NOTES OF THE WEEK.

Whatever may be the issue of the events of the present week, we do not doubt that one of the silent resolutions of the Miners' Federation and, in all probability, of the Trade Union movement generally, will be never to attempt to befriend the public as consumer again. The Miners' Federation will argue to itself, if not aloud, that its recent endeavour to break the vicious circle by reducing rather than increasing prices simultaneously with an increase of wages has been met either by determined hostility or complete indifference on the part of the public. "We offered to employ our economic power," they will say, "not only in our own behalf but to an even greater extent in the interests of the consumer. Two shillings a day to make up for our own increased cost of living was all that we were demanding for ourselves; while, for the domestic consumer of coal, we demanded a reduction of 14s. 2d. per ton, representing a saving on the total domestic expenditure of 36 millions a year. The public, however, would have none of it. So far from appreciating our motives or the self-sacrifice implied in such a use of our economic power, the public either supported the Government in its declared determination to keep prices as they are or actually to raise them, or it contem- plated our struggle on its behalf with indifference. Never again will any Trade Union be tempted to consider the interests of the public above or even beside its own. Let the public stew in its own juice. As for ourselves, we shall in future stick to wage-demands—and let the public pay."

It is a natural enough reflection for the Miners to make; but no resolution, silent or spoken, could, in our opinion, be more unwise. The public, it is true, is an elementary state of mind maddeningly blind to its own interests; and if it were left to the tender mercies of its capitalist and financial favourites, nobody could say that it had not incurred its fate justly. On the other hand, even the Miners' Federation is not above reproach in the matter of accessibility to ideas regarding its own best interests; and, moreover, in the present case, we are certain that the indifference or hostility of the public is founded in good common sense. To be perfectly explicit, what, we should like to know, has the public to thank the Miners' Federation for? Even if the reduction of the price of domestic coal were to be brought about by the action of the Miners' Federation, its blessings would have largely to be discounted rather than counted. In the first place, the amount of the reduction is so inconsiderable that in the year's housekeeping of an average family the relief of the burden of the cost of living would be scarcely noticeable. How many tons of coal does an ordinary working-class family consume annually? Two or three? But the saving of two or three times 14s. 2d. a year is not a great deal to be thankful for, and certainly is not sufficient reward for months of the threat of a General Strike. In the second place, the Miners' Federation has never succeeded in convincing the public that a reduction in the price of coal will not immediately be followed by a corresponding rise in the price of other commodities. The Government has said that the 66 millions of surplus profits made on exported coal, which the Miners kindly offered to divide between themselves and the public, is earmarked for the repayment of the Floating Debt: and that if the amount is not forthcoming from the surplus profits of coal, it must be collected by additional taxation. Would the Miners contend that the additional taxation would not ultimately fall upon the consumer, upon the very consumer who had, ex hypothesi, been relieved of the tax on coal? And if the usual argument of Labour is correct that ultimately all taxation falls upon the consumer, upon the very consumer who had, ex hypothesi, been relieved of the tax on coal? What can Mr. Smillie and Mr. Hodges say when they take their next trip to Geneva to confer with their confreres in the poverty-stricken countries of Europe? How can they sit at the same table with their victims and know that their own organisation has
pocketed 27 millions of economic blackmail levied on starving nations to whom Providence has denied the blessings of coal? To excuse themselves on the ground that, if the Miners do not get it, the British Government will, is the familiar procedure of the unprincipled in all walk of life; to draw, if the sole justification of a claim for higher wages or reduced prices is the existence of a "surplus" derived from export, nothing more is needed to invalidate the claim than such a foreign competition as would cut surplus profits down to little or nothing. How would the cost of the increased wages or reduced prices then be met? If the foreigner could not be made to pay, the Miners would have—on their own argument, that is to say—no option but either to accept a reduction of wages or to insist that the home consumer should again foot the bill.

But we can carry the matter a stage further. Over and above the objection to the making of the foreigner pay for our increased wages or reduced prices that convinces us that the Miners are at fault in their present policy, there is the objection to their general assumption that the only increased wages or reduced prices that can be drawn is the "surplus" or profits of output of any given industry. That is really the economic fallacy at the root of almost all of our current Labour dispute. Assuming, for example, that the product is valued at 100, the dispute takes the form of questioning whether Capital has a "right" to 10 or 20, while Labour takes only 90 or 80 in the form of wages; and if, as does sometimes occur, Capital "declares" a "dividends" of more than the arbitrary amount of, let us say, 10 per cent., Labour instantly declares that there is a surplus profit that might be equally drawn upon for increased wages. Shall we be paradoxical and say that, in fact, the mere creature of our bondholders, and that "Parliament has decided" (in the words of Sir Robert Horne) that prices shall remain as they are—or rise still farther as the case may be. But if the Miners' attempt to reduce prices is "unconstitutional," credit must at least be given them for the wish expressed; and since, moreover, for a very long time the Parliament has explicitly claimed to be the final arbiter of prices, the public has now been directed to the authoritative source of the high cost of living. Once the present abortive attempt of the Miners to act in the public interest is abandoned, therefore, the way is clear for a public appeal to the constitutional and self-avowed authority; and it should go hard with even an English Parliament if the winter is suffered without, at least, a public remonstrance. Melodrama need not be called in to our aid to describe the conditions that are likely to prevail in this country during the coming winter. Unemployment is certain to continue to increase, and we shall not be far wrong in our estimate that by the early spring at least 10 per cent. of the working population (the population that depends for its life upon finding employment) will be half-starving or living upon charitable doles of one sort or another. It is a newspaper lie that the level of prices is on the decline or that it will decline within a measurable period. Prices have risen, are rising, and will continue to rise, the issue of bank-credits being unabated and unaccountable. Further than this, it is a mathematical certainty that our "foreign trade" in terms of consumable goods actually imported into this country against goods exported will begin to decline still further, with the inevitable effect of impoverishing the country as regards both "work" and goods. It is inconceivable that such a state of affairs can come and remain without provoking even our public to some protest of a less mild character than a shrug of the shoulders or a stone at "Labour." And when it is remembered, as it may be, that the Government by loud claim is the sovereign controller of prices, the protest may possibly take the form of demanding nothing less than a Royal Commission.

The notorious Report on the Cause and Cure of High Prices, drawn up by the ingenious Mr. Greenwood and his friends, Mr. McKenna and Professor Pigou, and ignominiously subscribed and issued in the name of Labour production that does not take the form of output, but remains only as potential Production or Real Credit—who gets that, the value of which is at least 4 times the value of the mere output?—then indeed we are embarked on a fruitful quest. So long as "output" alone, in terms of surplus profits, dividends or what not, is regarded by Labour as the only fund for increased wages or reduced prices, so long will Labour be always in necessary antagonism to the other parties to industry, since it will not be able to increase its wages except by raising prices or (with much more difficulty) reducing profits. On the other hand, if Labour likes to direct its attention from "output" to the "means to output," from apples to orchards, from golden eggs to the geese that lay them, there is literally no reason why wages should not rise (or prices fall—which is the same thing) pari passu with the increase not of "output" alone, but of our total national capacity to produce. And it is because the Miners' Federation has not yet learned this truth that its present policy is as certain to be unsuccessful as its success would certainly come to misdirect the Labour movement for another decade.

If the public has, as yet, nothing to thank the Miners' Federation for, it owe this nothingness to their claims to the Government. The statement has been repeated until even Labour must have observed it, that the delicate operation of price-fixing is a sovereign function of Parliament [acting nominally in the public interest, but actually in the interests of Finance, since the Government is, in fact, the mere creature of its big stockholders] and that "Parliament has decided" (in the words of Sir Robert Horne) that prices shall remain as they are—or rise still farther as the case may be. But if the Miners' attempt to reduce prices is "unconstitutional," credit must at least be given them for the wish expressed; and since, moreover, for a very long time the Parliament has explicitly claimed to be the final arbiter of prices, the public has now been directed to the authoritative source of the high cost of living. Once the present abortive attempt of the Miners to act in the public interest is abandoned, therefore, the way is clear for a public appeal to the constitutional and self-avowed authority; and it should go hard with even an English Parliament if the winter is suffered without, at least, a public remonstrance. Melodrama need not be called in to our aid to describe the conditions that are likely to prevail in this country during the coming winter. Unemployment is certain to continue to increase, and we shall not be far wrong in our estimate that by the early spring at least 10 per cent. of the working population (the population that depends for its life upon finding employment) will be half-starving or living upon charitable doles of one sort or another. It is a newspaper lie that the level of prices is on the decline or that it will decline within a measurable period. Prices have risen, are rising, and will continue to rise, the issue of bank-credits being unabated and unaccountable. Further than this, it is a mathematical certainty that our "foreign trade" in terms of consumable goods actually imported into this country against goods exported will begin to decline still further, with the inevitable effect of impoverishing the country as regards both "work" and goods. It is inconceivable that such a state of affairs can come and remain without provoking even our public to some protest of a less mild character than a shrug of the shoulders or a stone at "Labour." And when it is remembered, as it may be, that the Government by loud claim is the sovereign controller of prices, the protest may possibly take the form of demanding nothing less than a Royal Commission.

The notorious Report on the Cause and Cure of High Prices, drawn up by the ingenious Mr. Greenwood and his friends, Mr. McKenna and Professor Pigou, and ignominiously subscribed and issued in the name of Labour production that does not take the form of output, but remains only as potential Production or Real Credit—who gets that, the value of which is at least 4 times the value of the mere output?—then indeed we are embarked on a fruitful quest. So long as "output" alone, in terms of surplus profits, dividends or what not, is regarded by Labour as the only fund for increased wages or reduced prices, so long will Labour be always in necessary antagonism to the other parties to industry, since it will not be able to increase its wages except by raising prices or (with much more difficulty) reducing profits. On the other hand, if Labour likes to direct its attention from "output" to the "means to output," from apples to orchards, from golden eggs to the geese that lay them, there is literally no reason why wages should not rise (or prices fall—which is the same thing) pari passu with the increase not of "output" alone, but of our total national capacity to produce. And it is because the Miners' Federation has not yet learned this truth that its present policy is as certain to be unsuccessful as its success would certainly come to misdirect the Labour movement for another decade.

If the public has, as yet, nothing to thank the Miners' Federation for, it owe this nothingness to their claims to the Government. The statement has been repeated until even Labour must have observed it, that the delicate operation of price-fixing is a sovereign function of Parliament [acting nominally in the public interest, but actually in the interests of Finance, since the Government is, in fact, the mere creature of its big stockholders] and that "Parliament has decided" (in the words of Sir Robert Horne) that prices shall remain as they are—or rise still farther as the case may be. But if the Miners' attempt to reduce prices is "unconstitutional," credit must at least be given them for the wish expressed; and since, moreover, for a very long time the Parliament has explicitly claimed to be the final arbiter of prices, the public has now been directed to the authoritative source of the high cost of living. Once the present abortive attempt of the Miners to act in the public interest is abandoned, therefore, the way is clear for a public appeal to the constitutional and self-avowed authority; and it should go hard with even an English Parliament if the winter is suffered without, at least, a public remonstrance. Melodrama need not be called in to our aid to describe the conditions that are likely to prevail in this country during the coming winter. Unemployment is certain to continue to increase, and we shall not be far wrong in our estimate that by the early spring at least 10 per cent. of the working population (the population that depends for its life upon finding employment) will be half-starving or living upon charitable doles of one sort or another. It is a newspaper lie that the level of prices is on the decline or that it will decline within a measurable period. Prices have risen, are rising, and will continue to rise, the issue of bank-credits being unabated and unaccountable. Further than this, it is a mathematical certainty that our "foreign trade" in terms of consumable goods actually imported into this country against goods exported will begin to decline still further, with the inevitable effect of impoverishing the country as regards both "work" and goods. It is inconceivable that such a state of affairs can come and remain without provoking even our public to some protest of a less mild character than a shrug of the shoulders or a stone at "Labour." And when it is remembered, as it may be, that the Government by loud claim is the sovereign controller of prices, the protest may possibly take the form of demanding nothing less than a Royal Commission.

The notorious Report on the Cause and Cure of High Prices, drawn up by the ingenious Mr. Greenwood and his friends, Mr. McKenna and Professor Pigou, and ignominiously subscribed and issued in the name of Labour
by the select intellectuals of the Labour movement, has not been long in being put to the use for which it was designed. Twice in the course of his interview with the Miners' Federation, Sir Robert Horne took the opportunity of turning their own Report upon them; and on each occasion, though we fear that Mr. Hodges was too busy to see it, with deadly effect. "I do not think," said Sir Robert Horne, with Mr. Greenwood's Report in his hand, "that we disagree . . . upon the question of prices and the cost of living." "You agree"—we paraphrase the rest—"that the Floating Debt must be wiped out either by taxation or by 'windfalls'—and that," he triumphantly concluded, "is what we are proposing to do with the 'surplus' profit on exported coal." Hoist with their own petard! We should like to know in fact, what honest answer Mr. Hodges, as signatory of Mr. Greenwood's Report, can make to Sir Robert Horne. The recommendation having been made officially by Labour that the Floating Debt must be wiped out as a prior condition of a reduced cost of living, Mr. Hodges cannot fairly object that the demand of the Miners is an exception to the general rule. Mr. Greenwood, if not Sir Robert Horne, will be present to inform him that, on the assumption to which his name is subscribed, the demand of the Miners is contrary to the economic recommendations of the Labour movement. Either the Report is wrong or the Miners' demand is wrong. Labour cannot run with Mr. Greenwood and hunt with Mr. Smith; that is to say, the economic recommendations of Mr. Greenwood, we find both wrong, and both wilfully wrong. Mr. Greenwood, however, has the excuse that he is a Professor of Economics. For Mr. Hodges to be wrong is a matter of life and death to thousands of his mining constituents, for whom, unfortunately, he has had no time to think.

There will, we believe, be time to think as well as every inducement in the days immediately before us. They are such as will try the heads as well as the hearts of men. Russia has seen Red in an agony of distress; Italy, more intelligent, has attempted the establishment by 'direct action' of (why should we not say it?) National Guilds. Signor Giolitti, under the pressure of the fait accompli, has become our disciple, and has invited the Italian capitalists to share control with Italian Labour. But we must warn Italian Labour nevertheless to take care; Signor Giolitti is a financier and a politician. The Italian economist has observed that financial control is not inherent in administration, and that both Labour and the consumer may find the nest of industry empty, the "Credit" having flown away. Without the control of Credit by the Consumer through the Producer, industry inevitably remains "capitalist." The example, however, is attractive; and it is not impossible that something of the kind will be tried in this country, even in this England of ours. Lord Weir complains in the "Times" that Labour has hitherto done nothing for industry but try to overturn it. The complaint is just, even though it comes ill from a member of a class that has done nothing to show Labour the way to keep industry on its social legs. But the complaint, we believe, will not be just much longer. The lessons of the present strike cannot be lost even upon Mr. Hodges. We shall do better than Russia, and better than Italy. We know the way.

If Winter lays my garden bare, My fire will bloom in roses, By ancient suns renaissance there Which coal or wood encloses.

And wood will tell of seasons lost, Of Autumn ripe and golden; But coal will tell of ages past, By no man's eyes behelden.

S. Andrey Peyre.

World Affairs.

In one of their annual migrations to Europe it is said that the swallows alit for a rest on the familiar telegraph wires of a certain province in Southern France only to find that these had been charged with a mysterious force and that thousands of their numbers were doomed to a cruel death. In the following year, we are told, not a swallow on its way north rested for a moment in the fatal province. Not only, it appears, has the group-soul of the swallow-tribe a heart to feel an injury inflicted on its organic members, but intelligence to learn by bitter experience. Thus it is that even the lower kingdom learns and progresses. The group-soul or group-mind of the species that inhabits Europe appears, however, to be less solicitous for its members, or less intelligent to profit by bitter experience. In the recent civil war—"for civil war it was—lakes of the noblest blood that ever flowed in human veins were poured out in the great sacrifice, and millions upon millions of the finest lives the world-soul has ever created were destroyed as if they had been no more than locusts or ants. Every day the European Press publishes columns of "In Memoriam" notices witnessing to the loving memory in which these sacri-
ficial heroes continue to be held by their immediate friends and relatives; but of public grief and remembrance, of national and European consciousness of the guilt and sacrifice of the Great War, there has as yet been little evidence save the few impressive moments of the English national requiem. Not only has Europe, as the conscious mind of the world-process, held no requiem for the dead, made no solemn commemoration of the tragedy of spilled blood, but neither France nor Germany, the two chief Continental protagonists of the tragedy, shows any sign of having learned anything by the war. There has been no "repentance" in Germany approximating to German guilt; and France appears to be engaged in continuing the war as if it had never been fought and won.

It was forgivable that while the war was in progress the various parties should have failed to realise its deepest significance. The tremendous tides of instinct that were then flowing could scarcely be expected to become articulate in human consciousness immediately and only the barest guesses at the truth were, in fact, attainable. We had them in the phrases a "war for Culture," a "war for Civilisation," a "war for Liberty, for Democracy, for Truth, for Progress"—phrases obviously "thrown at" a mark so remote from clear consciousness that only direction was indicated by them. On the other hand, we had the guesses of men like Lenin that the war was a "war for Capitalism," a war for commercial Conquest and for the completion of the economic subjection of Labour to Capitalism, a war for the enslavement of the masses to the few who control the economic machine. That both of these guesses had a foundation in fact must be admitted by every impartial judge. If it was not "idealistic nonsense" to claim that the war was a Capitalist war, neither was it inadmissible to claim that the war was a Capitalist war. Both guesses were equally admissible on the evidence to claim that the war was a Capitalist war. Both guesses were equally admissible on the evidence, and only time and the use made of the war by the various parties should have failed to realise its deepest significance. We had them in the phrases a "war for Culture," a "war for Civilisation," a "war for Liberty, for Democracy, for Truth, for Progress"—phrases obviously "thrown at" a mark so remote from clear consciousness that only direction was indicated by them. On the other hand, we had the guesses of men like Lenin that the war was a "war for Capitalism," a war for commercial Conquest and for the completion of the economic subjection of Labour to Capitalism, a war for the enslavement of the masses to the few who control the economic machine. That both of these guesses had a foundation in fact must be admitted by every impartial judge. If it was not "idealistic nonsense" to claim that the war was a Capitalist war.
on the evidence of those two years it would be possible to affirm that Lenin has been justified; the state of Europe at this moment shows little but confirmation of his most cynical guesses. But the end is not yet; the final decision has not yet been made; and Europe may still prove to have been saved and not finally destroyed by her sacrifices.

Before, however, considering what Europe must do to be saved, it is necessary to understand how the unconscious soul of Europe desired to effect by means of the war. Wars, we believe, are always psychological in origin; they reveal a stress, an unresolved conflict, in the group-mind and, finally, in the world-mind, which can find no better means of resolution into a synthesis than war. From this point of view, we have to ask what were the stresses in Europe before civil war broke out, and how the war itself both revealed and made their reconciliation possible. We have not far to look for a reply, since it is indicated in the historic circumstances surrounding and preceding the outbreak of war. Serbia versus Austria, and Germany versus France and England—these, it is plain, were the lines of conflict; and if we add that the demand of Russia to enter into European consciousness and to become one with Europe was the precipitant of the physical struggle, the significance of the war becomes apparent: it was no less than an attempt at a new and greater European synthesis.

Ever since Jove, in the mythical form of a Bull, brought about a fusion of races in the consciousness of Europa, the impulse of Europe has been towards an ever and ever more inclusive synthesis. Differing from the rest of the races in mankind, Europa has always generated its own opposites and always with a view to their reconciliation in a higher synthesis. Differences culminating in contrasts and contradictions have been instinctively cultivated in the European mind from time immemorial, so that if we look at any period in European history and in any province of thought, always we discover, ranged against each other, great men and great movements of antibhletic character, mentality and direction. Mysticism and Rationalism, Religion and Science, Naturalism and Art, Empire and Commonwealth—these are only a few of the contradictions always manifested in Europe; and so far is this constant stress from being a fault in the European mind that it may be regarded as the European quality par excellence, the proof that Europe is the epitome and expression; and led its exponents to elevate Siegfried, the Aryan, and his achievement of life, to a world-soul. But these stresses must be maintained in relative equilibrium, in a constant synthesis, if they are not to result in destruction; and side by side with the development of these pairs of opposites in the European mind, history shows successive attempts at European synthesis, each instinctively directed to including more and more of the total European mind. The Roman Empire, the Empire of Charlemagne, the Holy Roman Empire, down to the attempt of Napoleon to make Europe of one polity and one language are nothing more than a succession of efforts, on the part of the European group-mind, to realise itself as a single organic whole. The history of Europe, psychologically regarded, is "nothing more" than the alternation of periods of analysis with periods of synthesis: periods during which opposites are cultivated and periods during which their reconciliation in a higher synthesis is attempted.

The significance of the stresses which existed before the Great Civil War is the more apparent in their resemblance to those which were the cause of the German misunderstanding. Had Germany understood that Serbia's challenge was the challenge of the Slav race to a higher European synthesis, the war need never have bedeviled Europe. Germany in spiritual unity with Serbia and Russia could have ensured the new synthesis of Europe without civil war. But the German conception of the New Europe, though Aryan in unconscious need, was purely German in conscious expression; and led its exponents to elevate Siegfried as the sole European hero, and set against the other culture-heroes of the many-sided European mind. Nevertheless, it is as an attempt at synthesis that the war must be regarded; as an attempt that has so far failed.

The momentous question still to be answered is whether the attempt is finally to fail, and the war, not only in its immediate, but in its ultimate results, to have been fought in vain. Looking back in the light of events, we can see clearly that the unconscious desire of Europe was to create a new synthesis, more perfectly Aryan and "noble" in the high European sense, more inclusive of cultural and other differences, more tolerant of contradictions, so that they were Aryan in spirit, more organically articulated in a single European ethos. And it is probable that the prophetic European soul, dreaming on things to come, was intent upon this synthesis in anticipation of the Aquarian age into which the world is now entering. Is it possible, at the eleventh hour, for passion in peace to accomplish what passions in war have so disastrously failed to accomplish? Can the unconscious purpose of Europe, to which so much blood has been sacrificed, be fulfilled by the fatal and infertile office of spirit? Can spirit conquer where blood has lost? It is certain that the League of Nations, as at present animated, is incapable of accomplishing the task. Bourgeois in conception, pedestrian in method, and merely plebiscit in aim, the present League of Nations is doomed to sterility; it can create nothing; ex nihilo nihil fit. France does not believe in it; and little more than lip-service is paid to it by any nation in the world. Yet unless the breath of life can be breathed into it, by the creative imagination of Europe, meditating on the meaning of the Great Civil War of the eleventh hour, there is no hope that the unconscious purpose of Europe will ever find fulfilment or the war its saving grace and justification. It is the eleventh hour, but only the eleventh as yet. The first full conference of the League of Nations is to be held in the "Hall of the Nations," overlooking Lake Geneva and within sight of Mont Blanc, significantly the highest peak in Europe, on November 15, four days after the second anniversary of the Armistice. A European requiem, we believe, should be offered up there; a requiem for the soldiers; and the subsequent Congress, Germany and Russia should be solemnly admitted, nay, entreated, to enter the League, for the celebration of the European family reunion. The souls of the slain would attend as joyful witnesses that they had not suffered and died in vain.

M. M. COSMO.
The Fall of Reason.

By Edward Moore.

The attempt by Canon Barnes to reconcile science and religion by shocking both has not been planned well. It has made Churchmen quarrel, and it has left scientists unmoved. A real reconciliation between science and religion has been put further away by it. And this is just. For the reconciliation which is being attempted is not an equal one: the one side lacks the courage and the other the power to decide on it. The Church, or part of it, is willing to compromise, but not to consider the matter au fond; science, on the other hand, cannot and will not compromise, and it is right. For it will not finally be married to religion by compromise but by science; it will not accomplish its human aim—if it ever does—by leaving its path, but by following it more rigorously than ever. Certainly the time for a reconciliation has not yet come; the very conditions are lacking. Meantime the solid virtue of science is its honesty, which it cannot resign.

What is it, then, that is being attempted? Not a reconciliation between science and religion, but an understanding, or rather something that appears to be part mariage de convenance, part liaison, between popular science and official Christianity. Now popular science, science as understood by the man in the street and the clergy, is physical science—it is all science except psychology. This is the monster which Canon Barnes wishes to marry to Anglicanism, the respectable and barren Pasiphae of the middle classes. But allowing that the parties to the contract are these, it is surely an affair which does not matter at all. Neither the best Churchmen nor the best scientists have approached the controversy near enough even to discuss it. But although the dispute is of no consequence, the journalism of the terms in which it has been stated certainly is.

Let us discover if we can—let us imagine, rather—what the religious spirit is. There are—to make a convenient classification—four stages in human thought. First, there is the simple perception of facts, with an anthology of rough guesses about them. These guesses are criticised, a number are discarded, only the legitimate ones are left, and from the study of these a few general laws of thought are deduced. This is the second stage: the establishment of reason. But reason, once it is set a-working, carries man far; it leads him clean out of the visible into the invisible; it discovers the world of ideas, and, true to itself, it affirms their reality. This is perhaps the most astonishing feat ever accomplished by humanity. It is, briefly, the affirmation that the invisible is real. There is, however, a still higher stage, the fourth, in which the invisible and the visible are perceived as it were in one glance and as one; in which the invisible gives the world reality and the world fulfils the invisible. "Wisdom," said Heraclitus, "is one thing. It is to know the thought by which all things are steered through all things." This state of dual yet single perception, this metaphysical "second sight," is intuition, and its expressions are various—poetry, art, religion.

Let us return to the controversy sprung upon the newspapers by Canon Barnes. It would, of course, be exorbitant to expect to find in a religious controversy a manifestation of the religious spirit, for that spirit is foreign, is almost ironical, to controversy; it does not use arguments, but it can convince without it. But it would be reasonable to expect to find a recognition of the reality of ideas. It would have been natural to anticipate that Canon Barnes would have conceived the Fall of Man as a reality or a lie—as the case might be—in the realm of ideas, and one therefore not to be confused or refuted by any theory of merely physical evolution. But he did not; and his failure to do so—his assumption that because there is possibly no evidence of an historical Fall, and because the common evidence is on the other side, therefore there was no psychological Fall—was a failure to believe in the reality of things which cannot be seen, smelt, or tasted. When the Canon deals with realities which are neither physical nor moral, he deals literally with nothing at all.

Well, then, metaphysical thought being for the time buried, the controversy is of course being conducted on the ground of pure reason? Optimism, optimism! Even that, it appears, is beyond our present capacities. Take the dogmas which Canon Barnes is reported to have laid down; they are just so many "intuitions." Uneducated people always trust the rule of thumb, that is, guessing, to be real, men begin to suspect reason itself as something too theoretical, too "intellectual." And the other half—one has only to read the replies of Churchmen to his challenge. The Church is not honest. And the other half—has only to read the replies of Churchmen to his challenge. The Church is not honest. It believes in religious ideas without believing in their reality. It is not missing! The evil began in the doubt of the reality of ideas. For when ideas are no longer believed to be real, men begin to suspect reason itself as something too theoretical, too "intellectual."
Drama,
By John Francis Hope.

A marked peculiarity of this autumn season is the import of foreign plays. I have already mentioned that the Birmingham Repertory Theatre intends to produce several Spanish plays, beginning with Echevarry's "The Cleansing Stain," which is, of course, the berlud-stain; but the Everyman Theatre opened at Hampstead with a Spanish comedy, Mr. Dennis Eadie has returned to the Royalty with another Spanish comedy, the Kingsway has opened with an adaptation of an Hungarian play, and the Grand Guignol at the Little Theatre is an imitative entertainment, its inspiration is certainly not English. The interest in Spanish drama coincides with the revival of the activity of the "Spanish prisoner"—but that is another story. The question that I am asking myself is: "What is the purport of this development? Has England not only failed to produce a dramatist, but also failed to provide subjects for drama?" A straw may show which way the wind blows, a new playwright may have significance as a portent in this connection. I cast back to Mr. L. P. Brown, whose comedy of old Persia was produced at Birmingham at the beginning of September. Mr. Brown, I know, has practically finished a play dealing with Stonehenge at the beginning of the Bronze Age; he is projecting another play dealing with ancient Assyria; apparently the only age that does not interest him is his own—for he is an Irishman.

The phenomenon is of some significance, more particularly if we set it in relation with Mr. Wells' forecast of "the development of a world-wide community," a forecast, I may say, that is solidly supported by Wundt's treatment of the development of folk-psycho-logy. The first phase of internationalism is usually a denial of patriotism; the eyes not only of the fool but of the prophet are in the ends of the earth, which probably explains why the prophet has no honour in his own country. But the fool is interested in foreign things because they are different, the prophet, because he recognises an essential similarity; the fool is always trying to lose his identity, and just as the Russians cultivated a Byronic melancholy in public, so an interest in French minor poetry, for example, reveals itself in peculiar hairdressing and fearsome clothes and boots. The minor poet faithfully reproduces in his own person the caricatures of the things he admires; but the other type, which I call the prophet, becomes more intensely himself by contact with other cultures.

The Jews, to take a famous example, did not lose but find themselves in Babylon; if they went into captivity as barbarians, as Mr. Wells declares, they came out as a nation, with a history largely born of imagination, a cosmogony that was none the worse for being stolen, and an eloquence of denunciation that only patriotism can inspire. After exploiting Babylonian culture to the extreme, they exalted themselves as "the chosen people," and became at least a leaven among the peoples that has by no means ceased fermenting.

Can we hope for any similar result from our acquaintance with, say, the Spanish drama? I think not. If the Restoration comedians, with all their wit, could not acclimatise French comedy, could not make it palatable by introducing a bycicle, the hack-translators of Spanish melodrama and comedy are not likely to succeed. For drama, like all art, is born of inspiration, not of curiosity; we may go to France or to Spain, to Russia or Japan, to Persia or to Pettencairn Lane, but unless we discover there something that is in our hearts, which helps us to "become what we are," we might as well take a Cook's tour. Exotics are for the otiose; art lives by what it produces, not by what it imports; and the present trend of drama can only appeal to a nation of quidnuncs like the Athenians, who 'spent their time in nothing else, but either to tell or to hear some new thing.' It is possible to argue that an imported drama is, in the most literal sense, representative of a people that lives mainly on imports; but the subject is fitter for a didactic satire of a people decadent enough to live on tribute than for a justification of the import merchants of drama.

But if we turn from the imported plays to such a phenomenon as Mr. L. P. Brown, we are still, like St. Paul's Epicureans, desirous "to know what these things mean." Why should a man turn to ancient Assyria, or old Persia, or Stonehenge, for a subject when all around him are things that he knows that need interpreting? Have these places any superior dramatic or imaginative value; "are not Abana and Pharpar, rivers of Damascus, better than all the waters of Israel?" asks the Nationalist. If we look at it from the purely artistic point of view, an artist, when he chooses a period, assumes an obligation to interpret that period. Shakespeare, giving a sea-coast to Bohemia and a billiard table to Cleopatra, and so forth, treated his obligation in a cavalier manner; but his interest in Elizabethan human nature and his poetical and prophetic interpretation of it in universal terms, provided other than an archaeological interest. If he could not give us Antony and Cleopatra, he did give us Shakespeare; just as Shaw, with more claims to historical accuracy, gives us St. Paul's Epicureans, as much the intellect as Shakespeare was the emotional genius of the English-speaking race, and of some others. Their success in translation is indicative of more than local relevance.

One can perceive in the variety of Mr. Brown's subjects chiefly an intellectual curiosity; the subjects do not grip him, he grips them, imposes on them a tradi-

import of foreign plays.
Readers and Writers.

Various attempts have been made from time to time to "render" the New Testament into colloquial English in order to bring one of these, New may congratulate ourselves, has so far been more than a nine days' sensation; and even less than that length of life is destined, I believe, for the latest attempt, "Sayings and Stories," a translation into "colloquial English" of the Sermon on the Mount and some Parables. The New Testament of Professor A. P. Sinnett's translation was written to pass a candid judgment on its quality as a Greek style; but it is perfectly certain to me that, if the aim of the original writers was the grand style—simple as it must have been—whether they achieved it or not, it is indubitably achieved in the colloquial English of Mr. Hoare, I unhesitatingly say that the English of the authorised translation is nearer to the spirit of the original than the present translation, and, in that sense, more fully faithful to the intentions of the original authors.

It would be tedious to cite more than one example; and I will take it in the very first sentence of Mr. Hoare's translation. What joy, he says, "for those with the poor man's feelings! Heaven's Empire is for them," the authorised translator, of which is too familiar to need quotation. To begin with, I do not see what is gained (setting aside, for a moment, the cost) by the substitution of the exclamatory "What joy, etc., etc." by the ecstatic "Blessed are the poor!" Why again "the poor man," and, after that, the "poor man's feelings"? Why also "Heaven's Empire" instead of the "Kingdom of Heaven"; and why "is for them" instead of "thems is"? The gain, even literally, is imperceptible; and in cost I estimate that a world of meaning has been sacrificed. I have already suggested that "blessed" is an incomparably more spiritual word than "joy"—in English, at any rate, whatever their respective originals may indicate; and to my mind there is also a plane of difference between an incontinent ejaculation such as "What joy," which resembles "What fun," and has in view rather a prospect than a fact—and the serene and confident utterance of an assured truth. Further, and again without regard to the literal original, I am certain that a "poor man's feelings" is miles away from the intention of the original authors, since I have ascribed to this association of common social surroundings, social reform and what not. Was this the intention of the Sermon on the Mount, the very location of which symbolised a state of mind above that of the dwellers in the plain of common life? Was it a socialist or communist discourse? Is "poor man's feelings," in our English colloquial sense, is utterly out of place; and the original must have meant something symbolically different. The substitution, again, of "Heaven's Empire" for the "Kingdom of Heaven" may be, as Professor Dodd assures us, a more correct literal translation than the original phrase; but only a literary barbarian can contemplate it without grieving over the lost worlds of meaning. What is the prospect of an "Empire," even Heaven's Empire, to us to-day? As certainly as the phrase "Kingdom of Heaven" has come to mean, in English, a state of boodice, the reverberation of an exclaiming phrase, the decline of that state to one of outward pomp and circumstance. In other words, the spiritual meaning which must have characterised the intention of the Sermon on the Mount is completely sacrificed in the substitution of Empire for Kingdom. Much more might be said even about this single example of our author's method; but, perhps, the best course is to leave it without further attention. The volume is published by the "Congregational Union of England and Wales" and it serves to indicate the depths to which Nonconformist taste can sink. We only need now this version in "colloquial English" in the "nu spelling" to touch bottom.

Mr. A. P. Sinnett, the author of "Esoteric Buddhism," and one of the foster-parents of the Theosophical Society, has now published a little work (I think that phrase is in which much of these, New may not, since, after all, it is not party to what is described by the conscientious writer that of an "Empire," even Heaven's Empire, to us to-day? As certainly as the phrase "Kingdom of Heaven" has come to mean, in English, a state of boodice, the reverberation of an exclaiming phrase, the decline of that state to one of outward pomp and circumstance. In other words, the spiritual meaning which must have characterised the intention of the Sermon on the Mount is completely sacrificed in the substitution of Empire for Kingdom. Much more might be said even about this single example of our author's method; but, perhps, the best course is to leave it without further attention. The volume is published by the "Congregational Union of England and Wales" and it serves to indicate the depths to which Nonconformist taste can sink. We only need now this version in "colloquial English" in the "nu spelling" to touch bottom.

R. H. C.
Into the World of Ideas.

By Denis Saurat.

The Metaphysician: Man in his present state is not capable of bearing the responsibility for his actions, which the world is perpetually throwing back upon him. The consequences of a man's actions become so complicated, so subtle and so far-reaching that the present mind of man cannot grasp them, nor his present nature bear the load of them. Therefore, immortality, which responsibility demands, and without which the world could not continue, cannot be the immortality of the physical being, which would be totally inadequate. Man must be raised to a power corresponding, in its complexity, subtlety and scope, to the power of the consequences of his acts. Each moment in a man, each wave of desire which has caused some action, must become separately responsible for it, because of the complex contradictions between the innumerable moments. Therefore the necessary and unavoidable responsibility of man demands his subdivision into Ideas, which, being so much the more subtle, intricate, mobile, and far spread, will alone be able to cope effectively with the consequences of a man's life, and so enable the world's course to go on.

The Poet: On resurrection: Once a desire has disappeared its co-desires need it for their own existence, which has been built upon it. They will recreate it by their appeal to the general Potential—recreate it, or its responsibility. Thus a fall, being gone through a period of fictitious existence. He lives only in the memory of the world. Other Being can still build upon him without his actual presence, but it is on condition that, sooner or later, he will reappear to take up his responsibilities. Thus, on waking up, we find ourselves confronted with all that the others have done in reference to us during our sleep. So perhaps a being may reappear sooner or later, according to his importance referred to us during our sleep. So perhaps a being will reappear sooner or later, according to his importance to others. Thus resurrection becomes, through the accumulating need the world has of a being after its ideas, as the universe now appears to us. Our desires, our atmosphere is clear. When it is disturbed by the influence, as an enigma, points shining in the night, when our atmosphere is clear. When it is disturbed by the agitations of this earth, we will not even see them. We, the Earth, have parted from them. Thus at death shall fall into nothingness: resolved into Ideas, perfected. But all existence in the fallen state, sleep or death, is outside time. Millions of centuries will be as a night's sleep. Then the ideal world will arise all together. Judge by our time, its existence will be short. Seen from the inside, it will be complete.

The Poet: That is the Resurrection of the Dead, which is an awakening. From the moment of death until the resurrection there is no consciousness. All the dead are dead indeed: no ideal existence can coincide with the material world. Only at the end of the world is the Resurrection of the Dead.

On Earth as in Heaven.*

The central point in "A Guildsman's Interpretation of History," which is, if I am not mistaken, Mr. Penty's masterpiece, is his attack on Roman Law. Mr. Penty accuses Roman Law of having destroyed the Christian organisation of human societies which the Church, with her canon law, and the barbarians, with their common law, had elaborated during the Middle Ages. Why was the promise of the thirteenth century not fulfilled: St. Dominic, St. Francis, St. Thomas, the Guilds, the Gothic Cathedrals, the Universities, the primacy of spiritual power? According to Mr. Penty, because Roman Law, revived by the lawyers, induced the promaster-craftsmen of Guilds to forget their duties towards their workmen and the public, and to become mere masters in the actual sense of the word; it persuaded the feudal lords to abandon their duties towards their serfs and freeholders and to become mere landowners; and it led the princes to emancipate themselves from the Emperor and the Pope and thus was restored the Roman concept of sovereignty which even to-day has made the League of Nations impossible. By means of these two apples, of property and sovereignty, dominium and imperium, the legal Serpent brought about the fall of medieval society. "The Prince of the Devil," Heine called the Codex of the Roman Civil Law.

Had the natural course of events not been interrupted, Canon law and Common law would have
A Practical Scheme for the Establishment of Economic and Industrial Democracy.

THE (MINING) SCHEME.

[The following exemplary Scheme, drawn up for special application to the Mining Industry, is designed to enable a transition to be effected from the present state of industrial chaos to a state of economic democracy, with the minimum amount of friction and the maximum results in the general well-being. An explanatory commentary on the Scheme, clause by clause, appears below.]

DRAFT SCHEME.

(1) For the purpose of efficient operation each geological mining area shall be considered as autonomous administratively.

(2) In each of these areas a branch of a Bank, to be formed by the M.F.G.B., shall be established, hereinafter referred to as the Producers' Bank. The Government shall recognise this Bank as an integral part of the mining industry regarded as a producer of wealth, and representing its credit. It shall ensure its affiliation with the Clearing House.

(3) The shareholders of the Bank shall consist of all persons engaged in the Mining Industry, ex-officio, whose accounts are kept by the Bank. Each shareholder shall be entitled to one vote at a shareholders' meeting.

(4) The Bank as such shall pay no dividend.

(5) The capital already invested in the Mining properties and plant shall be entitled to a fixed return of, say, 8 per cent., and, together with all fresh capital, shall continue to carry with it all the ordinary privileges of capital administration other than Price-fixing.

(6) The Boards of Directors shall make all payments of wages and salaries direct to the Producers' Bank in bulk.

(7) In the case of a reduction in cost of working, one half of such reduction shall be dealt with in the National Credit Account, one quarter shall be credited to the Colliery owners, and one quarter to the Producers' Bank.

(8) From the setting to work of the Producers' Bank all subsequent expenditure on capital account shall be financed jointly by the Colliery owners and the Producers' Bank, in the ratio of the total capital expended on the total wages and salaries. The benefits of such financing done by the Producers' Bank shall accrue to the depositors.

II.

(1) The Government shall require from the Colliery owners a quarterly (half-yearly or yearly) statement properly kept and audited of the cost of production, including all dividends and bonuses.

(2) On the basis of this ascertainment Cost, the Government shall be bound by statute cause the Price of domestic coal to be regulated at a percentage of the ascertained Cost.

(3) This Price (of domestic coal) shall bear the same ratio to Cost as the total National Consumption of all descriptions of commodities does to the total National Production of Credit, i.e.,

\[
\text{Price per ton} \times \text{Consumption} = \text{Production}
\]

(4) Industrial coal shall be debited to users at Cost plus a agreed percentage.

(5) The Price of coal for export shall be fixed from day to day in relation to the world-market and in the general interest.

(6) The Government shall reimburse to the Colliery owners the difference between their total Cost incurred and their total Price received, by means of Treasury Notes, such notes being debited as now, to the National Credit Account.
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blended in a lasting synthesis. They are not incompatible, but complementary. The Common law was the natural expression among the barbarians of military, aristocratic and communist societies, in which the men owed loyalty to the leaders and the leaders military protection to the men and devotion to the common interests of the tribe. Canon law, based on the supposition that all justice proceeds from God, looked upon the rulership as a functionary whose performance were conditioned by the fulfillment of his duties. In both cases the common good was the object of the laws. "Laws have been made," said Fuero Juzgo, "to enable good men to live among bad." But Roman law set itself, Mr. Penty tells us, to enable rich men to live among the poor. It was not the common good, but only to avoid disputes among neighbours by granting to them absolute property in the lands they cultivated, and by establishing a supreme power in order to bring about the fulfillment of contracts.

It was in vain that the Church repeatedly condemned Roman law. In 1129 Pope Alexander III forbade the monks to study the Justinian Codex. In 1219 Pope Honorius III extended the prohibition to all priests; and in 1220, to the laity of the Paris University. In 1254 Pope Innocent IV extended the prohibition to France, England, Holland, Spain and Italy. But Roman law prevailed because it promoted the interests of the princes and great lords, and although the English imagine themselves to be ruled by the Common law and not by the Roman, and it is possible to justify their belief historically, the truth is that the concepts of Roman law have taken possession of Common law, and that Roman law is to-day in England, as it has been always and everywhere, the bulwark of private interests against the common interest. And what chiefly moved the lawyers of the Middle Ages to revive Roman law, is the horror of creative thought which in all times has made men in general and lawyers in particular prefer the work of compilation, gloss and translation to that of directly confronting problems and solving them originally.

We now live in societies contradictorily ruled by a religious principle, which orders us to love our neighbours as ourselves, and by a juridical principle, which authorises us (and in this case authorisation is virtually a command) to buy in the cheapest market and to sell in the dearest. The social question may be defined as the contradiction that exists between our religious and our legal norms. The revolutionary would like to resolve the contradiction by the simultaneous abolition of both norms, and by the establishment by violence of the communist principle in society. This might appear plausible to those who have not grasped the fact that a communist society cannot last unless it is based on a principle of love for our neighbours, and that the principle of love is not natural, but supernatural, for there is nothing in our nature that makes us love our neighbour as ourselves. The contradiction might also be resolved by upholding the juridical norm where necessary, against the religious; and this is the real desire of those who advocate the crushing by violence of all effective protest against the prevalence of Roman law. For I am certain that there are many more partisans of the restoration of pagan slavery than those who are prepared to profess it publicly. But it is also possible to resolve the contradiction that lies at the root of our unrest by adjusting the juridical norm to the Christian precept; and it is this that Mr. Penty aims at in his criticism of Roman law and his defence of Mediaeval law. I need not add that I agree with Mr. Penty, because I already saw that the way to transform law satisfactorily consists in submitting the principles of sovereignty and property, of imperium and dominium, of authority and liberty, to the superior principle of function, and that the function of man is to maintain and increase on earth the good things of heaven.
COMMENTARY.

I. (7) In the case of a reduction in cost of working, one half of such reduction shall be dealt with in the National Credit Account, one quarter shall be credited to the Colliery owners, and one quarter to the Producers' Bank.

A reduction in the cost of working is equivalent to an increase of Real Credit, being, as it is, an increase in the ability to produce as and when and where required. An illustration will make this point clear; and that the cost of producing a million tons of coal this year were reduced by one half next year, the Real Credit of the Mining Industry would be exactly doubled, in other words, the ability to produce coals would be twice what it had been. Such reduction of cost, however, is never the sole unsaid work of either the community, the owners of the capital, or the workmen. No invention or improvement in cost-saving springs fully developed in any one brain or in the community at large; but it presumes the existence of communal facilities, of the facilities afforded by existing capital and of the education and skill of the workmen. In a word, to every invention of cost-saving there have been contributed elements drawn from the community, from Capital and from Labour. The present clause recognises this undoubted fact and in a practical manner distributes the increased credit more or less proportionately among the factors to which it is due; to the community as represented by the National Credit Account, one half; to the Mining Directorate (which, it will be remembered, tends under the Scheme to become identical with the M.F.G.B.), one quarter; and to the Producers' Bank, representative of the M.F.G.B., the remaining quarter. To return to the foregoing illustration, a reduction of 50 per cent. in cost enabling, let us say, two million tons of coal to be produced at the former cost of one million, and reckoning the former cost as £1 per ton, would involve the distribution amongst the three parties of the cost saved. The National Credit Account would be credited with half a million pounds, and each of the other two accounts with a quarter of a million. The question where the money would come from is irrelevant; the increased Financial Credit would be the simple reflection of the increased Real Credit resulting from the increased ability to produce coal. It need scarcely be pointed out that the inducement to reduce costs is part and parcel of the present scheme. One of the fundamental principles, indeed, of the whole Scheme is the economy of energy, which, in the positive sense, is the increase of Real Credit. The community, the capitalist and the workman are each offered an inducement to economise energy; in other words, to produce as much as possible at the smallest possible cost, a proceeding in direct antithesis to the existing state of affairs.

I. (8) From the setting to work of the Producers' Bank all subsequent expenditure on capital account shall be financed jointly by the Colliery owners and the Producers' Bank, in the ratio which the total dividends bear to the total wages and salaries. The benefits of such financing done by the Producers' Bank shall accrue to the depositors.

We have seen from Clause I. (2) that the Producers' Bank represents that part of the Real Credit of the Mining Industry which rightly belongs to the Labour (wage and salaried) represented by the M.F.G.B. The Colliery owners or Directorate of the Capital of the Mining Industry have their own means of obtaining credit. The present Clause proposes that all future Capital expenditure shall be jointly subscribed by the Producers' Bank and the Colliery owners in a certain proportion, the proportion, in fact, which their respective contributions to the Real Credit of the Mining Industry bear to one another as measured in terms of their respective costs. It is understood that in the Mining Industry the allocation of costs between the direct producers and the owners of the Capital is, roughly 9 to 1. In other words, if 100 million pounds be the annual cost of producing our coal, 10 million pounds is the cost of Capital, and 90 million pounds is the Cost of Labour. It will be remembered that Costs are issues of Credit. Assuming that these issues of Credit are properly distributed, it follows in regard to the Real Credit of the industry the proportions are the same; and that the ratio of 9 to 1 is a correct representation of the relative contributions of Labour and Capital. For reasons already explained (I. (5)) it is not proposed to make a retrospective real-allocation of the existing Capital; but, on the other hand, a term is set to the existing monopoly of credit by only one of its factors. All future expenditure on Capital account; in other words, all fresh Capital required in the Mining Industry is to be subscribed in the proportions named by the two parties, and is to be held and exercised by them with all the rights and privileges attached. Let us suppose, for instance, that following upon the creation of the Producers' Bank representative of the Real Credit for which the M.F.G.B. are responsible, a Directorate decides that a Capital expenditure of £100,000 is needed in order to open up a new mine or to develop an old one. The proposal is considered by the Producers' Bank and any banks representing other Capital interests, and, if passed, proceeds to be dealt with as follows. The proportion of Wages and Salaries to Dividends being, we will suppose, 9 to 1, the Capital expenditure of £100,000 falls to be subscribed by the Producers' Bank and the Colliery owners in the amounts, respectively, of £90,000 and £10,000. The Producers' Bank thereupon issues a credit to the Directorate of £90,000 and thereby secures a corresponding share in the Capital of the industry. £90,000 worth of shares, in other words, are transferred or allotted by the Directorate to the Producers' Bank on account of the M.F.G.B., and such proportion of the "money" required as represents a correct estimate of increased rate of delivery is provided by a loan-credit which does not, of course, affect the depositors' accounts. It is perfectly clear that, in these circumstances, one of the avowed aims of Labour, namely, a share in the control of Capital, would at once be on the way to fulfilment; and without, it will be observed, either expropriating existing capital or capitalists, or in any way "abolishing" the proper privileges of capital administration in general. And, moreover, since it is notorious that in the Mining Industry, as in most other industries, considerable capital expenditure is long overdue, the Producers' Bank would not have long to wait to acquire a correspondingly considerable holding in the capital of the Mining Industry. We have been informed in fact, that within ten years or so, under the operation of the present clause, the Producers' Bank would be well in sight of the control (on behalf of the M.F.G.B.) of half the Capital of the industry. That the Colliery owners may conceive an objection to the subscription by the M.F.G.B. of nine-tenths of the new capital they require is possible and, perhaps, probable; but it cannot be said to be reasonable. Their present holding remains unimpaired together with all the privileges they do, in fact, claim for it; they are guaranteed as to the future, in which, likewise, they share in the proportion due to their holding; and their present difficulty in raising fresh capital is reduced, without any loss to themselves, to one-tenth. When we add that the social economic problem, the redressing objections mentioned may be regarded as fanciful. No practicable alternative to the Scheme exists in the minds of the irreconcilables on either side.
Views and Reviews.

DEMONS DEVICES—III.

The Webbs do not attempt the separation of political from economic power; indeed, it is clear from their Constitution* that the Guild solution does not appeal to them in its entirety. They seem willing to experiment with it in the organisation of certain industries; but the theory was always weak on the political side, and they do not attempt to reorganise the political State on an industrial basis. They argue on lines recently made familiar by Mr. G. D. H. Cole that because man is a complex being, no one principle applied logically can completely satisfy his needs. Producers' control, as represented by the Guild system, is necessarily antagonistic as a sole principle to consumer control, as represented by the Co-operative movement; and the two forms came into conflict years ago when the C.W.S. attempted to fight the Irish Agricultural Organisation Society. The Webbs, like Mr. Cole, find a place for the Co-operative movement in the Socialist Commonwealth as a distributive agency.

The Guild system tended to confuse self-government in industry with the government of the country; a legacy from the Syndicalist propaganda that is still being extended by some sections of the Labour movement, and lays them open to the charge of "Bolshevism." But the Webbs, still harping on their daughter Nationalisation, draw the line short from the Imperial Parliament not only all the Local Government Ministries, but "all the powers now vested in the Crown, not only over property as such, but also by way of taxation, including therefore the Right of Eminent Domain, so far as regards the absolute ownership of land, minerals, tidal waterways and foreshores, together with the duty of deciding when it becomes necessary to expropriate private owners, whether of estates in these properties, or of other instruments of production, with whatever compensation and under whatever conditions may be demanded; the Social Parliament, too, will also direct and control the administration of existing public services, and start any new ones that were left much scope for the "Trade Unions, organised as Guilds, to manage." There is nothing whatever, so far as I can see, to prevent the Social Parliament from administering its nationalised industries as, let us say, the County Councils now administer their tramways or the Admiralty its dockyards. The transfer of the various Ministries to the Social Parliament will presumably include their bureaucracies, with all their traditions as well as their correlated statistics; and the country will still be told what it wants, and what it must do, not by its elected representatives but by its permanent Civil servants.

For this reason, all these various schemes of representation, proportional, geographical, vocational, seem to me to be so much window-dressing. The country is, and will be, governed by its Civil Service, and all the reorganisation and re-grouping will only enlarge its sphere of operation and remove obstacles to its efficient working. The system may give us good government, but will it give us enough? In the last analysis, as Mr. Cole points out in his book, the citizen is regarded as a voter for members of Parliament, not for the heads of the Civil Service, not even for the various Acts of Parliament. It is presumed that he will be a citizen enlightened "by a full use of the essential instruments of Democracy, Measurement, and Publicity," which the Webbs much more important than "any choice between one method of voting and another"—as indeed they are; but whether he is a voter enlightened by the Civil Service or unenlightened by it, he will still be only a voter for members of Parliament, and not for the Civil Service. I stress the point because the extension of the powers of the bureaucracy will almost inevitably lead to the establishment of something similar to the droit administratif of France, although the Webbs, in a footnote, deny this. They think that the Act of Establishment of the Social Parliament "will be construed by the Courts of Justice like any other. No 'Conseil d'Etat' or other system of special tribunals applying 'administrative law' is involved. Cases would come before the ordinary Courts in the accustomed way, and be finally disposed of by whatever was the Supreme Court of Appeal. But I cannot accept the assurance of the observer again, and my trend of all governments to aggrandise their power, and to demand for themselves a status superior to the common or statute law. This trend has been obvious for years in England; Dicey says in his "Law of the Constitution": 'The last thirty years, and especially the fourteen years which have elapsed since the beginning of the twentieth century, show a very noticeable though comparatively slight approximation towards one another of what may be called the official law of England and the droit administratif of France. The extension given in the England of to-day to the duties and to the authority of State officials, or the growth of our bureaucracy, to use the expression of an able writer, has, as one would naturally expect, produced in the law governing our bureaucrats some features which faintly recall some of the characteristics which mark the droit administratif of France. Our Civil servants, indeed, are as yet not in any serious degree put beyond the control of the law Courts, but in certain instances, and notably with regard to many questions arising under the National Insurance Act, 1911, something very like judicial powers have been given to officials closely connected with the Government. And it may not be an exaggeration to say that in some directions the law of England is being 'officialised,' if the expression may be allowed, by statutes passed under the influence of socialist ideas.' But if this tendency develops under the Webbs' scheme, as most probably it will, what becomes of the ' democracy' in whose name it is advocated? The definite legal establishment of a non-elected "governing class," which is judge and jury in its own cause, does not seem a happy prescription for liberty. It is true that the Webbs specifically hand over to the Political Parliament "the protection of the liberty of the individual citizen against undue encroachments by any legislative or administrative authority, whether communal or vocational"; but with that body probably organising itself as an Imperial Federal Parliament, with a concomitant irritation of Colonial ideas of government, the individual citizen is not adequately protected. The bureaucrat at home, and the Imperialist abroad, are brothers in arms against individual liberty and common law rights; both of them are chiefly concerned with "governing the people" (for their benefit, of course), instead of teaching the people to govern themselves—and both tend to claim the privileged status of being beyond the common law. The Webbs' objections to "vocational representation" in government seem to me to be applicable to the vocation of government officials.

A. E. R.
PRESS CUTTINGS.

Financial are the mischievous feudalism of the nineteenth century. A handful of men have invented distant, seductive loans, have introduced national debts in countries happily ignorant of them, have advanced money to unsophisticated Powers on ruinous terms, and then, by appealing to small investors all over the world, got rid of the bonds. Furthermore, with the difference between the advances and the sale of the bonds, they caused a fall in the securities which they had issued, and, having sold at 80, they bought back at 10, taking advantage of the public panic. Again, with the money thus obtained, they bought up consciences, where consciences are marketable, and under the pretence of providing the country appeals to small investors all over the world, got rid of their savings, which they will never again see under their doors, and marquises act as their equerries when their service. Princes are their chamberlains, dukes open the Prater, or Unter den Linden. The shopkeepers, and everything was done to minimise the consolations of the interruption.

At the sound of a whistle the workers at Newton Street Post Office, Manchester, on Saturday, left their work to hold a twenty-minute meeting. The object was to show the workers' power, and how it may be used to the full if the Government persist in ignoring demands for a better wages standard.

Mr. F. J. Edge, Housing Commissioner for the Northern Region, has resigned his position, as, in the opinion of the Minister of Health, he is not in sympathy with the policy of the Ministry.

Mr. F. J. Edge said that he had been able to understand the changeable policy of the Ministry, the following were the principal points with which he was not in sympathy:

The reduction of the standard of housing from the standard indicated in the manual, and the apparent consequences of the interruption.

A resolution was passed drawing attention to what had taken place, and indicating that other measures would be adopted if necessary.—"Daily News."

Mr. F. J. Edge, Housing Commissioner for the Northern Region, has resigned his position, as, in the opinion of the Minister of Health, he is not in sympathy with the policy of the Ministry.

Writing to Brandon Council, Durham, yesterday, Mr. Edge said that he had been able to understand the changeable policy of the Ministry, the following were the principal points with which he was not in sympathy:

The reduction of the standard of housing from the standard indicated in the manual, and the apparent consequences of the interruption.

A resolution was passed drawing attention to what had taken place, and indicating that other measures would be adopted if necessary.—"Daily News."

Whatever hopes may be centred in the League of Nations as an insurance against future wars, almost every nation has been busily engaged since the Armistice in experimenting with a view to developing and improving weapons of war generally.

The most important experiments have been directed towards the development of the Tank. The French and the Americans, it is believed, have achieved very important results in this direction. British Tank experts have not been idle, and, although the greatest secrecy has necessarily been maintained, there is every reason to believe that they are highly satisfied with the progress made.

At Wool, in Dorset, the Tank Corps has an excellent experimental ground, but it has the disadvantage of having no other troops stationed in its vicinity. Combined operations, therefore, cannot be carried out. The military authorities are believed to be fully alive to this disadvantage, and it is thought that very shortly, as the end of the training season is approaching, a number of Tanks will be moved to one of the chief training centres, either Salisbury Plain or Aldershot, with a view to a small scheme of combined operations, in which the Royal Air Force, the Tanks, artillery, and infantry will all take part. It is to be hoped, however, that if these operations take place, some cavalry also will be able to participate, since it is of the utmost importance to have some light thrown on the question to what extent Tanks can take the place of cavalry.—"Times."
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