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NOTES OF THE WEEK.

While we intend to do our best to simplify the subject of the socialisation of Credit—the only form of Socialism that is either desirable or possible—it must be admitted that not only is there a limit to possible simplification, but attempts at simplification can be carried too far. The public should have learned by now that policies that can be expressed in newspaper headlines and phrases are usually bad, becoming bad, in the majority of instances, in the process of reduction to simplicity. Consider, for example, the policies embalmed in the phrases, More Production, Reduction of Costs, Work or Maintenance—in their original conception, as a part of a whole, there is something, no doubt, to be said for each of them. But isolated for the purpose of simplification, each and all of them result in practice rather in a reductio ad absurdum than in effective simplification. The same fate, we believe, awaits the policy now in process of popularisation through the medium of the Press—the policy known as yet only in the circumlocution, the responsibility of each industry for the maintenance of its own unemployed. As originally conceived and stated, chiefly by our old colleague, Mr. S. G. Hobson, there was much to be said for it as a transitional palliative during the changeover from one form of social organisation to another; but as now put forward and advocated, chiefly by the capitalist classes, not merely as a palliative but as a solution of the industrial problem, there is not only nothing to be said for it, but everything to be said against it.

Mr. Henry Clay, of New College, Oxford, has recently been expounding this policy in the "Times"; and his "practical" suggestions amount to this: that since the employing classes, and neither the workers nor the State, are ultimately responsible for the organisation of industry, the contribution to unemployment charges should be fixed in the case of the State and the workers, but made to vary in the case of the employers with the amount of unemployment. Thus, he says, the onus of unemployment will be laid where it properly belongs and in the strict proportion of its responsibility. The more unemployment, the greater the charge or levy upon the industrialists who are responsible for it; and the less the less. Would not employers, under these circumstances, he asks, have every inducement to diminish unemployment; and since, ex hypothesi, the amount of unemployment is within their control, the problem of unemployment might in that event be said to be solved as far as possible. It is an ingenious piece of reasoning that reminds us of the popular version of the Chinese method of paying doctors: paying them for health and fining them for disease. But does anybody who is accustomed to projecting policies into practice really believe that the device would work? Mr. Clay asserts that the only objections he has discovered among the employing classes are that the charges would be too heavy for the industry to bear and that the demarcation of industries would be difficult to carry out; but these objections are, in our opinion, trifling and negligible in comparison with the objection that in the last resort no single industry is necessarily responsible for its own unemployment. That the industrial system as a whole, and hence that its directors and supporters as a whole, are responsible for unemployment and all our other economic ills we, of course, admit. But this is a very different matter from admitting that any particular industry is responsible for any particular unemployment, even its own. Suppose there should be a strike or a lock-out in the transport or any other key industry, is the consequential unemployment in the dependent industries a fair responsibility and charge upon the latter? And would these victimised employers accept it? The fact is that an industry does not live to itself any more than an individual; and every attempt to isolate one social function from another is bound to result in injustice and finally in unworkability. The ultimately responsible authority both for employment and unemployment is not one industry or another but the whole of society; and nothing short of the socialisation of the direction of industry can possibly effect a solution of any particular industrial problem.

We have observed before that the Miners' Federation, under the astonishing leadership of Mr. Frank Hodges, is not yet out of the pit; and the indications are at this moment that the Miners' Federation is falling daily deeper into it. Not only have unemployment and under-employment increased within the last few weeks, but notices are pending for the closing down of whole mining districts, with the prospect before tens
of thousands more of Mr. Hodges' unfortunate members of complete and prolonged unemployment. It stands to reason that when and as fast as the mining industry is "de-controlled," the more favourably placed mines will refuse the less favourably placed; and the result of the process can therefore be only one of three things: such a rise in the price of coal as will enable the worst-placed mines to carry on at a profit; such a fall in wages in the worst-placed districts as would enable the present price of coal to be maintained; and the closing down of the inferior mines. None of these alternatives appears, on the face of it, to promise much relief of the general situation; for the effect of them all would be to contract still further the effective purchasing power distributed among the masses of the population. A rise in prices would hit the consumer, with a distinctly unfriendly repercussion on the public estimation of the Miners' Federation; and, on the other hand, a sectional drop in wages or a sectional unemployment would tend to split up the State, now caring wildy in the direction of "economy," under the lashes of the ignorant Press, will be persuaded to shoulder the debt of 150 millions said to be owing to the Railway companies, is a matter of relative unimportance. Everybody is or should be aware that the National Debt in its present form will never be discharged, and a 10 per cent. rise or less is therefore only an affair of figures; our financial system itself must be transformed. The more immediately serious circumstance, however, is that even at the present exorbitant and unwarranted fares and freights, the Railways are running at a loss; and proposals are at this moment under consideration for raising passenger fares another 25 per cent. at the very least. We do our best to maintain the belief that our commercial classes are not utterly without brains; but we must confess that our faith is near to being shattered when we hear that the remedy they propose for the industrial evils resulting from a failure of transport is the further restriction of transport facilities. For what can be the effect of raising fares again but the discouragement of communication, that is, almost literally, of the circulation of the blood of society? And what secondary effect can this bring about but the further impoverishment of society as an organic whole? The pathetic fallacy underlining the attempt to make every industry "self-supporting," able, in the cant phrase, to "pay its own way," has been already seen in the deadly work in the case of industrial unemployment: it is the fallacy that in a highly organised industrial community, such as our own, articulated in interlocking and mutually dependent functions, any one function must be looked upon, in its place in the communal credit, by its individual profit and loss account. The fallacy is at least as old as Adam and should have died with his fable of the "Belly and its Members"; yet apparently it is as much alive as ever, and our commercial classes are still under its obsession.

The "Daily News" on Monday last again exhibited rare courage in publishing a couple of columns on the subject of the communal control of Credit. The occasion was provided by an interview with Mr. T. M. Heron, a Leeds manufacturer, who expounded views with which our readers are familiar but which have hitherto been taboo in the popular Press. Regarding the present stagnation of industry, immediately due to the banks' restriction of financial credit, Mr. Heron asked why, if the Government could raise thousands of millions on the national real credit, an industry should be unable to raise money on its own real credit. After all, the national real credit upon which the Government issues financial credit is finally composed of the real credits of the various industries of society; and it follows that the basis of credit of any given industry is of the same nature as that of the State. There is thus no reason whatever why an industry should not issue credit since, in any case, the State, when in need, does the same thing. Mr. Heron, moreover, was forewarned and forearmed against the objection that an issue of financial credit, by its very nature and for whatsoever purpose made, has the effect of raising prices by "inflating" the currency in advance of the delivery of the goods. Every such issue, he told the interviewer, should be counter-balanced in its "inflationary effect" by a diminution of price, such that, instead of as now, an issue of credit resulting only in an immediate rise in prices, every legitimate issue of credit for production should result immediately in the reduction of prices. In other words, the public should recover in prices more than the loss of purchasing power now brought about by the inflationary effect of credit issues. This is an exceedingly important point; and we are glad that both Mr. Heron and the "Daily News" have given full publicity to it. The crux of the industrial situation is, in fact, to be found in the present practice of taxing the consumer for credit issues and never giving him a return for it. By reducing prices simultaneously with the increase of credit, not only is the community insured against loss, but, much more importantly, the distribution of the means of consumption is made to increase with the increase in the means of production. Money is only a mechanism for distributing goods. Real Credit, or the capacity to deliver goods, can, however, only be drawn upon in so far as the money demand is equal to the real capacity. Distribute money concurrently and proportionately as real credit is produced, and there can be no such thing as over-production, on the one hand, or under-consumption on the other. In short, the industrial problem would be solved.

Among the anomalies of the existing system, those which leap to the eye are the existence side by side of an increased capacity to produce and a reduced capacity to consume, and widespread unemployment and starvation with idle factories. But even these irrational contradictions are dwarfed when compared with the anomaly presented by our positive inability to accept an "indemnity" from Germany without being ruined by it. At the first blush it would appear that the more cheaply other countries can supply us with goods, and the more they can supply, the surer we have the means of affording to give us for nothing, the better off, in the material sense, we ought to be as a community. But the prevalent system of our bedlamite commercial community is such that a "present" from, let us say, Germany, in the form of cheap goods or goods gratis and for nothing, would not only be unwelcome, but actually
disastrous to the majority of our population. Indemnities paid by Germany in gold would, by enlarging the cash resources of our banks, enable their credit-issues or loans to be increased by a multiple of the new gold value, with the inevitable consequence of raising prices by an inflation of the existing purchasing power. Paid in goods, the indemnity would be only a trifle less ruinous, for unless the goods were of an impossible order, namely, non-competitive with our own industries, their effect would be worse than that of "dumping"; in short, it would mean an equivalent increase in unemployment. The explanation of the anomaly is to be found in the misconception of industry as a system not for delivering goods but for providing work. Since work is the only means by which most people can become possessed of purchasing power, any diminution of the demand for work is pro tanto a diminution of their income; and if, therefore, a miracle were to occur and Heaven were to pour down manna in the form of the necessary commodities of existence, we should be obliged to reject the gift or, at any rate, to sabotage the whole of it, as the only means of saving the masses of people from want. So long, in fact, as the communal production, from whatever source it arises, is not automatically distributed by means of reduced prices when it is great and increased prices when it is small, so long will the foregoing anomalies exist. The obvious solution of the difficulty of receiving a present from Germany is to reduce prices in proportion to the indemnity. The same method would effect the beneficent distribution of every other increment or windfall of real credit. The alternative is to continue to be impoverished in the same ratio that we become rich.

* * *

The relief experienced on the official denial of the alarming reports of Sir Arthur Geddes conversation with American journalists is the measure of the apprehension existing in both countries concerning the imminence of serious trouble. Like Mr. Lloyd George (who was presumably not speaking without full knowledge) "we wish to God that some one could say that the danger was passed"; but the assurance of the Foreign Office that every "question existing between Great Britain and the United States can, and will, be settled without difficulty whether with the existing or the succeeding administration, is no more sufficient for us than it appears to have been for Mr. Lloyd George himself; for he continues to be "worried," and "sometimes filled with dread." The situation is all the more dangerous from the fact that the statements and publicists of both countries appear to have a "Freudian complex" on the subject of the real cause of the difference. Is economic power so indecent that it must be treated with the "puritanism" hitherto reserved for subjects of sex? Cannot a matter that concerns the existence of modern industrial communities be treated frankly as a proper occasion of dispute and even war if no better solution is forthcoming? Leaving the answer to the psycho-analysts, we observe that even Dr. Frank Crane, an American publicist quoted by the "Times," who holds that a war between England and America is thinkable and possible, carefully excludes from his list of causes the only cause that could conceivably be effective. "Wars are not planned," he says; "they are tremendous explosions caused by the growing pile of (1) long-taught hates, (2) carefully nurtured jealousies, and (3) the possession of battle- fleets or armies which in this more idealistic; such causes in themselves would scarcely result in more than international rowdisms. The real nigger in Dr. Crane's pile is the economic factor, and it consists in the inability of two increasingly over-producing communities to divide between them the same contracting market. The danger of war will only have passed when distribution begins at home in both countries. Until then war must be an ever-present contingency.

World Affairs.

With fear and trepidation we come still closer to the problem of the Oceanic Empire of Europe and of the Nordic race. The British Empire is protean and gigantic in its very essence, being both a world-empire, a system of States, like ancient Rome, and at the same time a true racial organism, the manifestation of an anthropological collective being. It is protean in essence, inherently; dense, multiple and abstruse. But this Empire is complex and difficult to inquire into also in its substance, in its material functioning in relation to the world. The British Commonwealth, it seems evident to us, is a Commonwealth in a double and an all-important way; inwardly, in relation to itself, it is the imperial and human self-realisation of the Anglo-Saxon race, its supra-historical, evolutionary self-realisation; outwardly, it is the Commonwealth, the common possession and inheritance—or it should be so, it is bound to become so—of Aryandom as a racial organ of the Race; of Christendom as the power-body of the future religion of Pleroma; and of Europe as the cultural synthesis of history. The British Empire is, or must become, a Commonwealth of Aryandom, of Christendom and of Europe. Let this wish and this statement be not considered a dream, benevolent or malevolent, whether from the British or from the non-British point of view. Let this wish and this undertaking be not judged as idealism in the sense of sentimentalism and unrealism. The question of British destiny is a question both of the world and of England-Albion at this moment, a concern of the world as a whole since the organisation of the world cannot but be the British problem, both human and imperial, a problem of existence. The British Commonwealth is a Proteus, is the Proteus of the world. We believe that the British Imperium is the corner stone of the future order of the world. Its function in the human spirit is manifold, profound, perplexing; difficult to perform, fraught with responsibilities, immense. To inquire into this function and to find the truth is not easy.

The Empire of the British Man, speaking, firstly, in the pan-human, anthropogenetic sense, is the physical body, the material basis that we have named the body of Power, for England or Great Britain. It is the principal vehicle of the evolutionary guidance of the Race in the West. Like Mr. Lloyd George himself; for he continues to be "worried," and "sometimes filled with dread." The situation is all the more serious from the fact that the statements and publicists of both countries appear to have a "Freudian complex" on the subject of the real cause of the difference. Is economic power so indecent that it must be treated with the "puritanism" hitherto reserved for subjects of sex? Cannot a matter that concerns the existence of modern industrial communities be treated frankly as a proper occasion of dispute and even war if no better solution is forthcoming? Leaving the answer to the psycho-analysts, we observe that even Dr. Frank Crane, an American publicist quoted by the "Times," who holds that a war between England and America is thinkable and possible, carefully excludes from his list of causes the only cause that could conceivably be effective. "Wars are not planned," he says; "they are tremendous explosions caused by the growing pile of (1) long-taught hates, (2) carefully nurtured jealousies, and (3) the possession of battle-fleets or armies which in the present more or less idealistic; such causes in themselves would scarcely result in more than international rowdisms. The real nigger in Dr. Crane's pile is the economic factor, and it consists in the inability of two increasingly over-producing communities to divide between them the same contracting market. The danger of war will only have passed when distribution begins at home in both countries. Until then war must be an ever-present contingency.
racial function. She is comparable in this respect to the Far Eastern synthetic function, to Yamato, a "glorious blend." Not just one of the races is Europe, in particular not one only, though Aryandom sustains and directs her racial bulk. Europe is a product, a fruit of History, more than a continent, more than a race. Europe is a Civilisation, a cultural efflorescence of the Mediterranean, Alpine and pure Aryan humanities. To end this determination of the Pleroma and the Over-soul of England, of Germany and Russia, of France and Italy, of Spain and Tchecoslovakia of Jugo-Slavia and Scandinavian Europa, Europe is the representative and the measure of the World as a Kingdom and of History as a self-creation of Man. England, we say, is a member of this Europe. England and her Commonwealth must act as an organ of this Over-soul, as one of its functions.

Europe under Over-soul function, in her superfunction, is the bearer of the synthetic culture of humanity in its inception: nothing less than this is her elementary and world-embracing duty and right. Europe is the inception of the Loka Samgraha of Man; which final entity is, as we have outlined, a historic, cultural force, not an anthropological, somatic one. Loka Samgraha, the World-Synthesis, is a shaping force infinite and divine essentially, and concrete and human substantially. It is both; pleromically both, infinitely finite. It is the religious force, a religion. Europe and the world-synthesis are values universal and supra-racial, let us be permitted to speak with insistence; and Europe is a religious value of mankind, a religion itself whatever the appearances. For though the Religion of the Logos and Sophia, of the incarnation of the Divine in the pan-Man and pan-Humanity, is essentially, typically Aryan, this religion is not Aryan substantially, phenomenally. The religion of Europe, Christianity, is, substantially speaking, Hamitic, African, we have to say; Hamitic and also Semitic, victoriously, vitally Semitic in the honourable sense of the double-edged term. Moreover, the religion of Europe, both spiritually and structurally considered as well as materially and symbolically, is universally human in character, Universal. The Christian Gnosis, both Aryan and non-Aryan in its nature and origin, is the objective Gnosis of mankind. The Religion of Christ, to say the whole truth, is the upadhi or container for the Transcendental and Absolute Religion itself, for the incarnation and realisation of the Sophia of God on earth, for the socialistic and humanistic Europe. Europe is that continent of the Earth where the world's many humanities meet as Humanity, incipiently only till now, it is true, and just now in a satirical and terrible way. Europe is chosen, nevertheless, both by Providence and Destiny, and must be finally chosen also by the Will of Humanity, to become the Continent of the World's Synthesis, the organ of unification in the body of Man, his atonement and salvation. For this messianic soil is the bearer of Christendom as the body of power for the Christian Gnosis; the bearer, bitter to say, even of the French and Russia bloody revolutions which are the material conditions for the universal liberation; and the bearer, ultimately, of Western Aryandom, that is to say of the Aryandom most centrally placed and most safely grounded geographically and anthropologically. White or Aryan humanity is the dispensational and responsible racial block of Man to-day. Europe, the world's inheritance, is in charge of this responsible block of mankind, principally, however, in the thrust of the Teutonic, Nordic Man. Of this Man, we believe, the British Commonwealth is the principal world-organ; for it is the nature of the Oceanic world-empire to govern and organise the world. The mission of Russia, of the continental world-power of the white humanity, is to set the world free, but not to organise it.

M. M. Cosmo.
is conducted in this country is not merely a death penalty; it is the most inhuman and purposeless form of torture that can be imagined. "Field and Gray were condemned two months ago," the writer in the "Daily Express" must be scourged for saying.

"They have ranged the emotions of hope and despair, penalty; it is the most inhuman and purposeless form more terrible than this among its puerile physiological cruelty which has a public sanction, increases were condemned over two months ago," the writer in with their daily and nightly thoughts the noose that it is conducted in this country is not merely a death hard to stage good plays, but to give a profit to their Community; at the point B, the word Producer; and at the point C, the word Consumer. We now have a little diagram illustrative of the meaning of Credit, for Credit is that which is contained within the three lines connecting the Community, the Producer, and the Consumer. Is Credit the product of the Community alone—as the collectivist Socialists and Single-taxers say? No. Is it the product of the Producer alone, as both Capital and Labour say? Again, the reply is in the negative. Then is it the product of the Consumer alone, as nobody says? Nobody is quite right; it is not. No, Credit is the joint work of each of these three points and the lines between them. Credit is a triangle; Credit is a trinity.

But here we enter another phase. Our triangle must move. Life is not static, but dynamic. E pur si muove, which, being interpreted, means that our triangle must get a move on to be alive. What is the movement? It must be circular to answer to the description of business which consists in the circulation of Credit. How does it move? In our ideal triangle of Credit, the movement is continuous and equal from A to B, from B to C, from C to A, and round again. Or, in the words on the triangle, Credit passes from the Community to the Producer, from the Producer to the Consumer, and from the Consumer back again to the Community. Given such a constant and equal circulation, and it will be found that the miracle of life takes place; in other words, our triangle will grow, Credit will increase. On the other hand, stop or impede the circulation at any point, and lo, behold, the triangle begins to diminish. Credit declines.

Now strike out at A the word Community and substitute for it the word Finance. Private Finance has usurped the place and function of the Community, and proposes to control the circulation itself. Let us see what happens. Instead of requiring that the movement
of Credit from A to B shall pass on undiminished or increased to C. Private Finance, usurping the power and privatising the function of the Community, requires that his little Credit as possible shall pass from B to C, and that the increment due to B shall pass back directly to A. It will be seen what a spoke in the wheel is inserted by this arbitrary authority; and with what shattering consequences to the whole trinitarian system of Credit. In default of the transmission of Credit from B to C, the Consumer begins to languish; and his contribution to the triangle begins to decline. His end, poor fellow, goes in, fades out. At the same time, poor old B is scarcely keeping his end up. Depending on C to take off his current of Credit by the process of Consumption, and being now required to return it directly to A, B discovers that A cannot consume all the goods, not more than a fraction of them; whereupon, having nothing to do, B has to begin to close down, go on short time, become unemployed. Meanwhile the usurping A has the time of a usurper's life. He has effectually interrupted the circle of Credit and drawn to himself what should have been passed on to C; and for the time being he lives like a bloated parasite. But the shrinking of the triangle, due to the successive failure of C and B, spells his doom in the whole system of Credit. In default of the transmission of Credit from B to C, the Consumer begins to languish; and his contribution to the triangle begins to decline. The final collapse of Credit is called Bolshevism.

The New Year sub-title of The New Age is "A Socialist Review of Religion, Science and Art." Religion, Science and Art are, of course, the Trinity of Blessed and Immortal Memory: Feeling, Knowing and Doing upon every plane of Matter and Consciousness. And just as Credit has been seen to be a triangle contained within and absolutely dependent upon the co-equal existence of its three lines and points, so Faith in Life is the joint product of the co-equal feelings, Knowing and Doing—but that is not what we set out to say. We intended to explain the word "Socialist" in the sub-title. Clearly, the present policy of The New Age is not Socialist in any of the ordinary senses of the word. We are not Collectivist, we are not Syndicalist, we are not Communist à la Russe; nor are we "proletarian" Socialists or even Anti-Capitalists. What we would "socialise" is not property, not capital, not production, not labour; but only—Credit; and that because Credit is, in fact, the equal product of the Community, the Producer and the Consumer. Our Socialism is therefore designed to do and aim at doing one thing only: to depose the usurper Private Finance and to restore the Community to its proper place in the organic circulation of Credit. The restoration of the Trinity of Credit to its proper Persons and their mutual service—that is our Socialism, the beginning and the end of it. The money-changers must be driven out of the Temple of Credit as well as out of the Temple of Faith.

How to do it?—but it really is not difficult. The scheme drawn up by Major Douglas and published in these pages for application to the Mining industry would provide a working model for a complete restoration. We cannot hope to carry conviction by verbal demonstrations alone. Even the diagram our readers have been kind enough to draw for us is only to a practical demonstration what a cookery-book with illustrations is to a starving man. The recipes are there, and the result is shown on paper; but the world cannot see it and eat it. We feel and we know, but the third element of real faith is lacking: we cannot do or get done; and for want of the Third Person of the Trinity, whose place and power are usurped by Ignorance and Vanity and Laziness and Fear and all the vices, our scheme is held up out of reach of practice; and meanwhile the triangle of Credit shrinks and shrinks to the orchestra of Russian music.

National Guildsmen.
place to get sight of the merchant's wife; it was a brilliantly acted scene, and was a colossal joke. Everybody is made to over-reach himself by his own cleverness; Volpone himself, trusting his parasite as himself, even signs his will and appoints his parasite as heir—as a joke. Rather, it is their virtues, not their cleverness, that trip them up; it was their faith in human nature that placed them all in the power of the parasite, but he, who really believed in no one but himself, and was fertile in devices to the end, in the very Court of Justice, shared the same fate. Pushed to its logical extreme, every quality or faculty leads to disaster; man is a complex whole, not a single function or passion, and at his peril does he allow himself to use only one or one group of faculties—but Jonson is making me morose.

The performance of Mr. Baliol Holloway was a masterpiece. It is useless to mince words in the description of his playing of Volpone; he had got the character with entire comprehension, and it seemed to play itself. Whimpering, he was shamming sick, haranguing the crowd, or planning some new device, and was a colossal joke. Rather, it is their virtues, not their cleverness, that trip them up; it was their faith in human nature that placed them all in the power of the parasite, but he, who really believed in no one but himself, and was fertile in devices to the end, in the very Court of Justice, shared the same fate. Pushed to its logical extreme, every quality or faculty leads to disaster; man is a complex whole, not a single function or passion, and at his peril does he allow himself to use only one or one group of faculties—but Jonson is making me morose.
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The performance of Mr. Baliol Holloway was a masterpiece. It is useless to mince words in the description of his playing of Volpone; he had got the character with entire comprehension, and it seemed to play itself. Whimpering, he was shamming sick, haranguing the crowd, or planning some new device, and was a colossal joke. Rather, it is their virtues, not their cleverness, that trip them up; it was their faith in human nature that placed them all in the power of the parasite, but he, who really believed in no one but himself, and was fertile in devices to the end, in the very Court of Justice, shared the same fate. Pushed to its logical extreme, every quality or faculty leads to disaster; man is a complex whole, not a single function or passion, and at his peril does he allow himself to use only one or one group of faculties—but Jonson is making me morose.
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Principia Metaphysica: A Commentary.
By Denis Saurat.

III.—PSYCHOLOGY: FALL AND RESURRECTION.

23. Existence entails responsibility.

A being exists when the outside world takes his actions into account. Even if he could ignore his fellow beings, he must be taken into account by the Potential which created him, since otherwise another being would be created in his place. But an action is only an expression, which the world can only take into account on the understanding that there is a force behind it, so that when the world builds its own expressions on that, that should be kept up by the necessary energy. Actions are like cheques or notes of hand: they circulate as credit for a while, but ultimately they must be cashed, or there must be the possibility of their being cashed. Thus the world, in its actions, is obliged, under pain of collapse, to demand of each being that he should stand by his actions. The world can only take into account a being that has the necessary force to bear the consequences of his deeds; and sooner or later the consequences of an act according to the laws of the World-Conventions are thrown back by the world upon the author of the act. For instance, a man can only walk across a street if he can bear the responsibility of doing it: satisfy the laws of gravitation; he sets to work with the strength necessary to move his body across, make a passage for himself through intermediary obstacles, be they the air or the traffic, etc. In this case he has to pay his cheque generally at once. But, for instance, he may only eat some particular food if he is sure of digesting it, and not being killed by it: and there may not have to pay the cheque for long periods, and yet in the end be poisoned or endangered. But in any case the world cannot and does not take notice of any action which has not a sufficient responsibility behind it; if such an expression is attempted, the being who causes it is crushed, just as a man is under the traffic he has been unable to resist or avoid in crossing the street.


The consequences of any action extend ad infinitum, because any action once performed has to be taken into account, more or less, by all the beings that are in the world, and by all the future beings the Potential will bring into the world. No being can therefore ever completely and for ever disappear, for in the scheme of the world there should be a gap, and all beings taking, as they must, into account, the consequences of actions of a non-existent individual, would be giving out cheques on a fictive account and therefore collapse. Indeed, that partly does happen, and thus all beings do die one after another, and cannot very long survive anyone they have known. And yet the world goes on and does not die, and that demands the continued existence in some form of all the beings that have been in it. Otherwise the world itself would come to an end and being cease altogether: indeed, it would have ceased ages ago.

25. Liberty is the power of expressing one's desires; it is a concomitant of responsibility; and both, of existence itself.

A being who could not express his desires would not know them, and therefore would not have them: since the essence of desire is the possibility of self-consciousness; and the only way desire reaches self-consciousness, or intensity, or satisfaction, is by expression. Liberty is therefore what a being gains by coming into the world; as responsibility is the price he must pay for it. And since a being once come into the Actual, creates ever more and more Potential (2), and grows infinitely,

26. As every being is infinite, liberty entails immortality.

27. The foundation in men of the World of Ideas is the beginning of an immortality which is continued in a different order of Being.

There are in men innumerable desires which are not of this world: which arise from no events that have taken place in it; which serve no ends connected with it. Such are, particularly, all desires of man for the beautiful. But every desire has to be realised. In spite of all the modal variations of its existence (28 to 30), it persists and increases for ever (2). If therefore, we find in ourselves desires, such as our need of beauty, which are not to be satisfied in this world, we can only deduce (from our psychological experience that all desire is ultimately satisfied) that such desires must needs continue to seek for an expression after this world. And since the conditions of this world are impediments to them, these desires will create for their expression a different cosmic organisation.

In reality, none of our Ideas (9) find satisfaction at all in this world; that is why they cannot live in it and disappear so rapidly from our consciousness. They can only be said to have been born into us, so fitfully do they live; and yet we feel their intensity and their force while they possess us; and that they need and strive for full life and expression. They come into our consciousness as the summits of the waves of our desires; but they are new departures, and new foundations; and the absolute earnests of the life to come; as well as the proof that whatever life to come there is shall have no common measure with this present one, and be in no way like it; so much so, as not to be perceivable even from this life.

28. When a desire has reached the highest intensity it is capable of it ceases and falls. Perfection is annihilation.

Thus all desire, in its satisfaction, ceases: be it hunger in eating, or love in union: the utmost reach of desire is the summit of a curve, and precedes its extinction; but

29. A fall is a return into the Potential, ever unsatisfied, which refills the falling being with new forces, and resurrects it. Desire follows an infinite rhythm of rise, fall and resurrection.

Thus our desire of eating soon returns to us; thus, although, after contemplating some work of art, we go away satisfied, there soon comes upon us the craving to see a work of art again. And the craving to see another, a more beautiful, work of art, because the first satisfaction of our desire has created new Potential in us: has revealed to us many beauties we had not imagined, which we now desire, in a second work of art, to see developed and brought out. Thus, after eating one particular meal, we find in us a desire for a better prepared and organised meal when our hunger comes again. The satisfaction of a desire thus only allays it for the moment; in fact, it increases the desire, because it makes it aware of new subtleties it was not conscious of before, and which it will demand and augment in its next expression. Thus not only is desire a series of waves, but an ascending series of waves, in which the summit of each rises higher than the summit of the preceding one.

30. There are two kinds of fall: sleep and death. In sleep, a desire comes back as desire, in the same expression; in death, a desires gives up its former expression, and comes back on the next plane, sub-divided into ideas.

Take sexual desire, which each expression or satisfaction calms but for a while, but which at the end of
Our life ceases altogether. It sleeps between each expression, and comes back in the same expression again. In the end, it dies completely. But this only means it gives up one mode of existence and one language. In those of us whose minds are not dead before their sexual desires subside, no longer building for physical satisfaction, but transformed into many ideas: many needs of beauty, of intensity, of expansion, of high action. Old men, who have perfected the sexual desire and transformed it into many ideas, are never mentally dead before—they think again. When one idea is entertained, it makes itself felt. And that attempt would be, as for all desire, a slow-moving material machinery to realize it. But we expect our desires to sprout into our consciousness. As no man can keep all the desires of his heart from his brain, and even then, he makes only the remembrance of that idea. It is the expression of language; what we call an abstract idea, the mere generic name of it. However, some desire has to be satisfied, either one of the pair in all the opinions of the other, or simply to indicate an agreement in certain essentials.

The essential in the particular case of Gall and Spurzheim is that of localization of function. However, I acknowledge that this idea of phrasing is not to be recommended, and I will avoid it in my forthcoming book, "Principles of Psychology."

In the point in the review which especially attracts my attention is this: "He (Gall) argued, and demonstrated, that there are fundamental powers of the mind, which are located in certain parts of the brain. . . . . " I join issue. I assert that for the first time in the history of Psychology I have shown how all forms of thought may be reduced to certain elementary factors which I have determined and called the Fundamental Processes of the mind; and conversely I have shown how the combinations of these serve to explain any mechanism, or complex, actual or possible. I prove by methods of rigorous hitherto unknown in Psychology that my exposition covers the whole field, that in the mathematical sense these Fundamental Processes are necessary and sufficient, and that from the principles I have set forth a limitless number of new corollaries flow, illuminating old philosophical morbid conjectures or opposing theories; for example, Kant's Transcendentalism, or the theory of aphasics associated with Broca's lobe.

There is no localization of functions or "powers," rather in the course of thought the whole brain is concerned either by virtue of activity or inhibition. The whole man thinks. I beg "A. E. R." therefore to forsake the study of Gall's works, which belong to a dead literature, and to apply himself seriously to the understanding of "Psychology: a New System," for that will bulk more largely in men's minds five hundred years hence than now; that is the gate through which all men of thought must pass. Arthur Lynch.

The point on which Dr. Lynch joins issue is one that he would find it difficult to maintain. If the brain is the organ of the mind, and I know of no valid reason for supposing that it is not, then the doctrine that "the whole man thinks" implies that the brain is a single organ—and Flourens' discredited teaching is revived again without any experimental proof. Exactly what Dr. Lynch means by "the whole man," I do not pretend to know; in cases of multiple personality, for example, very much less than the patient himself. But the point is pressed. The mystic in his ecstasy, too, presents the phenomenon of disappearance of personality, which

* "In Search of the Soul." By Bernard Hollander, M.D. (Kegan Paul. 2 vols. £2 2s. net.)
Ribot "takes to be the absolute dispossession of mental activity effected by a single idea (positive to mystics, negative to empirics) but which through its high degree of abstraction, and its absence of determination and limit, contradicts and excludes all individual sentiment. But let one single sensation, however ordinary, be perceived, and the entire illusion is destroyed." Inferences and abstractions, Ribot concludes, "The states of consciousness that are called ideas are only a secondary factor in the constitution and changes of personality. The idea certainly plays a part, but not a preponderating one. These results agree with what psychology has long since taught, that ideas have an inconsistency and separation of the thought and of personality. The idea certainly plays a part, but not a preponderating one. These results agree with what psychology has long since taught, that ideas have an inconsistency and separation of the thought and of personality.

This circumstance would have for a result, not only the inconsistancy and separation of the thought and of the will, but also the complete absence of energy for each of these isolated phases of the ego, if, in each of these spheres there was not a more or less clear return for the consciousness of some of these fundamental directions." The whole man is a complex being; " hath not a Jew eyes, hath not a Jew hands, organs, dimensions, senses, passions?"—it did not occur to Shakespeare to add ideas. If the thinking part of man were the whole man, we should be a race of philosophers, God help us!

But as Dr. Lynch says that "in the course of thought the whole brain is concerned either by virtue of activity or inhibition," he does not seem to believe that "the whole man thinks"; for if anything is inhibited in the act of thought, the whole man cannot be functioning. This is precisely the position of Gall, who, in Dr. Hollander's words (p. 257) says: "Now the brain is acting as a whole because its various parts are called into play simultaneously, though—as Gall pointed out—the whole brain is not concerned in each of the component sensations and volitions associated with any particular mental state. He admitted, it is true, that several mental perceptions are generally active at the same time, but their elementary distinctions and independence of each other are shown, not only by their different degrees of strength bearing no constant relation to each other, but by the ever-varying combinations, in number and in kind, in which they manifest themselves. For if they were all general results, of one general power, operating through one organ, there would be in all instances a fixed proportion in the manifestations of feeling and thought and a definite order in their sequence and arrangement, in harmony with the unity of action of a single organ.

There is no need for me to repeat what I have already said about Dr. Lynch's fundamental processes; but I may point that his armchair psychology, determined chiefly by introspection, has neither the demonstrative nor the empirical but which through its high degree of abstraction, and its absence of determination and limit, contradicts and excludes all individual sentiment. But let one single sensation, however ordinary, be perceived, and the entire illusion is destroyed." Inferences and abstractions, Ribot concludes, "The states of consciousness that are called ideas are only a secondary factor in the constitution and changes of personality. The idea certainly plays a part, but not a preponderating one. These results agree with what psychology has long since taught, that ideas have an inconsistency and separation of the thought and of personality. The idea certainly plays a part, but not a preponderating one. These results agree with what psychology has long since taught, that ideas have an inconsistency and separation of the thought and of personality.

This circumstance would have for a result, not only the inconsistancy and separation of the thought and of the will, but also the complete absence of energy for each of these isolated phases of the ego, if, in each of these spheres there was not a more or less clear return for the consciousness of some of these fundamental directions." The whole man is a complex being; " hath not a Jew eyes, hath not a Jew hands, organs, dimensions, senses, passions?"—it did not occur to Shakespeare to add ideas. If the thinking part of man were the whole man, we should be a race of philosophers, God help us!

But as Dr. Lynch says that "in the course of thought the whole brain is concerned either by virtue of activity or inhibition," he does not seem to believe that "the whole man thinks"; for if anything is inhibited in the act of thought, the whole man cannot be functioning. This is precisely the position of Gall, who, in Dr. Hollander's words (p. 257) says: "Now the brain is acting as a whole because its various parts are called into play simultaneously, though—as Gall pointed out—the whole brain is not concerned in each of the component sensations and volitions associated with any particular mental state. He admitted, it is true, that several mental perceptions are generally active at the same time, but their elementary distinctions and independence of each other are shown, not only by their different degrees of strength bearing no constant relation to each other, but by the ever-varying combinations, in number and in kind, in which they manifest themselves. For if they were all general results, of one general power, operating through one organ, there would be in all instances a fixed proportion in the manifestations of feeling and thought and a definite order in their sequence and arrangement, in harmony with the unity of action of a single organ.

There is no need for me to repeat what I have already said about Dr. Lynch's fundamental processes; but I may point that his armchair psychology, determined chiefly by introspection, has neither the demonstrative nor the empirical but which through its high degree of abstraction, and its absence of determination and limit, contradicts and excludes all individual sentiment. But let one single sensation, however ordinary, be perceived, and the entire illusion is destroyed." Inferences and abstractions, Ribot concludes, "The states of consciousness that are called ideas are only a secondary factor in the constitution and changes of personality. The idea certainly plays a part, but not a preponderating one. These results agree with what psychology has long since taught, that ideas have an inconsistency and separation of the thought and of personality. The idea certainly plays a part, but not a preponderating one. These results agree with what psychology has long since taught, that ideas have an inconsistency and separation of the thought and of personality.
Christianity is, in Matthew Arnold's phrase, "neither Catholic nor Protestant, but "Christian," has envying one another. " Mr. Bell's advocacy of Expertised, Sped-up, not to say Fed-up, automatic not be desirous of vain glory, provoking one another,

Rheims-and Paris, Paris, Paris-his observations opposed things as Individualistic-Collectivist-Competitive-Monopolistic-Scientifically-Managed-Capitalistic-Trustification of Industry, and the Efficiently-Expertised, Sped-up, not to say Fed-up, automatic machine on known as a Man, Mr. low played called a 'hand.' " If Mr. Bell will extend his observations he will discover that there are very few people who do not believe contradictory things; contradictions cannot be true in logic, but they can be true in psychology, and Mr. Bell, as a Christian, ought to remember Paul's war among the members of his church.

Blougram said: "When the fight begins within us, let us also walk in the Spirit. Let us neither follow the flesh nor the world."

He brings into contrast the ideals of the Bolshevik and the emancipation of the proletariat: they have achieved centralisation of power, a privileged oligarchy, and the emancipation of the proletariat: they have achieved centralisation of power, a privileged oligarchy, industrial conscription and police supervision of private life. (In Moscow, everybody breaks the law almost daily.) They desire international socialism, but foster nationalist movements and drift unresistingly towards the imperialistic domination of Asia. They aim at encouraging art, and are creating an industrialism which is fatal to artistic life. "The Bolshevists are industrialists in all their aims." They are introducing, as fast as they can, American efficiency among a lazy and undisciplined population." But "the atmosphere is one in which art cannot flourish, because art is anarchic and resistant to organisation."

Which is not true. Mr. Russell emphasises, however, the essentially religious character of Bolshevism. It "combines the characteristics of the French Revolution with those of the rise of Islam." This plea for a minimum income independent of wages contains some interesting arguments, and several fallacies. The first of the latter (as the title indicates) is "the assumption, ... that increased production is in itself desirable until a higher all-round standard of comfort is possible." The author, however, is not wholly unconscious that our low standard of comfort may be attributable to mal-distribution, for he recognises that "by securing that everyone is in command of sufficient income to purchase what may be reasonably classed among necessities, we can increase the proportion of national income flowing to the staple industries and to this extent steady demand." His own attribution of the striking advance in productivity to government control of the staple industries and to this extent steady demand. The year 1905 marks the point at which the financial burden upon industry began to outweigh the relief afforded by improvements in process. Having come to the conclusion that the worker will not work because he has no interest in national prosperity, Mr. Milner proposes to give him this by securing to every man, woman and child a fixed proportion of the national income, obtained by deduction of a percentage from its uneven distribution of power. "Only peace and a long period of gradual improvement can bring it about." A less hopeful outlook cannot well be conceived, though, if Communism were indeed the only alternative to present evils, it might be difficult to resist even so discouraging a conclusion. But the question asked in chapter v (part ii): "Is it possible to mould a mental reform of the existing economic system by any other method than that of Bolshevism?" leaves open the door to an alternative. Mr. Russell has explored many "roads to freedom." A glance at the map of credit-control might convince him that the direct way is not yet past finding out.

Higher Production. By a Bonus on National Output. A proposal for a minimum income for all varying with national productivity. By Dennis Milner, B.Sc., A.C.G.I., F.S.S. (Allen and Unwin. 6d. net.)

This plea for a minimum income independent of wages contains some interesting arguments, and several fallacies. The first of the latter (as the title indicates) is "the assumption, ... that increased production is in itself desirable until a higher all-round standard of comfort is possible." The author, however, is not wholly unconscious that our low standard of comfort may be attributable to mal-distribution, for he recognises that "by securing that everyone is in command of sufficient income to purchase what may be reasonably classed among necessities, we can increase the proportion of national income flowing to the staple industries and to this extent steady demand." His own attribution of the striking advance in productivity to government control of the staple industries and to this extent steady demand. The year 1905 marks the point at which the financial burden upon industry began to outweigh the relief afforded by improvements in process. Having come to the conclusion that the worker will not work because he has no interest in national prosperity, Mr. Milner proposes to give him this by securing to every man, woman and child a fixed proportion of the national income, obtained by deduction of a percentage from its uneven distribution of power. "Only peace and a long period of gradual improvement can bring it about." A less hopeful outlook cannot well be conceived, though, if Communism were indeed the only alternative to present evils, it might be difficult to resist even so discouraging a conclusion. But the question asked in chapter v (part ii): "Is it possible to mould a mental reform of the existing economic system by any other method than that of Bolshevism?" leaves open the door to an alternative. Mr. Russell has explored many "roads to freedom." A glance at the map of credit-control might convince him that the direct way is not yet past finding out.
"SHAKESPEARE IDENTIFIED."

Sir,—I wish to thank you for the opportunity you so readily granted me of replying to some of "R. H. C.'s" remarks upon the Earl of Oxford's poetry. It is to me a matter of keen regret that your space will not permit a continuance of the controversy. Perhaps, however, you may be able to find room for placing the following facts before your readers.

Of the 258 lines of Oxford's recognised verse 222 were published in 1576, when he was but twenty-six years of age, and before his literary and dramatic career had begun; 256 lines, much of it belonging evidently to the same early period, have been gathered together in recent years from miscellaneous pieces of MS, never prepared for publication. The trifling remainder have become the prey of collectors during his lifetime. It is certain, therefore, that most of what is known as Oxford's poetry was written at least 17 years before a single "Shakespeare" line was published; and it is highly probable that the whole of it belongs to about the same time.

About 1580 his real literary career began. In 1589 he is spoken of as the chief of some writers whose doings could not "be found out or made known." In 1593 Shakespeare's "Venus" was published; and up to the present there has been nothing whatever to show for Oxford's literary period.

Pastiche.

THE EIGHTH HEAVEN.

He came out of the crowded hall into the dimly lighted street, borne on the tide of moving people—and his own emotions. If ordinary people sometimes got into the seventh heaven, he must have got into the eighth. What a man! he kept saying to himself, "What a speech!"

He felt in his ecstasy that he had come into a new world in which everything was possible; in a world which could produce such a man everything must be possible. The wit—the playfulness of him! And then the driving force with which he sent the truth home. . . . into your very heart . . . that truth you had only half realised, the truth that you had only half realised, into a heart that you didn't know you had, which he, this Master created, it seemed, for the purpose of driving the truth into it. It was glorious to be alive, glorious to bring about a friendship that would alter his whole life. . . . Should he slip out to the pillar-box and post it to-night, with the feeling still hot in it? He looked out of the window. Of course it was pouring with rain, and he had taken his boots off. No, to-morrow morning on his way to the office . . . a new day . . . he took his clothes off slow, wound up his watch, got into his pyjamas, and then . . . took up that magic envelope and posted it gently through the bars of the grate into the still red remnants of the fire. Quietly, regretfully, almost shyly, he slipped into bed.

Was it the cocoa and the sardines (which were certainly doubtful) . . . or what?

A. NEWBERRY CHOICE.

PASSERS-BY.

By thronging ways I went, where many a face
Dull-eyed met mine and passed. I knew full well
Behind each two eyes lay a far, strange place
Secure and ivory-walled, a citadel.

Yet with my wide eyes watching I could mark
Through guarded gates, swift shadows now and then
Of monstrous shapes that huddle in the dark
And shameful spaces of the minds of men.

One youth played host to murder night and day.
. . .

I saw a couch spread in one woman's eyes
Whereon her neighbour's husband naked lay.

And one man housed a company of lies.

And then a calm one came who looked at me
A second only, but his eyes were kind.
And, "Enter, friend!" they said. O suddenly
I walked a realm all sweet with singing-birds!

A MESSAGE.

Had I the right to grieve,
When Friendship turned her head and left me wondering?
Had I the right to speak
Across the misty space left by our parting?

How can I know?

Ah, Friend! You are my friend;
I cannot bend my will to doubt that certainty.
I can afford content;
Those months are years; years, ages; time in plenty,
When once I know.

M. S.
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