NOTES OF THE WEEK.

Since the present phase of the Miners’ strikes is probably over and done with, there is no need to recount the details either of its causes or of the settlement that has been provisionally reached. The epitaph of the whole incident—for it proves to have been no more than an incident—has been written by the “Times”: “It is certainly painful to have to say that the fault is one of a highly sensational character; but it inspires the “Times.” However that may be, the “Times” may have for avowing the painful truth about the Government, we can but dimly guess. It is possible, indeed, that there was no motive in the case save the motive of public judgment which occasionally inspires the “Times.” However that may be, the truth is what the “Times” has written; and we would commend it to the attention of the partisan writers of the “Spectator” and of those journals that appear to be paid never to admit that the men may be right or wrong. A million tons of coal lost—and more to follow by reason of the flooding of the pits—people’s minds disturbed and their passions of prejudice aroused—threatenings of a highly sensational character concerning the train service, the lighting of our towns, and the heating of our houses—all that, on account of a fault exclusively that of the Government. There is no wonder that the “Times” asks whether a Government (or the so-called State—the State consisting only of the people who exercise its functions) that can commit a blunder of this magnitude is fit to be entrusted with the actual management of a great industry like mining. Power enough it certainly has, since even such a blunder as the present is beyond the reach of punishment; but it is not for the lack of power that the present control of the mines is distasteful to the miners, but for the lack of responsible power; and it is precisely this that appears to be an aggravated defect in the case of the State. State-power without even private responsibility is capable of tyranny as well as of blunders. We extract from the incident another warning against the commission of the mining industry to the care of the State.

It is assumed, however, that the Miners are so set upon Nationalisation that Nationalisation they intend to have at whatever cost; and since, at whatever cost also, the majority of the governing classes, and, we may add, the majority of the general public, are equally set upon opposing Nationalisation, the conclusion is drawn that a “clash” is inevitable; in other words, that society is to be the victim of an active class-war with all its possible and probable consequences. The “Times,” for instance, states as if it were an axiom that “the miners have made up their minds that their industry must be transferred to the State”; and in the House of Lords on Monday Lord Buckmaster complained that the Government in bringing in the Ways and Communications Bill were giving away an “outpost” in the inevitable war between private and national ownership of industry. Surely this language is a little familiar. We have heard before, though never from Lord Buckmaster, of the inevitability of war. Wars that can be foreseen, however, are not inevitable, since they are the work of man; and, in the instance of the alleged inevitable war between private and State ownership and control, the inevitability is all the less from the fact that it is not State ownership, but State ownership that the Miners, for example, have set their minds on, but certain aims and objects which they have been led to imagine (partly by their own advocates and partly under the stimulus of the private owners) can only be obtained by means of State ownership. It is absurd to say that the miners, any more than anybody else, are in love with State ownership, and bureaucratic management, for its own sake; and, in consequence, that their minds are set upon Nationalisation; and, in the absence of any better means of replacing the present system and of improving upon it, they are prepared, so we gather, to make a fight for it and to employ to this end both their political and their industrial powers. But in the event (not impossible) that a better alternative...
than Nationalisation can be discovered—an alternative satisfying the claims which the present system has failed to satisfy—the Miners, we are sure, are not so set upon Nationalisation that they would pursue it for its own sake; nor are they so Marxian in temper that the satisfaction of their own claims would lose its savour if, in the alternative system, both the public and the private interests were also satisfied.

It is necessary, however, to be clear upon the conditions which an acceptable alternative to Nationalisation must fulfil. We will suppose, for the moment, that it is possible to reconcile under a new scheme the interests of the consumer with the just or, at any rate, the legal interests of the present proprietary—but it is still not possible, even if it were desirable, to do this at the expense of the producer, namely, of the Miner himself. The Miners' claims, though they are in the abstract only equal claims, are, in point of time, prior claims, and must be satisfied as a first condition of the practicability of any alternative to Nationalisation. What, however, are these claims whose satisfaction is to precede while still providing for the satisfaction of the associated claims? They are not so very terrible, after all; for the Miners are not ogres of gluttony, possessed with the will to dominate coal and to roast society on it! Their claims, in fact, are perfectly human, and the perfectly social, of men who desire to act responsibly in a responsible society, and to share both in the direction of their industry and in its social benefits. Translating these general phrases into particular demands, we may say that the Miners desire to cease to be commodities in industry, that is to say, nothing but wage-slaves; they desire a share in the control, and a conditionally increasing share in the control, of the industry in which they are engaged; they seek security not merely for the continuance of their bare wages, but for part and lot in the social betterment of their one of the means; and, finally, they desire that their industry shall be of public or social, even more, or rather, much more, than of private value. If the phrase meant anything at all to other than students of these things, we should say, in a word, that what the Miners are seeking is the creation of a National Guild. The question we must, therefore, put to the opponents of Nationalisation is this: Agreeing with them (as we do) that Nationalisation is not a better alternative to the existing system—what system can be devised that shall be at once not Nationalisation, and an alternative system which promises, at least, to satisfy the claims we have mentioned? For ourselves, we know that such a system can not only be devised, but has been devised; it is contrary to sense that just claims cannot somehow or other be reconciled. In the meantime, however, the onus of producing such a synthesis is plainly upon the opponents of Nationalisation; for otherwise, it must be said, the demand of the Miners for Nationalisation must be conceded by default.

Nationalisation, however, is not now likely to be adopted voluntarily by the Government; and if it comes to the "clash" anticipated by Lord Buckmaster and others, we offer it as our opinion that the Miners will lose in that event as well. Insufficient force is at their disposal to compel the State, backed not only by the private interests, but by the public at large, to adopt a system for which nobody has much taste. Moreover, if we are to believe the rumour first recorded by the "Daily Herald" and afterwards endorsed by the "Times"—now appears that the Government has decided upon its alternative to Nationalisation, and that it has chosen for a basis the Report of Sir Arthur Duckham of the recent Royal Commission. This is undoubtedly, whatever else it may be, a matter for grave anxiety to be, in the first place, for if it has hitherto been the case that the Miners' demand for Nationalisation has been mainly justified by the absence of any constructive counter-alternative to the present condemned system, the adoption by the Government of Sir Arthur Duckham's Report nullifies the Miners' present advantage even if it does not place the moral advantage on the other side. There is clearly no other Richard in the field besides Nationalisation, and it is with this system that the Miners' opponents of Nationalisation must henceforward reckon. What, then, is the gist of Sir Arthur Duckham's Report?

We are glad to see that the "Daily Herald," while declaring hostility to Sir Arthur Duckham's scheme as a whole, admits that it "might in detail be a good one." The admission is necessary; for, indeed, there are several provisions made in Sir Arthur Duckham's Report and Recommendations which are essential, first or last, to any practicable scheme. Among other recommendations, for example, Sir Arthur Duckham names the following: the acquisition by the State (or the future Coal Controllership) of the existing mineral or royalty rights, which have hitherto been the source of many inconveniences and losses to the industry; the grouping of the Miners in their natural geographical areas, under what may be called the regional control of existing companies; the amalgamation of the existing companies for this purpose; the introduction of a standard costing system of production, with provision for full publicity; and, in consequence, a measure of public control of prices. These, we may say, are recommendations the advantages of which are obvious; and they are certainly designed to ensure a part, at any rate, of the public demand for efficiency of production as well as the greater part of the demands of the Miners.

But the question cannot be evaded whether, apart from recommendations of this kind, however valuable they may be in themselves, Sir Arthur Duckham's Report contains the basis, or even so much as the beginnings of a basis, for the satisfaction of the Miners' demands. We must repeat that the origin of all the trouble in the coal-fields is not to be found in the dissatisfaction of the public at large, and still less, in the dissatisfaction of the existing proprietors with the existing system; and it is therefore not to the satisfaction of these two parties, we believe, that we can look for a complete solution of the difficulty. It is the Miners whose just grievances and determined efforts have brought about the downfall of the existing system; and it is, in consequence, to the satisfaction of their demands, first and foremost, that both the public and the existing proprietors must look. A Report, or a scheme based on it, that proposes merely to satisfy the demands of the public and of the proprietary without a more or less serious attempt at the satisfaction of the demands of the real authors of the agitation is not likely, in the end, to satisfy anybody; for the same power that has destroyed the old system, because it has failed to satisfy them, can equally well destroy its substitute for the same reason.

The provision made in Sir Arthur Duckham's Report for admitting the Miners to a share in the control of the industry must be pronounced to be, on the surface, very plausible indeed; and we shall do well, in view of the propaganda that will be made of them, not to under-rate the appeal even to the undeveloped sense of justice both of the public and of a section of the miners themselves. In each of the geological coal-areas, where a single amalgamated company is to be formed of the existing companies, a directorate of not fewer than seven directors is to be formed, of whom two are to be directly elected by the Miners, one by the management, and only the rest by the present ordinary shareholders. This directorate of seven, of whom two are the direct representatives of the men, is further to be supplemented in the direction of coal-fields is not to be found in the dissatisfaction of the public at large, and still less, in the dissatisfaction of the existing proprietary with the existing system; and it is, in consequence, to the satisfaction of their demands, first and foremost, that both the public and the existing proprietary must look. A Report, or a scheme based on it, that proposes merely to satisfy the demands of the public and of the proprietary without a more or less serious attempt at the satisfaction of the demands of the real authors of the agitation is not likely, in the end, to satisfy anybody; for the same power that has destroyed the old system, because it has failed to satisfy them, can equally well destroy its substitute for the same reason.

The provision made in Sir Arthur Duckham's Report for admitting the Miners to a share in the control of the industry must be pronounced to be, on the surface, very plausible indeed; and we shall do well, in view of the propaganda that will be made of them, not to under-rate the appeal even to the undeveloped sense of justice both of the public and of a section of the miners themselves. In each of the geological coal-areas, where a single amalgamated company is to be formed of the existing companies, a directorate of not fewer than seven directors is to be formed, of whom two are to be directly elected by the Miners, one by the management, and only the rest by the present ordinary shareholders. This directorate of seven, of whom two are the direct representatives of the men, is further to be supplemented in the direction of coal-fields is not to be found in the dissatisfaction of the public at large, and still less, in the dissatisfaction of the existing proprietary with the existing system; and it is, in consequence, to the satisfaction of their demands, first and foremost, that both the public and the existing proprietary must look. A Report, or a scheme based on it, that proposes merely to satisfy the demands of the public and of the proprietary without a more or less serious attempt at the satisfaction of the demands of the real authors of the agitation is not likely, in the end, to satisfy anybody; for the same power that has destroyed the old system, because it has failed to satisfy them, can equally well destroy its substitute for the same reason.
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the pit-manager; and this Pit Committee is to have
care of the detailed management of the mine in so far
as this does not trench upon the manager's legal re-
sponsibilities on the one side, and on the general ques-
tion of wages, on the other side. Pit-administration
as distinct from pit-government is thus, we may say,
to be democratic in character, while, at the same time,
the inclusion of a couple of the men's representatives
on the governing Board of Directors would appear to
be giving to the men a reasonable share in the supreme
control. But, on the face of it, as we say, the conces-
sions to the principle of joint-control as demanded by
the Miners appear to be considerable. Two seats on the
supreme authority and a fairly complete control of the
pit-conditions—these appear, at the first blush, to be
as much as the Miners have ever asked for as a begin-
ning of industrial democracy. What, then, is wanting
in the recommendations to enable them to become the
basis of a workable scheme.

The reply is that everything, in fact, is wanting.
Under the colour and cover of a reasonable approxima-
tion to the demands of the workers for a share in
control, not only is no share in real control being allowed
to them, but what nominal control is allowed to
them is fixed at a maximum which there is no prospect of
ever exceeding. Real control excluded, even the
nominal control provided for in the Report is stereo-
typed for all time. Let us consider, for example, the
most striking and plausible of the arrangements sug-
gested, namely, the inclusion of two workers' repre-
sentatives on the Board of Directors; and let us ask, in
the first place, what is the status of these directors in
comparison with the status of the remaining share-
holders' directors; and, in the second place, what is
the nature of the ultimate sanction for any authority they
may be called upon to exercise. The answers to both
questions are unmistakably plain. The status of the
workers' representatives on the Board of Directors is
that of wage-slaves simply; wage-slaves, it is true,
with a right of perpetual presence at directorial meet-
ings; a perpetual delegation of wage-slaves, that is to
say; but wage-slaves nevertheless. And the sanction
for their authority—in other words, their power upon
occasion to enforce or re-inforce their opinion—is no
more and no less than our old friend, the right to
strike. We are familiar enough with the disabilities
imposed on representatives of an inferior franchise
when engaged in discussion, apparently upon equal
terms, with representatives of the superior franchise.
In a final vote upon policy, the inferior representatives,
whatever their numbers, must give way to the opinion
of the representatives of the superior interests. Eco-
nomic power precedes and determines the value of the
voting-power. And since, in the case under considera-
tion, the votes of the workers' representatives stand, in
the last resort, only for Wages, whereas the votes of
the rest of the directors stand for the economically
superior elements of Rent, Interest, and Profits; and
the since, again, the ultimate sanction of the workers'
representatives is only that of the strike, while the ulti-
mate sanction of the shareholders' directors is that of
the forces of the Crown—the disparity of authority
must be such as to annihilate the character of the
terms of reference. Our two workers' representatives
on the Board of Directors will be, in other words, spokes-
men only of the wage-earners concerned; in no
sense co-equal with the representatives of the Capital
interests; and, in character and wages for the good beha-
vour of the men they represent.

As if this disparity of status were not enough to
damn the scheme in the eyes of economic democracy.
The provision is implicit that this arrangement is to be
final, and to last for all time. The living essence of
democracy, namely, the right and the opportunity to
grow, is carefully excluded if not by name, at least in
fact. The two workers' representatives on a Board
of Seven directors are limited, in the first instance, to
two in number; but they appear likewise to be limited
in number to two for ever. The ratio of value now at-
tached to Property, on the one hand, and to Labour
on the other, is, in other words, to remain the same to
infinity. Always there is to be a recognised and an
insurmountable superiority of the claims of Capital
to control over the claims of Labour; and in the propor-
tion of two to seven which the Report lays down as the
fair apportionment of control between Labour and
Capital, we are to see the everlasting character of the
wage-system in relation to Capitalism. It is clear, we
hope, from this brief analysis in which must consist
both the plausibility and the danger of Sir Arthur Duck-
ham's scheme. Its plausibility lies in the fact that it
appears to provide for a measure of joint control, even
to the extent of admitting representatives of the
workers to the supreme Board of the Directorate. This
bait must be attractive to such of the Miners' leaders
as can imagine themselves to be in power merely when
they are in the presence of power. Its danger lies in
its plausibility, of course; and, on the other hand, in
the fact that the franchise of the workmen is limited
to the inferior franchise of Wages in relation to Capital,
that the scheme presupposes and assumes the continu-
inuation of this relationship, and that, if adopted, it
would tend to stereotype the wage-system and so perpetu-
ate the fundamental injustice of Capitalism in general.

We have already said, however, that it will not do
to under-rate the importance of the adoption of the
scheme by the Government—if, that is to say, the
Government are correctly reported as being about to
adopt it. It is within the discretion of the Govern-
ment to adopt any of the Reports, and not necessarily
the Majority or even the Chairman's Report, of a Royal
Commission appointed by itself; and the presumption
upon which the Miners have hitherto proceeded that,
in fact, they have a right to the adoption of the National-
ising scheme, was, on the face of it, a reasonable approxi-
mation to the demands of the workers for a share in
control; not only is no share in real control being allowed
from the beginning, the comparative merits of the scheme
adopted by the Government, and the alternative
scheme favoured by themselves; or, in the alternative,
to bring forward an entirely new scheme designed at
once to satisfy their own claims and the claims other-
wise enforced or provided for in the Duckham scheme.
Next once again we ask whether such a constructive alter-
native, that is to say, both to Nationalisation
and to the Duckham scheme—isa under the con-
sideration of the Miners. We once again ask whether
they are prepared to consider such a scheme if it is
laid before them. We have pointed out in previous
issues the serious, indeed, the fatal, defects of the
Nationalisation demanded by the Miners. Without any
question whatever, the Nationalisation of their demand
would have the contrary effects of all that they antici-
pat.e from it. Besides altering the balance of the public and ruin-
ing still further the present administration of their
industry, the Miners would find themselves, under Na-
tionalisation, the harassed slaves of an incompetent but
active bureaucracy. We have also pointed out, in
the preceding paragraphs, the serious and the no less
fatal defects of the Duckham scheme. They are such
as to cast a favourable light even upon Nationalisation
itself. But there is a third alternative which, we be-
lieve, would not only 'work' if it were adopted, but
work to the satisfaction of the just claims of all three
parties, the consumers, the existing proprietary, and,
last but foremost, the Miners themselves. The only
question that remains is whether it is too late to get a
hearing for it.
My purpose in this long series of articles has been to present the case against the project of dismembering the Turkish Empire, not from the point of view of the Turks, but from the point of view of England at the Peace settlement. I have tried, by pointing out the very wide divergence of our wartime propaganda from the facts of history, to warn my country that the said propaganda is no firm ground on which to base a policy. The massacres, of which we hear so much, were not on one side only, and the blame for them cannot be laid on one side only. Neither the Muslims nor the Christians of the Turkish Empire are the real criminals, since the state of feeling which produced those tragic events had been deliberately worked up by agents of the Czarist government. I have tried to give my readers some idea of the importance of the preservation of the Turkish Empire to the welfare of the British Empire in the East. A friendly policy towards Turkey secured to us in days gone by the friendship of the whole Islamic world. Our late alliance with the Czarist government broke that friendship, and seriously shook the loyalty of our own Muslim subjects—a loyalty which was the best foundation of our Eastern Empire, the only one of which a democrat would have any hope, on principle, of an unheard-of tyranny throughout the British Empire in the East as the natural consequence of that alliance. The Muslims made uneasy by alarm for Turkey and for Persia, and eager to make protests, had to be suppressed.

Islam, being a complete system of society as well as of religious belief, requires an independent state for its development on modern lines. The process had begun in Turkey, and with a fair measure of success, despite initial blunders, which were quickly rectified. Progressive Muslims everywhere had formed high hopes of it. They see, in the soul treatment Turkey has received, and the threat of her destruction by the Christian Powers, not only the extinction of the last great Muslim Power, but also the collapse of a great civilising movement. The scheme of modern education upon Muslim lines, radiating from a university at El Medina (The City of the Prophet), and many other projects full of hope for the Islamic world have fallen with the fall of Turkey, and are now at England's mercy. The destruction or division of the remnant of the Muslim Empire can never be forgotten or forgiven in the East.

I have pointed out that there was, in England's treatment of the Turks in the six years which preceded the great war, an element of what most Englishmen would call foul play, which is not less a slur upon the name of England because most Englishmen were unaware of it; for, as the Allied Delegates in Paris so justly observed in their reply to the Turkish delegation, every nation is judged largely by the conduct of its Government.

I have touched on the nefarious attempt, in certain quarters, to give to the Czarist government the life and liberties of Eastern States a tinge of medieval Christianity. The origin of that attempt is the origin of our whole Czarist policy, in my opinion. It is the custom of the Labour Party at the present moment to ascribe the Czarist tendency in British politics to the Tories and their love of autocratic methods. It seems to me quite clear that it originated in the desire of some ecclesiastically-minded Englishmen to bring about a "reunion of Christendom." For the sake of that apocalyptic vision, the said Englishmen were ready to sacrifice the work for human progress, liberty and toleration which was our chief claim to renown. Avid of dogmas, not of works, they saw no good in any system which was not saturated with ecclesiasticism. People who had never been baptised possessed no human rights, in their opinion; and the presence of non-Chris-
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CHAPTER X.

In considering the inadequacy of a mere extension of manufacturing production unaccompanied by a modification of the distributing system, it was seen that in any manufacturing process there enters into the cost and re-appears in the price, a charge for certain items which are really rendered useless, but which form a step towards the final product. These items may be conveniently grouped under the heading of semi-manufactures when considered in relation to a more complex product, and in many cases they may in themselves, for other purposes, represent a final product. For instance, electric power, if used for lighting, is a final product, and ministers directly to a human need, but the same energy, if used to drive a cotton mill, is in the sense in which the term is here used, a semi-manufacture.

Now, it should be obvious that a semi-manufacture in this sense is of no use to a consumer—if it is used as an ultimate product it ceases to come under the heading of a semi-manufacture.

A semi-manufacture must be an asset to be counted into an estimate of the potential capability to produce ultimate products (which is the whole object of manufacture from a human point of view), and with certain reservations represents an increase of credit-capital but not of wealth. This conception is of the most fundamental importance.

If we concede its validity a transfer of value in respect of semi-manufactures as between one undertaking and another is measured by a transfer of real credit, and like a financial credit transfer is most suitably dealt with through the agency of a clearing-house.

Let us imagine such a clearing-house to exist and endeavour to analyse its operations in respect to Messrs. Jones and Company who tan leather, Messrs. Brown and Company who make boots, and Messrs. Robinson who sell them, and let us imagine that all these undertakings run on the basis of a commission or profit on all labour and salary costs, an arrangement which is, however, quite immaterial to the main issue.

Messrs. Jones receive raw hides of the datum value of £100 which require semi-manufactures value £500 to turn out as leather, together with the expenditure of £500 in wages and salaries. Messrs. Jones order the hides and the semi-manufactures by the usual method from any source which seems to them desirable, and on receipt of the hides, turn these into the Clearing House, which issues a cheque in favour of Messrs. Jones for the total amount £1,000; by means of which Messrs. Jones deal with their accounts for supplies.

The Clearing House writes up its capital account by this sum, and by all sums issued by it. The out-of-pocket cost to Messrs. Jones of their finished product is, therefore, £500. Let us allow them 10 per cent. profit on this, and the cost, plus profit, at the factory under these conditions is £550, and a sum of £600 is owing to the Clearing House.

Messrs. Brown who require these hides for boot-making, order them from Messrs. Jones, and other supplies from elsewhere amounting to £500, and similarly transact Messrs. Jones' invoices (which include the sum paid by the Clearing House) with the rest to the Clearing House, which issues a cheque for £1,650 to Messrs. Brown, who pay Messrs. Jones; who, in turn, retain £550 and pay back £600 to the Clearing House. Messrs. Jones are now disposed of. They have made their own arrangement in respect of the hides, leather, etc., and have made a profit of 10 per cent. on the cost of this labour.

Messrs. Brown now make the leather into boots, expending a further £500 in salaries and wages, and making 10 per cent. profit on this. They receive an order from Messrs. Robinson for these boots: for Messrs. Robinson's own out-of-pocket cost, with their commission, is £300 paid by a cheque from the Clearing House for £2,400 + £600, £2,000 of which goes to Messrs. Brown, who pay off their debt of £1,550 and retain the remainder.

Now let us note that the purchasing power released externally in these transactions is that represented by wages, salaries and a commission on them, and that no goods have been yet released to consumers against this purchasing power. These sums thus distributed will be largely expended by the recipients in various forms of consumption, and it is only their joint surplus which will assist in providing an effective demand for Messrs. Robinson's stock. The price of this stock then requires adjustment.

Let us now introduce into the transactions a document we may call a retail clearing invoice, which might form in its description of the goods a duplicate of that document, etc., and have made a profit of 10 per cent. on the cost of this labour.

Messrs. Brown now make the leather into boots, expending a further £500 in salaries and wages, and making 10 per cent. profit on this. They receive an order from Messrs. Robinson for these boots: for Messrs. Robinson's own out-of-pocket cost, with their commission, is £300 paid by a cheque from the Clearing House for £2,400 + £600, £2,000 of which goes to Messrs. Brown, who pay off their debt of £1,550 and retain the remainder.

Now let us note that the purchasing power released externally in these transactions is that represented by wages, salaries and a commission on them, and that no goods have been yet released to consumers against this purchasing power. These sums thus distributed will be largely expended by the recipients in various forms of consumption, and it is only their joint surplus which will assist in providing an effective demand for Messrs. Robinson's stock. The price of this stock then requires adjustment.

Let us now introduce into the transactions a document we may call a retail clearing invoice, which might form in its description of the goods a duplicate of the invoice, etc., and have made a profit of 10 per cent. on the cost of this labour.

Messrs. Brown now make the leather into boots, expending a further £500 in salaries and wages, and making 10 per cent. profit on this. They receive an order from Messrs. Robinson for these boots: for Messrs. Robinson's own out-of-pocket cost, with their commission, is £300 paid by a cheque from the Clearing House for £2,400 + £600, £2,000 of which goes to Messrs. Brown, who pay off their debt of £1,550 and retain the remainder.

Now let us note that the purchasing power released externally in these transactions is that represented by wages, salaries and a commission on them, and that no goods have been yet released to consumers against this purchasing power. These sums thus distributed will be largely expended by the recipients in various forms of consumption, and it is only their joint surplus which will assist in providing an effective demand for Messrs. Robinson's stock. The price of this stock then requires adjustment.

Let us now introduce into the transactions a document we may call a retail clearing invoice, which might form in its description of the goods a duplicate of the invoice, etc., and have made a profit of 10 per cent. on the cost of this labour.

Messrs. Brown now make the leather into boots, expending a further £500 in salaries and wages, and making 10 per cent. profit on this. They receive an order from Messrs. Robinson for these boots: for Messrs. Robinson's own out-of-pocket cost, with their commission, is £300 paid by a cheque from the Clearing House for £2,400 + £600, £2,000 of which goes to Messrs. Brown, who pay off their debt of £1,550 and retain the remainder.

Now let us note that the purchasing power released externally in these transactions is that represented by wages, salaries and a commission on them, and that no goods have been yet released to consumers against this purchasing power. These sums thus distributed will be largely expended by the recipients in various forms of consumption, and it is only their joint surplus which will assist in providing an effective demand for Messrs. Robinson's stock. The price of this stock then requires adjustment.
ally sent them (out of which they paid Messrs. Brown) recovering the remaining 40 per cent. from the actual purchasers of the boots, and reimbursing the Clearing House; whereas the capital balancing Messrs. Robinson's account would write down their own credits by that amount. This would leave the credit-capital of the community—that is to say, the financial estimate of potential capacity to deliver goods—written up by 60 per cent. of £35,500, which is an accounting reflection of the actual situation.

From this point of view, all semi-manufactures become simply a form of tool power, and are subject to the same treatment as manufacturing plant; they are a form of capital assets to be depreciated as written down from time to time. There is absolutely no difference in principle between the treatment in this manner of a tool which wears out in five years' time and a unit of energy which is dissipated in a few minutes in driving the tool.

We arrive, then, at a conception of credit employment, by which all semi-manufacturers are treated as additions to the community capital account; subject to writing down as they are actually consumed as ultimate products. In order to be effective the writing down must take the form of a cancellation of credit-capital, a process which is done quite simply and automatically by the appearance on the account of the retail buying invoices in the manner roughly outlined, or by any other device which is based on the dynamic conception of industry.

Exactly the same treatment is applicable to the installation of fresh tools, buildings, etc., although for convenience, no doubt, separate accounts for such assets would be desirable, since the writing down would be done at somewhat longer intervals.

We have now clearly arrived at a point where there is a direct relation between effective demand and prices, as distinct from the relation between costs and prices. Let us now imagine a single adjustable tax applied to all production, of such magnitude as to bring prices from those fixed by the foregoing method to the suitable international exchange level. In existing circumstances, without affecting present prices, such a tax would pay the interest on the war loan many times over. Let such a tax be applied to this purpose, the War Loan being distributed in the manner described and possibly increased by additions from Clearing House transfers. It is clear that a rise in external prices would be met by an increased distribution, while a greater internal efficiency would have a similar result. Such an arrangement would make it possible to effect, in fact, would certainly induce, a transition from a purely competitive world system to one exhibiting in concrete form the demand for co-operation without regimentation, which, beyond all question, underlies the so-called proletarian revolt.

It may, perhaps, at this juncture, be desirable to emphasise the obvious, to the extent of pointing out that no financial system by itself affects concrete facts; that the object of measures of the character indicated is the provision of the right incentive to effort and the necessity of

A Guildsman's Interpretation of History.

By Arthur J. Penty.

XV.—THE FRENCH REVOLUTION (concluded).

It was not a return to the old régime but the rise to power of the revolution profiteers, the nouveaux riches recruited from the bourgeoisie and the peasantry who had acquired the property of which the nobles and clergy had been despoiled, and who now wanted to be confirmed in the possession of their riches. This confirmation the Directory readily gave. Indeed, there was little else to be done, for it was fear alone that if the old régime returned to power they might have to return these lands that had allowed the Jacobins to be supported while they were hated. Moreover, the Jacobins had themselves sold the large estates of the nobles and clergy to the profiteers when they were in need of money. The revolution, in fact, had built up new vested interests and its ends, so far as the great mass of its supporters were concerned having been attained, confidence was restored and trade revived. Power passed out of the hands of the nobility into the hands of the bourgeoisie because the revolutionaries attacked property and ignored currency.

Though the Directory left France to make its own economic readjustment, it was quite as ruthless as the Convention in its efforts to preserve the Republic, for it had to struggle against a succession of conspiracies against its power. Recognising that a revival of Catholicism was taking place, the Directors imagined that the priests were conspiring against them and deported in one year nearly fifteen hundred of them under conditions which gave them little chance of survival. When the Directors feeling that things could not go on any longer themselves sought a dictator who was at the same time capable of restoring order and protecting them. This is the explanation of the coup d'etat which placed Napoleon in power. It was arranged by the Directors themselves as the only escape from an impossible situation.

It is a mistake to suppose that Napoleon overthrew the Revolution. On the contrary, he ratified and consolidated it. As early as 1795, at the end of the Convention, the idea had been canvassed of restoring the monarchy, but Louis XVIII having been tactless enough to declare that he would restore the ancien régime in its entirety, return all property to its original owners and punish the men of the Revolution, put an end to all discussion. Indeed, the Royalists must have been impossible people. Even Le Bon says: "The Royalists gave proof during the whole of the Revolution of an incapacity and narrowness of mind which justified most of the measures taken against them."

The Monarchy being impossible it was necessary to find a general. Only one existed whose name carried weight—Bonaparte. The campaign of Italy had made him famous. He had been repeatedly pressed by the most influential and enlightened generals to place himself at the head of the Republic, but he refused to act upon
their advice. He saw very clearly the difficulties which would beset him if he acted prematurely. He saw that the task of rebuilding France was impossible unless he were in a position to exercise absolute power in order that measures might be carried through with the greatest possible speed, which, of course, was impossible if every measure had to be preceded by a long discussion in the Assemblies. He saw, moreover, that he must be beyond the reach of parties, and so he preferred to wait until the Directorate itself should seek his assistance. Conscious of the fact that his ideas upon the art of governing differed fundamentally from theirs, he refused to have anything to do with the government of France until they were willing to allow him to govern in his own way, and has sufficiently insight to see that a time was bound to come when conditions would have reached such a pass that they would be willing to grant him his terms.

Napoleon reserved to himself the right of initiating all laws, and he restricted the duties of the Assemblies to confirming or rejecting them. Yet while he insisted upon having the last word in the framing of all new laws, he always conferred with the two other Consuls with whom he was associated before proceeding, even with the most trivial measures. He chose his agents of government indifferently from the Royalists, Girondins, or Jacobins, having only to their capacities. But although in his Council he sought the assistance of eminent jurists, he appears to have been always up against them, for he is reported to have said that any measure which is promoted for the public good is sure to meet with the opposition of lawyers. This fact is not surprising when we remember that lawyers are trained in the tenets of Roman Law which is individualistic in intention while measures for the public good are necessarily communal in aim.

I said that Napoleon ratified and consolidated the Revolution. His authority speedily put an end to the Parisian insurrections and attempts at monarchical restoration and restored moral unity where there had only been division and hatred, and he provided work for the unemployed in building, the construction of military roads, and in minor ways, such as giving large orders for furniture to the Tailleurs. He was wise enough to see that no restoration of the ancien régime was possible, and so made no such foolish attempt, for he saw that order could only be restored on the assumption that those in possession of the land were confirmed in their ownership. With the law passed by the Convention enacting that all estates should be divided up into such small pieces that they could not interfere, nor with many other useful measures which had been enacted during the Revolution, such as the establishment of the metric system and the creation of important colleges. Indeed, all through the Revolution, much useful work of this kind was done by technical committees, in which the majority of the members of the Assemblies took refuge in order to escape from the political conflicts which threatened their lives.

The only statesman in history whose work may be compared with Napoleon is Augustus, since he undertook the task of reorganising the Roman Empire after the Civil Wars as Napoleon did France after the Revolution. They both had recourse to similar methods of government. Both sought a solution in the organisation of a highly centralised bureaucracy. Though we have no record of Augustus, we must recognize that when the traditions of a country have been destroyed there is no other way of delivering it from anarchy, and the popularity of the Napoleonic régime is a sure witness that though it was despotic it could not have been, so intolerable as that which the people had endured during the Revolution.

The French Revolution does not appear to me to be a thing to be defended or denounced, but to be studied, for it is a rich field for the study of economics and psychology. We should aim at understanding it in order that we may profit by its mistakes. The conviction of the Revolution were due to the fact that it attempted an impossible task. The revolutionists thought society could be reconstructed anew on a purely theoretical foundation, not understanding that the basis of every social order is to be found in certain conditions, and that it is only possible to reshape it within certain definite limits, for society can only exist by imposing certain restraints, laws, manners, and customs to constitute a check upon the natural instincts of barbarism which never entirely disappear. The Revolutionary gospel of nature, by reminding these restraints, without which no society can exist, transformed a political society into a barbarian horde, for misled by Rousseau they did not understand that the aim of civilisation was to escape from nature and not to return to it. Hence it was that while the Revolution had its moral sanction in the demand for the redress of certain definite social grievances, the feeling of unrest was exploited by idealists and theorists in an attempt to realise an unrealisable thing. Among other things, the events of the Revolution give the lie to what might be called the spontaneous creation theory of democracy—the idea that the will of the people is omnipotent and final—for democracy cannot spontaneously create itself. Democracy will arrive when it knows how to choose the right ideas and not a day before, for there is a law of gravitation in human affairs which is as constant as the law of gravitation in the physical universe, and which all who aspire to govern society must obey. It was because the Revolutionists did not understand this that the Revolution ended by establishing not the sovereign people, but a bureaucratic despotism.

It is remarkable how slow mankind is to learn by experience. A crisis has overtaken the modern world which has many parallels with the crisis which overtook France before the Revolution, and yet with the experience of the French Revolution to guide us, there is little or no attempt to learn the lessons which it has to teach. On the one hand we have a governing class, crying peace, peace, when there is no peace, as jealous of maintaining their privileges as the French nobility, and as unwilling as them to meet the need of additional taxation and equally blind to the inevitable consequences of their short-sightedness. On the other hand, just as in France there was a movement of peasants grouping its way back to Mediaevalism demanding the Just Price, so we have a popular movement on a similar quest demanding a fixed price and the control of profits. Whatever the movement, both to Mediaevalism was frustrated by the French intellectuals who exploited the popular unrest in the interests of impossible ideals, so we have the Socialist movement doing just the same thing. For in all the big fundamental things there is little to choose between the Socialists to-day and the French Revolutionaries. Both have got their ideas upside down. Rousseau made morality dependent upon Law, while Marx made it dependent upon economic condition. In theory this is a different; in practice it is not, for both make morality dependent upon the maintenance of administrative machinery. Both concentrated upon property and ignored currency. Both were in search of a fool-proof State. And so it is in respect of the whole range of Socialist ideas. They differ from Rousseau only is being out of our purview, but from Marx to-day for Rousseau did realise that the basis of society must rest upon agriculture, but Socialists to-day appear to have forgotten it. The difference of their ideas regarding property is a matter of minor importance, since the more they differ the more they are alike in their belief that evil resides finally in institutions and not in men, and in their faith absolute in the natural perfection of mankind.
Drama,
By John Francis Hope.

Mr. Owen Nares is young enough, both as actor and manager, to set the critic an exercise in the science of hypothesis. He can hardly be said to have a reputation yet, although he did play in "Romance," and has threatened to play Hamlet (poor Hamlet! Martin Harvey plays it dear). But if Mr. Owen Nares had had a reputation to lose I think that he would have lost it by his production of "The Cinderella Man," as it is, he will probably make a reputation, and perhaps a fortune, by it. It is easy to sneer, of course, but there are all sorts of actors just as there are all sorts of men, with a corresponding variety of reputations; and to be the probable chief purveyor of "gup" to the groundlings is to be distinguished from the actors who are artists. There are compensations in such a career; how often has Mrs. Martin Harvey, for example, told the Press about the affectionate friendship of her audiences, particularly in the provinces, of their almost human sorrow at the sight of the sufferings of poor Mimi, in "The Only Way," and so on? The pathos of the letters they write, the sad, sad joy of the poor girls who know that this world of the imagination is real, who long for some opportunity of humble sacrifice such as came to poor Mimi with all the circumstance of publicity! "Gup" has its compensations. "The Only Way" is the easy way to the hearts of the people, and it is a maxim of science that the line of least resistance is not the line of greatest progress.

"The Cinderella Man" has no effective historical background like "The Only Way," lacks even the distraction of costume. It is just a sweet story of love at the present day, love and art. The poor poet starves in his garret while he is writing his masterpiece; you can see him doing it, and looking as fit and healthy in the process as, say, Mr. Upton Sinclair. Everything pawnable has gone to the pawnshop, but still the masterpiece is unfinished; this is Christmas Eve, the radiators will not radiate, the stomach is empty, but the brain is full — of inspirations for the masterpiece. Critics have often regretted the fact that opera libretti are not equal in artistic merit to the music that adorns them; and the composer in this play (his style and ideas are not those of grand opera) utters the artistic fallacy that he needs a masterpiece of a libretto to inspire a masterpiece of music—as though a composer cared a semi-quaver about literature! That masterpiece will presumably be discovered by the competitors for a prize of some thousand dollars which the poet next door (unknown to the composer) is already trying to win—and then, and not until then, the composer will mount Pegasus and fly to the heights of Parnassus. If the song sung in the first act is a fair sample of his work, some such miracle will be necessary for the production of his masterpiece.

So the poet starves next door while he writes the libretto. He does not starve merely because he is a poet (although that is in the tradition); he starves because he is too proud to work or to accept help from wealthy relatives and friends. He is an orphan, of course; he has no dear mother to put the hot water in his milk, no dear father to say, "Get out of my house, you young scamp!" He has nobody to abuse him but an old harridan of a landlady; no one to admire his real gentlemanly ways but a sentimental "gentleman's gentleman" who has not maintained his first estate.

He is a genius, of course; even his friend says so, and the composer who wrote the abominable rubbish in the first act was inspired by one of his sonnets which appeared in a newspaper. Perhaps the composer was right! The man next door is a millionaire with a daughter whom he has not seen since he separated from his wife (who is now dead). The daughter arrives (like "Peg o' My Heart," but without the dog), and is lonely in this big house without friends. What could be more natural than that she should visit the poet next door, of whose loneliness and genius and detestation of rich girls she had heard from her friend? She had sung one of his songs badly, and the words touched her, oh! so deeply; he was lonely, it was Christmas-time, and if the Cinderella man could not go to the banquet the fairy godmother could take the banquet to him. She made a burglarious entry with the basket over the roof (how she got it over the roof we must not ask), set out the collation, and failed to escape before he arrived. There were curtains, of course, and she did what every woman does in such a predicament—she hid behind the curtains. After the poet had gnawed the knuckle-bone, or whatever it is, he became sensitive to the presence of unseen beings; he called upon the fairy godmother, and in the room there was no pumpkin to split, she parted the curtains and looked, oh! so sweet. They both gnawed the knuckle-bone, while she invented lies to conceal her identity; and when he discovered that she was only the companion of the "Prince's" next door, he was pleased to have her assistance in the great work on which he was engaged—which, from the passages read, seemed to consist of specifications of decidedly peculiar visual activities.

She loves him, of course; he learns to love her, of course, but does not discover it until the end of the third act. Then, then, oh! how can a man propose when he has only fifteen cents? Besides, a man may not marry his fairy godmother, says the table of affinity in fairyland. So in a few hours he writes an unhappy ending to his libretto, and runs away. He loses the prize, but the fairy godmother shows the original ending to the composer, who ejaculates superlatives, and promises to produce the thing himself if the committee refuse to award the prize for it. He is introduced to the millionaire father, who begins to have no other object in life but to make his daughter happy; and there is only the question of the fairy godmother's identity to be settled. How will he take it when he discovers that the "Prince's" companion is really the Princess, whom he has sworn never to meet? He is thoroughly shocked at the discovery, of course; poets are such unsuspecting persons (and money, we know, has no smell) that no suspicion of her identity had ever occurred to him. But then the thought of her beauty, her sweetness, her kindness, her God-knows-whatness, overwhelmed him, and he kneels at the feet of his Princess, humble but happy, a poodle poet poodling poetry.

There is no doubt that the play is popular, and there is every reason to suppose that it will settle down as comfortably to money-making as the poet will after six months of matrimony. The play is no one but the artist; it has the maudlin quality that is the passport to the affections of a very large section of the British public. On special terms the more advanced of the Sunday schools may be induced to take parties of scholars to such a wholesome entertainment; the play is as clean as a "scrubbed" gas, and as useless for purposes of illumination or heating. Mr. Owen Nares, without Waller's gifts, or even the flair of Martin Harvey, may assume the leadership of that vast crowd of adoring girls with legitimate successors of the "Keen-on-Waller" population. Poor things, they must have someone to worship, and such worship is profitable from the box-office point of view. We may safely leave Mr. Owen Nares to his popularity; he will enjoy it.
A Cubit to His Stature.

II.

We come now to the hypothesis which Dr. Crawford puts forward to explain these remarkable phenomena which occur in the presence of this medium. The principle is that levitations are produced by means of a structure projected to the table from the body of the medium, and raps by rods of a similar kind. Where the applied force is small the structure is built up on the cantilever principle; but an inclined strut connects the table to the floor and thence to the body of the medium in cases where heavy pressures on the table are likely. Much more important are the suggestions which Dr. Crawford makes on the possible nature of these structures. His experiments seem to him to indicate that they are composed of matter in a form quite unfamiliar to ordinary physical science, which nevertheless obeys the more general physical laws. This matter is impalpable and invisible, at least in strong red light, while white light at once breaks it up. It seems, however, to possess weight; and there is every indication that under conditions and by means so far quite unintelligible to us, it is abstracted from the body of the medium. A good deal of evidence for this astonishing possibility is the most striking thing in these books. Dr. Crawford maintains that while in many levitations the weight of the medium increased by about the weight of the table—a result one would anticipate if the mechanical reaction is on the body of the medium—in some, in those, namely, in which there was other evidence that the strut as distinct from the cantilever method was employed, her weight fell decidedly. Moreover, when the "operators" were asked to take as much matter as possible from the body of the medium and rest it on the floor, the weight of the medium decreased by about half, i.e., by fully fifty pounds. Only in the later stages of the process did the medium experience any discomfort.

Where it enters the body of the medium the structure is composed of this unknown form of matter, which can, however, transmit through itself various kinds of ordinary stresses. In order to transfer such stresses to ordinary matter conversion into another type of matter intermediate between this and ordinary matter is required. This is "materialised" matter and may under certain conditions become visible to the eye; and the probability is that it forms both the free and the body of the medium. To account for certain phenomena even in this general fashion, more, however, is required. Some kind of energy must be supplied. Its probable source, in Dr. Crawford's opinion, is the bodies of the sitters as well as the medium; though it has a peculiar affinity for the body of the medium, and different substances vary considerably as conductors of it. He tends to refer to it as itself a substance.

The second of the two volumes I am discussing contains also the record of some experiments carried out on "contact" phenomena with another medium. Here Dr. Crawford endeavoured to find out whether a table could be moved without muscular action on the part of the sitters, and for this purpose he devised an extremely ingenious apparatus. Its effect was to ensure by a mechanical arrangement that the total muscular pressure was less than a fixed maximum, and register at the same time the increase in the weight of the table due to "other" causes. I admit that the results which Dr. Crawford records seem to me to put it beyond reasonable doubt that in such phenomena forces are sometimes in operation which cannot be accounted for by the attractive hypothesis of unconscious muscular action. There seems, in fact, to be a good deal of evidence that contact and non-contact phenomena are much the same in principle, and that modifications of the hypothesis which accounts for the latter will cover also the case of the former. Dr. Crawford's attitude to the "direct voice" phenomena is much more hesitating, and the evidence he produces decidedly less satisfactory. But if their genuineness is admitted as a general idea of projections would bring them into line with the others.

Admitting provisionally the genuineness of the phenomena, as we saw reason to do, we ought to consider the validity and limits of Dr. Crawford's attempt to account for them. On the first point I shall only say that the hypothesis appears to me very probable. Its adaptability to important variations in the phenomena seems distinctly significant; and I should be inclined to lay great stress on the evidential value of the fact that it has proved possible to devise an hypothesis so elaborate in some respects as to verify it by test experiments and by exact measurement at so many different points. The least clear and in itself the weakest part of the argument is the introduction of the idea that energy is derived from the body of the medium. This is something of the sort takes place seems to me extremely probable. But Dr. Crawford's account of it requires much expansion, and some of his reasons are misleading, if not altogether false. A small loss of weight on the part of the sitter is explainable on purely physical grounds; and, besides, energy does not have weight. It might, of course, be associated with yet another unknown form of matter, and some of Dr. Crawford's statements seem to indicate that this is his view. Perhaps he will discuss the problem more fully in the further volume which he promises us dealing with the detailed constitution of the structures.

No one who takes any interest in the study of abnormal phenomena can fail to be reminded of the general similarity of this hypothesis to numerous previous theories covering a wide range of ideas which normal respectable people are afraid of. The notion that all sorts of marvels are produced by the projection from the "medium" of an attenuated quasi-material structure of some sort is not new. What does distinguish Dr. Crawford is the unusual definiteness with which he expresses the hypothesis and the original study which he has made of the conditions under which this happens and the laws which such operations appear to obey. He points out that under definable conditions phenomena might be produced at a very considerable distance from the body of the sitter, and this by means of the medium's attaining the same kind as he has described. Some of the telekinetic experiments of Aksakoff are immediately recalled by this, and the various tricks to account for which someone invented the term "psuedopodia." A more remote possibility is that there may after all be something in the ancient and enduring traditions about lycanthropy, which so many writers have shown the evidence for notable historical cases to be. That, after all, is what one might expect where the subjects are distinguished. Rumour with its legends treats them as pegs provided by the grace of God. What we really want to know is what common experiences lay behind the traditions and nourished them. The closest analogues, however, are with the numerous theories of the subtle and etheric bodies. To some of these at least Dr. Crawford's work lends real support. Let us hope that their adherents will be thankful for the mercies thus vouchsafed to them.

It remains to be said that the limitations of Dr. Crawford's position are quite impressive. He is no psychologist; and when he refers to the "other" of the mind's contempt for the known, he means just below the surface. "It is difficult to see how the mind of the medium can lift a table, . . . but not at all difficult to picture how her
mind, in its subconscious aspect, may be responsible for the general inanities of trance speaking. In the case of [of the latter] phenomena the mind of the medium had far too much to do with the results." Here we have the familiar attitude of the physical scientist, who cannot see how the mind can possibly be an object of disinterested scientific study. To him it is a factor to be discounted so far as possible; its only obvious function is, in fact, to introduce variability into results otherwise fairly intelligible. That the concentration of Dr. Crawford's interests on certain detachable elements in the phenomena has a decided value is plain. But this should not blind us to the narrow field which his research covers. When he talks about "psychical" science or "psychic" phenomena he is not thinking of the medium's mind or any part of anybody's mind, but of a particular form of matter similar in some respects to, but different in others from, that of which, as we commonly say, earth and sea and sky are composed. There is in fact physical matter and there is psychical matter. The latter differs from the former most obviously in its impalpability, though no doubt there are great differences in detail also, just as there seem to be intermediate forms. Dr. Crawford does not deny that the universe also contains minds. They do not, however, interest him. From such a position it is a far cry to the immortality of the soul. Dr. Crawford plainly believes that his voice carries the distance; though we have only his own word for it. The convenient abstraction by which physics simply neglects the action of mind on matter is paralleled by the absence of any consideration on Dr. Crawford's part of the way in which his "operators" perform their allotted functions. So great is the deference he pays them that one is tempted to say he regards them as taboos. As a piece of scientific method, this procedure is perfectly sound. We must not allow it to conceal from us, however, the enormous gap which remains to be filled in in the argument. That the "operators" are not the conscious selves of the medium and the sitter is pretty clear, though only on psychological grounds. Whether secondary personalities are developed, how many of them, and their nature remain untouched questions. Yet this is the point of connection with more familiar trance phenomena. I have myself, for example, been impressed by the similarity between much of the account which the operators give of themselves and certain common elements in scripts or trance utterances. Everything seems to point to a close connection between the two types of phenomena such as I referred to at the beginning of this discussion. The place is the profound importance for the understanding even of these bizarre non-mental phenomena, of making as intelligible as may be the way in which the soul functions through the brain, and of utilising all the growing knowledge of the nature of the unconscious.

Against Dr. Crawford himself, in fact, I have only one complaint to make. Though his use of the term "psychical" is definite enough, and though he does not depart from it, it is certainly confusing, and may lead to endless misunderstandings in a field where attempted precision is specially to be desired. This criticism gains force from the unavoidable suspicion that Dr. Crawford does not realise the complexity of the issues. Without calling in question the value of his work, it considerably limits the field of application of its methods and results. Much of Myers's writings now wear an archaic air; but we are very far from having exhausted the suggestions contained in his extraordinarily comprehensive "Scheme of Vital Faculty." If every student of psychical research, and still more every investigator, would try to possess some thing of the aesthetic spirit, they would at least be less confused in the popular mind. Plate's eternal question might also find an answer on occasion.

M. W. ROBIESON.

The Old Master as Grotesque.

By Huntly Carter.

VI.--TURNER

There is no surer way of evading art than by art. Even creditable writers are deluded about the nature of art and the historical development of art-expressions, and, therefore, misinterpret and misplace artists. Immediate personal and social, stylistic, moral and emotional characteristics are looked for, instead of highly individualised improvisations of an eternal theme. Ruskin, for one, was always detecting in Turner, for instance, aesthetic intention. He considered that earth had equipped him for a first-class moral philosopher, and, accordingly, had placed him where he could gaze on the sad procession of man and things, separate them with his moral sense, store the pieces in his prodigious memory, re-arrange them with amazing skill and precision, and so enrich the art world with a literal rendering of material and tangible appearances. He was, in fact, of the firm opinion that till Turner came "the perfect veracity in the representation of general nature by art had never been attempted." Thereafter, he considered it his special duty to label Turner, Ruskin the Second with a foot-rule. It is doubtful whether Ruskin had a clear conception of the truth of Turner's immortal part. Evidently he was in the dark as to its relation with the Early Childe, the Japanese, the Venetians, Blake and the rest. He was unable to set Turner in the gay company of immortals who are concerned with "The Life-movement of the Spirit through the Rhythm of things," and to see that his pictures were mainly the outcome of the principle that the artist must pierce beneath the mere aspect of the world to seize and himself possess by that great cosmic rhythm of the spirit which sets the currents of life in motion." Had he been acquainted with this principle he would, I think, have seen that Turner sought to seize the universal in the particular, not the reverse. It is true Ruskin was inspired to compose an incomparable verbal hymn of praise to Turner, but we do not find he was deeply observant enough to enter his subjective world. To him, as I once said, the work-a-day world had many characteristics of Hell, and the business of art was to express the moral truth about them and to leave critics to lash art-expressions with disgust when they failed to tell the moral truth about material conditions.

Yet, in spite of his obvious limitations as an art critic, Ruskin might, if he liked, have taken off his hat to Turner in a very different manner. He might have taken it off to the noble grotesque spirit in Turner by applying his own theory to him. He conceived it, as I stated, when he was wandering about morally and aesthetically curious in Renaissance Italy. He observed that a low form of grotesque was exhibiting a low species of jest as a mark of laughter. The immoral features of the affair aroused his wrath, and he immediately proceeded to rebuke them with a high form of grotesque, holding up a high species of jest amounting to high-spirited playfulness." Thereafter, leaving heavily on his conception of noble and ignoble grotesque, he sought to give a philosophical, moral and emotional precision to his theory by associating the noble grotesque with play-behaviour, and with "races" in which the "human soul, taken all in all, reached its highest magnificence," in "two great families of men, one of the East and South, the other of the West and North." And in both these families, wherever they are seen in their utmost idleness, there the grotesque is developed in its utmost energy; and there is no one complaint to make. Though his use of the term "psychical" is definite enough, and though he does not depart from it, his own word for it. The convenient abstraction by which physics simply neglects the action of mind on matter is paralleled by the absence of any consideration on Dr. Crawford's part of the way in which his "operators" perform their allotted functions. So great is the deference he pays them that one is tempted to say he regards them as taboos. As a piece of scientific method, this procedure is perfectly sound. We must not allow it to conceal from us, however, the enormous gap which remains to be filled in in the argument. That the "operators" are not the conscious selves of the medium and the sitter is pretty clear, though only on psychological grounds. Whether secondary personalities are developed, how many of them, and their nature remain untouched questions. Yet this is the point of connection with more familiar trance phenomena. I have myself, for example, been impressed by the similarity between much of the account which the operators give of themselves and certain common elements in scripts or trance utterances. Everything seems to point to a close connection between the two types of phenomena such as I referred to at the beginning of this discussion. The place is the profound importance for the understanding even of these bizarre non-mental phenomena, of making as intelligible as may be the way in which the soul functions through the brain, and of utilising all the growing knowledge of the nature of the unconscious.

Against Dr. Crawford himself, in fact, I have only one complaint to make. Though his use of the term "psychical" is definite enough, and though he does not depart from it, it is certainly confusing, and may lead to endless misunderstandings in a field where attempted precision is specially to be desired. This criticism gains force from the unavoidable suspicion that Dr. Crawford does not realise the complexity of the issues. Without calling in question the value of his work, it considerably limits the field of application of its methods and results. Much of Myers's writings now wear an archaic air; but we are very far from having exhausted the suggestions contained in his extraordinarily comprehensive "Scheme of Vital Faculty." If every student of psychical research, and still more every investigator, would try to possess something of the aesthetic spirit, they would at least be less confused in the popular mind. Plate's eternal question might also find an answer on occasion.

M. W. ROBIESON.
he wrote about Turner that the latter was a specially prepared instrument for transmitting the spirit of the noble grotesque. He saw that Turner was an idealist in a world of monsters. He perceived that he was "exuberantly imaginative," sensible to invention, aware of "God's bounty in Nature"; that he had "immediate inspiration," and, in fact, with one exception, all the fine things which Ruskin included in his index of grotesque nobleness. I suppose "the perfect veracity in the representation of general nature" which he bestowed upon Turner was a business far too serious to admit even the highest species of jest. Indeed, it almost looks as though Ruskin regarded the great painter as an inspired funeral mute. And yet Turner—the real Turner—not only had but a rare capacity for jesting, but must have been convulsed by the finest spirit of it. How could it be otherwise with a mind such as his, so splendidly capable of imaginatively or intuitively apprehending Reality, and exploring it in quest of truths which were nowhere to be found in a world infected with the incurable disease of hypocrisy. Like all great artists, Turner must have entered a spirit-world, been taken up with its revelations, and profoundly concerned to know how to acquire a power of obtaining veracity in the expression of his experience. Is it not conceivable that from this spirit-world—answering to Blake's Heaven—he saw the truth of material and tangible things, and trusted, by giving them an unimpeachable veracious representation, to express the spiritual reality about their dull and stupid solidity? Is it not conceivable that Ruskin's limited stock of insight mistook this unimpeachable veracity for the foundation of a magnificent fabric of scientific truth, whereas, in reality, it was a truth of another order—the truth that the too solid material and tangible things only exist to be laughed at?

In support of this assumption, which might easily trip the unwary accustomed to regard Turner as a patent copyist, I might add the incontestable fact that Turner indulged a process of refining which considerably modified the hard material and tangible wilderness beloved of Ruskin, and suitably enshrined in the Liber Studiorum. Colour was the sun of his life, as the laughing sun was the god of his inspiration. Look how the sun shines in some of his great sun pictures—"The Sun Rising through Vapour," "Dido Building Carthage," the magic Venetian sun in the "Bridge of Sighs," "Going to Sea," "Venice, Morning." He sets his finest pictures floating like radiant spirits on an eternal stream of sun-colour ravishment. There are, for instance, the pictures at the Tate Gallery to prove it. And in his later period he moved to such a point of refinement that actually his pictures became pregnant with fluidity, so that poor Ruskin's precious world of solids began to disappear like morning mists beneath the sun. Whereupon people called Turner mad. But was he mad? Or was he making a consummate use of the spirit of the noble grotesque?

By his later manner, Turner stood revealed as much a mystic as Blake, having a definite affinity with the long line of nature mystics in painting, from early Chinese times onward. It is of interest to note that Ruskin attached a mystic value to Turner without, however, knowing what mysticism meant. In the Castlefranco chapter added to the Traveller's Edition of "The Stones of Venice," there occurs the following passage: "When I wrote the passages about Tintoret in the preceding index, I had myself only got far enough to understand his chiaroscuro, and his mysticism in the direction in which it resembled Turner's; his proper Venetian mysticism—the language of signs and personages (Iconographe Chretienne), which runs down from Egypt through the Byzantines to Venice in one unbroken and ever clearer stream—a sacred language just as accurately spoken and easily read by its scholars as old Greek itself—was at that time wholly unknown to me." "What," someone may ask, "does Ruskin mean by Tintoret's proper Venetian mysticism?" Is mysticism a local affair or a universal one? I have always thought it resides in a power to perceive Reality, is confined to no one spot, and runs down from the beginning of the world through all nations "in one unbroken and ever clearer stream." I now believe it is at the source of the noble grotesque form of expression, and therefore this expression illuminates the barrenness of material and tangible things, as with vivid rays of light laughter thrown across an empty picture.

Homage to Sextus Propertius.

By Ezra Pound.

IV.

Jove be merciful to that unfortunate woman
Or an ornamental death will be held to your debit,
The time is come, the air heaves in torridity,
The dry earth pants against the canicular heat,
But this best is not the root of the matter:
She did not respect all the Gods,
Such derelictions have destroyed other young ladies aforesight,
And what they swore in the cupboard
wind and wave scattered away.
Was Venus exacerbated by the existence of a comparably equal?
Is the ornamental Goddess full of envy?
Have you contemplated Juno's Pelasgian temples,
Have you denied Pallas good eyes?

Or is it my tongue that wrongs you
with perpetual ascription of graces?
There comes, it seems, and at any rate
through perils (so many), and of a vexed life,
The gentler hour of an ultimate day.

Io mooed the first years with averted head,
And now drinks Nile water like a God,
Ino in her young days fled pell-mell out of Thebes,
Andromeda was offered to a sea-serpent
And respectably married to Perseus,
Callisto, disguised as a bear,
Wandered through the Arcadian prairies
While a black veil was over her stars,
What if your fates are accelerated,
your quiet hour put forward,
You may find interment pleasing.
You will say that you succumbed
to a danger identical,
charmingly identical, with Semde's,
And believe it, and she also will believe it,
being expert from experience,
And amid all the gloried and storied beauties of
Maeonia
There shall be none in a better seat, not one denying your prestige.

Now you may bear fate's stroke unperturbed,
Or Jove, harsh as he is, may turn aside your ultimate day.
Old letcher, let not Juno get wind of the matter,
Or perhaps Juno herself will go under,
if the young lady is taken?

There will be, in any case, a stir on Olympus.
Hale, Hearty—and Farewell.*

MR. BAX has been a perplexing figure in the Socialist movement for more years than I can remember. He has pursued his way, by an inner light of his own, sometimes travelling solitary through the abstract, at other times dropping, by his own patent parachute, upon some practical political or economic issue, only to return again to the clouds, after delivering his soul and dining and wine, with innumerable friends of kaleidoscope opinions. Although a man like the rest of us, the habit of abstract thought has been to him a sure guide through those crises and personal conflicts of which the Socialist movement has had its share. In the early days he maintained friendly relations with Morris, Hyndman, Engels, Shaw, Liebknecht (the elder), and a dozen more, who, at one time or another, found themselves in personal conflict. Nobody can quarrel with Mr. Bax. If you try, you are arrested at the first move by a consciousness that he is constructing a minor synthesis at what time he is inviting you to be talkative and convivial. A bludgeon is of no earthly use against an abstract proposition. In this wise, Mr. Bax has moved amongst us, an apparatus with an appetite for good things. It is not surprising, therefore, that these reminiscences are mostly pleasant, with scarcely a sting. The late Miss Helen Taylor and the feminists are about the only exceptions. Even the unhappy Aveling gets off with a caution.

The volume, however, is curiously inadequate and unsatisfying. On analysing my own feelings about it, I imagine the Mr. Bax has written for a small coterie of Social Democrats, when the average reader would have preferred less generalisation, even fewer personal sketches, but infinitely more about world-movements and a more exact account of the philosophic controversies in which he has played a considerable part. For example, in 1880 he went to Berlin as assistant to Edward von Hartmann, with whom he discussed "the possibility of a corporate social consciousness being in the womb of time and evolution." "No doubt the idea is vastly more important than the German Confederation; but this is a book of reminiscences. We see here the real Bax, with his preoccupations and philosophic curiosity; perhaps we get a glimmering into the reason why academic justice has not been done to him. He mixes his intellectual drinks. His descriptions, too, of the personalities he has met are objective and perfunctory; they lack the note of intimacy; they are photographs rather than portraits. Engels is an exception. Mr. Bax makes him live again; we see the man with his sense of the burden of maintaining the doctrine pure and undefiled, and his jealousy of any other man, particularly Mr. Hyndman, who dares approach the Marxian Holy of Holies. I have sometimes wondered whether the prosperous Engels did not fully realise that economic power preceded and dominated the Marxist doctrine of his day.

It does not appear in the book, of course, but reading between the lines it seems as if we see the Mr. Bax played the rôle of Philosopher-in-Chief to the old Social Democratic Federation, Mr. Hyndman being installed as Leader and Professor of Applied Economics. With Engels in the background as liaison officer with the orthodox Marxians in Europe, the S.D.F. had an intellectual armoury far superior to the I.L.P., and soon to burgeon into the largest Socialist organisation in England. Truth to tell, most of us found the S.D.F. mentality a fearsome thing: all the more fearsome because we were all too ignorant to withstand it. Messers. Shaw and Webb went gaily on their Jevonian way, writing suavely of "ultimate utility" and "rest of ability." To most of us, it was all double-Dutch. I have since come to the conclusion that that is precisely what it was. The impression created on our young minds was that there was no discoverable point of contact between the S.D.F. and the Fabian propaganda, fast crystallising into doctrine. But we were all clear that the I.L.P. had no intellectual basis and existed purely on a spirit of social compunction, expressing itself in the formula of political independence. It is certainly strange that the largest Socialist body in England, being now more than a quarter of a century old, has not evolved one idea of permanent value; has not thrown up a single original thinker. It has lived on scraps thrown at it by the Fabians and S.D.F. There are signs that it is now turning to National Guilds for sustenance. Yet this political organisation, with its catch-phrase ideas, has finally squeezed the S.D.F. out of existence. It must have been galling to clear, if dogmatic, thinkers like Bax and Hyndman to see their followers gradually succumb to the gob-mouches of the I.L.P.

What is the explanation?

We can find it, perhaps, in this book of reminiscences. Mr. Bax joined the S.D.F. in 1882. Writing thirty-five years later, he has not charged his memory with any experience that bears directly upon the human family as human. He pricks up his ears at a fundamental principle, philosophic or economic; his anecdotes are of characteristics of leaders and other interesting people, particularly Victorian. To most of us, it was all double-Dutch. Mr. Bax—a dignified, disinterested, and unassuming man—has not as a politician, the I.L.P. leaders, and Mr. Hyndman has failed as a politician. As politicians, the I.L.P. leaders have swept him aside. Yet, as a politician, he understood, and understood, and worked with, the Trade Unionists better than his colleagues. Yet, as a politician, he was an even greater failure than Mr. Hyndman. In dialectics, these men could make minor-meat of any of the I.L.P. leaders. But there was one thing the S.D.F. leaders overdid; they could never adapt its doctrine to current political controversies. It was not fatalist, but its belief that the economic development had so far matured that the downfall of Capitalism was imminent proved its own downfall. There was, in fact, a fatal flaw in the argument. It confused the nature and function of the State with the economic struggle; it strove to put its
quart of economic formula into the political pint-pot. It is
the universal Marxian misconception; not merely that
there must be a prior conquest of political power;
but of the nature and relation of political power to the
industrial structure. The I.L.P., without thought or
logic, remains; the S.D.F., with serious thought and
unflinching logic, is out of action. Mr. Bax’s "corporate
social consciousness" is still apparently "in the
womb of time and evolution."

In his chapter on the S.D.F., Mr. Bax tells us of its
change of name, which took place in 1911, thereafter
becoming the "British Socialist Party." It is the
story, not merely of a nominal change but of the final
phase of the movement for Socialist unity. I must
briefly refer to it, since it has some bearing on the origin
of National Guilds. The year that saw this change of
name also witnessed the formation of the Joint Standing
Committee between the I.L.P. and the Fabian Society.

In the following year (1912) "National Guilds" began
to appear serially in The New Age, running into 1913.
Mr. Pease, in his dull and uninspiring "History of the
Fabian Society" (pp. 202 to 209), gives us a formal
account of the various attempts at Socialist unity begin-
inning in 1893. Characteristically, Mr. Bax has little,
if anything to say about this movement, in which Mr.
Hyndman and Mr. Quelch played an honourable part.
Mr. Pease, equally characteristically, gives the facts
and completely misses the spirit. The earlier attempts
at unity were bound to fail because it was sought to
unify divergent doctrines; the main attempt, between
the years 1903 and 1907, was to consolidate political
Socialism and so establish a counterpoise to obscurantist
Labourism. As it was an unofficial movement, never
reaching a formal stage, Mr. Pease would naturally
know nothing of it. Nevertheless, once or twice it
came very near to success.
The formation in 1909, of Labour Representation
Committee (intended by the Trade Union Congress
to be a mere by-product) filled many of the more
thoughtful Socialists with forebodings. Two grave
dangers were apprehended: (i) That political Socialism,
as far as it had been defined, would be attenuated, if not
lost, in the inert mass of sleepy opportunism; (ii) That
the political stimulus administrated to the Trade Unions
would detract from their industrial functions. Our
worst fears were realised. From their nooks and crannies,
old-fashioned Labour officials grasped with avidity
the new glimmer of hope; and the last state of that man is
generous hospitality to the dirty devils; and the human brain, if
the human cranium must be abusively described as scientific. Having demonstrated
that "mankind" has been very unkind to man,
has perverted the process of evolution (which he seems
to identify with progress) to the creation of masters and
slaves, and the organisation of society on a basis of hate,
he concludes that "a purgative house-cleaning of
the human cranium must be the first step towards race
salvation."

The brain surgeon may protest that such an
operation would infallibly kill the patient, but Mr.
Swift insists that it must be done "in order that the human
brain, cleared of its decaying deposits, may recover
life." There is a familiar passage in the Gospels which
warns against such drastic treatment; the unclean
spirit, we are told, being cast out of a man, "walketh
down by dry places seeking rest, and finding none.
Then he saith, I will return to my house whence I came
out; and when he is come he findeth it empty,
swept, and garnished." At this point Mr. Morrison
Swift says: "The human brain, cleared of its decaying
deposits, must think out the highest principles of
constructive action, breaking away wholly from its slavery
to stupidity, and make the world over on the model of
these new ideas." The Gospel story, with rather more
knowledge of human nature, declares: "Then goeth
he, and taketh with himself seven other spirits more
wicked than himself, and they enter in and dwell there;
and the last state of that man is worse than the first.
Even so shall it be unto this wicked generation."

The clean heart and the open mind seem to afford generous
hospitality to the dirty devils; and the human brain, if
it could be purged, as Mr. Swift demands, of its
inherited and acquired prejudices and protections against
these new ideas (whatever they are) would find
itself unable to think out even the lowest principle of
constructive action. We cannot "return to evolution,"

* "Can Mankind Survive?" By Morrison Swift.
(Marshall Jones. $1.50 net.)
"In Darkest Christendom, and a Way Out of the Darkness." By Arthur Bertram.
(Allen & Unwin. 7s. 6d. net.)
as Mr. Swift demands, because we are the product of it and are in the process of it; evolution is not like miracles, is not something that happened two thousand years ago; it is a process as active in Mr. Swift's prescription as in my repudiation of it, as active in war as in the pacific protests against war. "Can Mankind Survive?" Yes; it can survive even its critics, and although it is probably true that the Bolshevik activity will give a considerable shaking to the capitalist system, as Mr. Swift declares, there is nothing either in heaven or earth to suggest that, even if either system exterminates the other, it will also exterminate itself.

Mr. Arthur Bertram writes at much greater length, and with more painful feeling, a series of well-known and well-deserved criticisms of the social order that has had its results in the recent war. The diagnosis is familiar, and the prescription is vague; "we have laboured," he says, "to make as clear as possible our unshakable conviction that the only way out is Christ—returning to God by Him, and that this involves implications much more far-reaching than is imagined by current conceptions of Christianity. We say that God has not remained silent in His heaven; that He has spoken to us, and that our sorrows arise from our refusal to listen. We are not in a position to get the admission that Christianity has never been tried, and we believe that an honest examination of Christ's message will convince the inquirer that if he tries His way it will not fail us." Admireable sentiments, made more affecting by the personal conviction that dictates them; but what is the message of Christ? Mr. Bertram leaves us to discover it from the Bible, where people have discovered everything, including even the persecution of unbelievers, and the foundation of a Church upon a pan.

This reference to Christ, like Mr. Swift's reference to evolution, demands a miracle. It demands that we, who, ex hypothesi, do not understand Christianity after two thousand years of preaching, should become capable of understanding it, a feat which certainly requires an alteration, a conversion, or an illumination of our faculties. If that does not happen naturally in the course of evolution, by adaptation to circumstances and learning by experience, it must happen by agency; somebody must show us how we can be born again, instead of merely telling us what we must be. But it does not follow that we shall desire to be born again, even when we know how it can be done; the will to be different from what one is is not active in a fortunately constituted man, whose feelings and thoughts are harmoniously related, and issue in successful action. It matters not whether the personal will that dictates us; but what is the message of Christ? Mr. Bertram leaves us to discover it from the Bible, where people have discovered everything, including even the persecution of unbelievers, and the foundation of a Church upon a pan.

But there is no guarantee that what I have called the fortunately constituted man is one who has already accepted the message of Christ. He may simply be Pilate, on whom Christ made very little impression beyond the conviction that Christ was harmless. That easy Roman, who paid the penalty of his disbelief (proved as it is harmless) is much more common than religious people usually imagine; there are people to whom the "message of Christ" is simply foolishness, as St. Paul put it, but amiable foolishness. The assumption that Christ has a message for all men is contradicted by the other assumption of the need of conversion, as it is also contradicted by some of the reputed sayings of Christ. "He that is of God heareth God's words; ye therefore hear them not, because ye are not of God." If the "only way" out of our present difficulties is Christ, then there is no way out; for the conflict of types and personalities is clearly understood in the Gospels, and the triumph of any one type would mean that the human race had lost its most vital characteristic, its power of variability. The best becomes the worst when there is nothing else. The simple fact is that no prescription is valuable unless it is proved possible of application. To tell us that the only cure for our troubles is that we ought to be different, that evolution or Christ is our only means of salvation, is to tell us nothing to the purpose. There are myriads of such vague prescriptions before the public, ranging from "Science" to "Social Reform," and including practically every proper noun in the language. The proof that life is impossible on its present lines is certainly as old as Christianity, and still we are here muddling along and making the best of a bad job. It is true, painful, and necessary in the natural way we do, the results would be different; but I must confess that the novelty of the demonstration of the wickedness of this world has lost its freshness. We need something more relative than these vague objections in the name of evolution and Christianity, and we do not get it from these two authors.

A. E. R.

Reviews.

The Camelliers. By Oliver Hugue. (Melrose. 6s. net.)

This is a "record of the deeds—and misdeeds—of the Imperial Camel Corps in Egypt, Sinai and Palestine," the author says in his dedication. It is written in the Colonial convention of unconventionality, and is alternately a record of military operations, a series of reminiscences inspired by the casualty list, interspersed with chapters of obvious and abominably sentimental fiction about the nurses in the hospitals. The author claims for the Imperial Camel Corps a considerable share of the honours that have fallen to other units, for, like every other arm of the Service, the Imperial Camel Corps has not received its due meed of recognition. People in Australia believe that it is the Imperial Camel Corps doing?" just as in England they used to ask: "What is the Navy doing? What is the Infantry doing? What is the cavalry doing? What is the artillery, and the Air Force, and the Supply Corps, and the War Office, and the Government, and the country, doing?" No questions—the proverb is something musty; but here, at least, are the Camelliers replying to the questions of Australia. But what did the Imperial Camel Corps do?

Golden Days from the Fishing Log of a Painter in Brittany. By Romilly Fedden. (Black. 7s. 6d. net.)

If Mr. Fedden had confined himself to fishing, this book would only have appealed to brothers of the craft. There is, we think, enough information about flies and fish to recommend the book to those who do not spare the rod, but "flag streams" for all the world as though they lived in Xerxes' time. But we think that Mr. Fedden is too truthful to be a really good fisherman; he never caught a duck-faced chub, or a hen-pecked trout, or any other of the weird creatures of the stream. But he makes amends for his amazing veracity by citing some of the folklore and superstitions and customs of the people of Brittany, is perhaps better in de-
Redmond's Vindication. By the Rev. Robert O'Loughran. (The Talbot Press. 5s. net.)

Father O'Loughran has written an agreeably garrulous and incoherent discourse on things in general and Ireland in particular that is well worth the attention of the general reader. It abounds with anecdotes which are generally witty and seldom apropos; it is full of criticism which is so charitable that it includes well-nigh everybody and kills no one. It handles facts in such a disorderly manner that they barely prove their own existence; and the lines of criticism cross and criss-cross like the rails at Clapham Junction, with this difference, that no one of them ever is pushed to its logical conclusion. No Irishman (and no Englishman, if he speaks the truth,) can write of Irish affairs without condemning English action; but surely no one has ever condemned the English more heartily than has Father O'Loughran while, at the same time, maintaining that English supremacy is a necessary condition of Irish existence. That, I very de be of the Victorian school and Ireland in this book, and what there is seems to be more the cordial approval of a friend than the analysis and verdict of a historian. So far as we can gather, Redmond's vindication is the whole state of world-politics at the present time; and Father O'Loughran also insists, with Christian charity, that the man who did his best for Ireland is deserving of Ireland's gratitude. He is most clear and most emphatic when he insists on the natural affinity between Ireland and France, and demonstrates that whatever England may be to Ireland, Germany would be no better. Although he does not say so definitely, Father O'Loughran throughout the book is protesting against the parochialism of Irish politics, both as manifested by the English government of Ireland and by the Irish resistance to it. He is too good a Catholic to agree with the blinkered nationalism of the Sinn Fein remedy; although he agrees powerfully with its indictment of England, he tries to see "Ourselves" in the perspective of world-politics, and, in that setting, it is visible except to the worst. We may summarize his message by saying that if the Irish are not human, being Irish will avail them nothing; and if they are human, the exclusiveness of Sinn Fein will diminish as they begin to take their place in the scheme of things. Anyhow, the English ought to be ashamed of their record in Irish history—as most of them are.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

A CONSTRUCTIVE SCHEME FOR THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE.

Sir,—I take the liberty to suggest a scheme for the future constitution of the Ottoman Empire which I consider would meet all the necessary requirements of a just peace, would safeguard the interests of all the Turkish and non-Turkish nationalities and satisfy the Moslems of the world, including seventy-two millions of India, and would also be free from all racial, colour, or religious prejudices. It might be somewhat on these lines:—

Thrace (Western and Eastern), the whole of Asia Minor, of Cyrenaica or other important coastal portions, should form the main State of a united or federated Ottoman Empire, with Constantinople as the capital of the constitutional Sultan, the Khalifa of the Moslem world.

According to the pledged words of Mr. Lloyd George, to which India, as a part of the Empire, was a party, and of President Wilson "a secure sovereignty," with the fullest independent autonomy of the Turkish nation be "assured" over this State. (The Sultan will probably himself appoint one of his Greek subjects as the Governor of Smyrna.)

To the main State should be united or joined a number of self-governing States, either on the lines of the United States of America, the German States, or the British Colonies. The following might be the federated States:—(1) Syria, including Palestine; (2) Mesopotamia; (3) Arabia; (4) Armenia; (5) Egypt; (6) Tripoli; (7) Albania; (8) those portions of the Black Sea littoral which have a preponderant Turkish-speaking Moslem population.

All these States should be federated with the British Colonies, by members of the League of Nations, with its constitution more universalised. They may have the option of asking, through the League of Nations, for the sanction of the paramount and parent State (Turkey), foreign administrators if they do not possess themselves or cannot get them from within the Empire.

In my opinion this scheme can be put into practice at once only if the policy of "grab" on the basis of secret treaties be given up. If Great Britain leads the way and forsakes its greed of getting, with capitalistic objects, by some means of other parts (even if Great Britain can only take a mandate), the possession of Mesopotamia and Palestine, all other Powers shall have to follow suit and the whole tone of the settlement shall be elevated.

Let Great Britain take the lead for the sake of right and justice, for the peace of the world and the security of the British Empire in the East, as well as for the happiness of seventy-two million British citizens of India.

SHAIKH M. H. KIDWAI OF GADIA.

The Mosque, Woking, Surrey.

"THE THUNDERBOLT."

Sir,—In a notice of my novel, "The Thunderbolt," which appeared in your issue of July 3, your reviewer appears to consider it impossible that a girl in a German clinic should be inoculated with a foul disease. He goes on to say: "That practice has been the subject of much comment by Mr. Colmore. Mr. Colmore has in this disfiguring German medical practice, etc." and I am writing to let you know (and I think you should let your readers know) that the defamation of German medical practice consists in the facts which I state and not in my statement of them. Briefly these facts are as follows:—The late Professor Neisser, in his clinic at Breslau, inoculated eight girls with a foul disease for experimental purposes. In 1913 Professor Neisser came to England, was welcomed by the medical profession here, and presented with a gold medal by the Chirurgical Society.

My purpose in bringing forward these facts in "The Thunderbolt" is a quite simple one—namely, to state truth.

Against literary criticism I never appeal, but when facts are in question I think a novelist should have the right of reply.

G. COLMORE.

[Our reviewer replies: I accept Mr. Colmore's assurance that the late Professor Neisser inoculated eight girls with a foul disease for experimental purposes. But I am still unenlightened concerning Mr. Colmore's artistic purpose in making use of that fact. "To state truth" is not an artistic purpose, but a scientific one; the artist works in the medium of reality. I have only to press for "the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth" to discover that Mr. Colmore's purpose was probably not a scientific one. Is it true, for example, that an English girl of good family was accidentally included among these eight? My criticism was a literary criticism; it was to the effect that "The Thunderbolt" was not a legitimate development of the original theme, that, as I said, "the tragedy is forced, and therefore fails to produce its effect." The fact that a German medical man did inoculate eight girls is not, I think, a legitimate reason for excusing Mr. Colmore for supposing any unsuspecting person, obviously not German, would have been included in the number; and, I repeat, I think that the whole incident is a defamation of German medical practice without any artistic justification. I will not remark on the significance of the statement that Professor Neisser "was welcomed by the medical profession" in this country.]
Pastiche.

ON AN OLD TATTERED BOOK.

Do they despise you, these others? 
Do they look down on you? 
You in your faded blue, 
All tattered amid your brothers 
Who shine so brightly. 
And you with your leaves all muddy, 
And the cover of you all bloody. 
Yet I take you nightly 
And read you quietly 
Beside the fire or in the fading sun, 
And, having done, 
You comforted me when I was sore afraid. 

CAPT. F. HAPPOLD, D.S.O.

THE TIME SPIRIT, 1919.
Apollo hath had his day, 
Dionysos cometh in wild array, 
With fury and sound 
Who is dismayed? 
Who is afraid? 
His moan is a lie. 
Will anyone sigh? 
Apollo's deeds are accurst; 
May he perish who first loved money! Through him no fathers; enemies, 
but Love mingled gall with it. 
Ares groaned and cried: "It is strong enough; those who have felt it know that." 
Ares received the dart: Aphrodite smiled a little. 
Ares groaned and cried: "It is strong indeed—take it from me." But Love said: "Keep it."

MERCENARY LOVE.

It is bitter not to be kissed; it is bitter to be kissed; but bitterer than all things is to lose one's love. 
Love now has no child; a cunning one, old custom is disdained—they care only for money. 
May he perish who first loved money! Through him there are no brothers, through him no fathers; enemies, murders because of him. 
And this is the worst—through him we that are lovers are destroyed.

A DREAM.
I thought in a dream that Love with wings upon his shoulders and lead about his lovely feet sped by and lighted down. 
What does this dream mean? I think it means that after wandering in love with many I am now taken from all others and bound hand and foot in this.

OLD MEN AND DANCING.
I love a handsome old man and I love a young man who can dance, but if an old man dances he is three times old and grown childish in his mind.

CARPE DIEM.
Since I was born a mortal to travel the track of life, I know what time I have passed, and I do not know how much I have to come; leave me then, sorrow; let there be no dealings between us. 
I will be gay and laugh and dance with Lyons before the end overtakes me.

Sprng.
It is good to go afoot in Spring when the meadows are blossoming and the west wind breathes its sweetest fine air, good to see the grape-shoots, good to walk under the vine-leaves, good to possess a beautiful girl scented with love.

Translated by Richard Aldington.

ANACREONTEA.

THE DRINKER.
The earth drinks the darkness, and the trees drink the earth; the sea drinks the winds, and the sun drinks the sea, and the moon drinks the sun. 
My friends, why do you quarrel with me for drinking as I wish?

THE LOVER'S LYRE.
I would like to sing of the Atrides and of Kadmos, but my lyre sings Love alone upon its strings. 
Just now I changed the strings of the lyre and sang of Herakles, but the lyre spoke only of love. 
There is nothing left, heroes, but to say farewell, for my lyre sings only of love.

WOMEN'S GIFT.
Nature gave horns to the bull and hoofs to horses, fleetness to hares and a wide mouth of teeth to the lion, swimming to fish, flight to birds, wisdom to men, but to women nothing.

LOVE'S DART.
A man of Cythera by the furnaces of Lemnos took iron and fashioned the shafts of the Loves. 
And Aphrodite took sweet honey to anoint the tips, but Love mingled gall with it. 
Ares, shaking his thick spear, sneered at Love's shaft, but Love said: "It is strong enough; those who have felt it know that."

Ares received the dart: Aphrodite smiled a little. Ares groaned and cried: "It is strong indeed—take it from me." But Love said: "Keep it."
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