the country into a number of watertight compartments, each of which will be run on democratic lines by the workers themselves, whilst they will all be co-ordinated by means of the Guild Congress. There would thus be a number of individual States with wide and independent powers, but federated for common purposes. The members of each guild would be paid—not wages—but a share of the joint product of their labour. The essential feature of the scheme (for I must not weary you with details) is that each industry will be a monopoly controlled by the workers themselves. True, the Guild Socialist differs from the Syndicalist in proposing joint committees of consumers' guilds and workers' guilds; of Guild Congress men and members of Parliament, but, failing agreement, the power of ultimate decision is always to rest with the guilds—the right to strike is to be their inviolable prerogative. Should we not, then, under the guild system merely have changed King Log for King Stork? Would the community be any better off under the régime of such a monopoly than it is at present? The competition between one manufacturer and another and between Labour and Capital at least has this advantage that the consumer reaps the benefit of the lowest possible prices. Competition is the very life-blood of the modern industrial system, and, although its absurdities doubtless require trimming, it cannot be wholly eliminated without disastrous results. To substitute for it a series of democratic monopolies is to court certain destruction. For it will be the workers themselves who determine the hours of work, the types of goods to be manufactured, the price to be paid. Better surely a balance of power between labour and capital even, as at present, than the domination of one or other. If the worker is right in his dread of the domination of the capitalist, the community is surely equally justified in hesitating to submit itself to the tender mercies of a number of democratic industrial monopolies.

Thus the attempt to abolish the wage system by the methods of Syndicalism or Guild Socialism fails to safeguard the interests of the community as a whole, because it implies that each industry will be run in the interests of the workers and not of the community.—MR. W. I. HICHENS at the Society of Arts, February 26.