

THE NEW AGE

A SOCIALIST REVIEW OF RELIGION, SCIENCE, AND ART.

No. 1488] NEW SERIES. Vol. XXVIII. No. 20. THURSDAY, MAR. 17, 1921. [Registered at G.P.O. as a Newspaper.] **SEVENPENCE**

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
NOTES OF THE WEEK	229
WORLD AFFAIRS. By M. M. Cosmoi	232
OUR GENERATION. By Edward Moore	233
DRAMA: At Mrs. Beam's. By John Francis Hope	234
ART. By R. A. STEPHENS	235
READERS AND WRITERS. By R. H. C.	235
TOWARDS NATIONAL GUILDS. By National Guildsmen	236
VIEWS AND REVIEWS: The Human Aura. By A. E. R.	
	237
REVIEWS: Warfare in the Human Body. Public Ownership of the Liquor Trade. The Wicked Foremen	
	238
LETTER TO THE EDITOR from A. L. Gibson	
	240
PRESS CUTTINGS	
	240

NOTES OF THE WEEK.

THERE can be no doubt that the Labour movement has been reduced to despair. On all sides this frame of mind is evident. From Mr. Cole, who now proposes that the National Guilds League shall retreat to its ideological basis, to Mr. Mellor, who commits himself to the vague thing he calls Revolution, nothing is more apparent in the Labour world than its complete intellectual destitution. The "Daily Herald" is the appropriate representative of such a state of mind, and in recent issues its unfortunate readers have been told that nothing can be done for them. "Labour has got to the end of its reformist tether; and there is no more room within the capitalist system for further advantages to the workers." Mr. Lansbury, of course, does not "advocate a bloody revolution"; he has not the courage to face facts, but he does "advocate that the working classes shall organise, politically and industrially, in order to get rid of a system that can only be improved by being ended." We are reminded of a letter we received a few weeks ago from a well-known Jewish financier. He had been examining the Douglas-NEW AGE scheme and had come to the conclusion that it would, if adopted, "save industrial civilisation." But, he went on, "industrial civilisation is not in my opinion worth saving; it deserves only to be ended." Strange, is it not, that despair of the commonwealth should simultaneously seize upon both extremes of the capitalist system; and that both should agree that the cure for capitalism is to empty out the baby with the bath. There is something sinister in the association as well, when we recall the circumstance that every "bloody revolution" of recent years has been the work of Finance co-operating with the Labour Left. Is there a natural, or an artificial, nexus between the two parties; and is the "despair" psychological or political? In any event, it is unworthy of anybody calling himself a man.

The form of the "Daily News" despair is, as might be expected, of an even feebler type. Correcting the President of the National Free Church Council, who said that "the most obvious need of our day is a renaissance of personal morality," the "Daily News" ventured to go "a little further," and declared that "the most obvious need of our day is a renaissance of personal religion"—using the term, of course, "in its broadest and oldest sense," whatever that may be. It is altogether wrong, the Rev. Daily News assures us, to suppose that "it is the system that is wrong, or that

if the system be got right, all would be well." "In the last analysis the system is made for man [!!] and not man for the system; and it is therefore the virtues and vices of the men who work it and not the strength or weakness of the system itself that will determine both their destinies." This, of course, is only another way of saying that the "Daily News," like the Labour Press, has nothing to propose and is, in fact, in the situation of the mariners in the "Tempest": "All lost! To prayers, to prayers!" For nothing is more certain than that the call for "personal religion" in *statesmanship* only arises when statesmanship proper, or the application of religion to social problems, is at its wits' end. Besides, it is the blackest of lies, being a half-truth, to assert that it is the virtues and vices of the men who work it, and not the structure of the system itself, that produce the characteristic effects of a given piece of social mechanism. Would loaded dice fall otherwise if thrown by an honest man? Would, let us say, the Bank at Monte Carlo consistently lose if its operators were readers of the "Daily News"? The prevalent economic system can be demonstrated to be no less mechanical and calculable in its effects than a structure of steel; and it is so far independent of the character of the men who work it that if its agents were all Cadburys (as not a few of them are), the results would be just the same. Without troubling to dispute the proposition that the world paramently needs more personal morality or more personal religion, we affirm that the first sign of a renaissance of either would be not an attempt to work the present system differently, but an attempt to transform the system itself. Moreover, we assert that the final analysis of the system has been made, and that the means for its easy and peaceful transformation are known and immediately available. All that is lacking is the spiritual resolution of "the men who work" the "Daily News" to get off their knees and put their shoulder to the wheel.

Hope has long since fled from the promise of salvation by Labour politics; for, in spite of its recent electoral successes, nobody with any sense of reality can maintain that the Labour party is nearing the goal of a Labour Government. As we used to warn Labour, when its leaders were agitating for Votes for Women, the addition of millions of inexperienced and ignorant voters to an already sufficiently ignorant electorate was bound to re-act against the success of political Labour; and our prediction has now been confirmed, not only by the facts, but by the complaint of Mr. MacDonald that he

owed his defeat at Woolwich to the "non-political," in other words, the women, voters. The other side, he said, "scraped up every person entitled to vote"—as why should they not?—and swamped the "intelligent" vote cast for Mr. MacDonald himself. This procedure, legitimate democratically, and strategically long ago carefully calculated by "the other side," may be expected to be developed as time goes on, with the consequence that any General Election whose issues are controlled by "the other side" may confidently be expected to result in the defeat of Labour. Even, however, if this were not the case, the prospects of radical reform by Labour politicians would be very little better; for the truth is that Labour politicians, singly and collectively, have no radical *idea* capable of actuating a policy differing in any radical respect from the present Coalition and Liberal ideas. That Labour's sentiments and mere opinions appear to indicate a different source from that which inspires the present Government we do not deny; and confused observers like Lord Haldane are deceived by the idealist vocabulary of the Labour movement. But when Labour's ideas and ideals are reduced to terms of brass tacks, as in its recent suggestions for dealing with Unemployment, for instance, the *identity* of the tacit assumptions of Capital and Labour is manifest. Elevated to power to-morrow, in short, the only practical difference the Labour party would make in our social life would be the institution of more severe conditions, primarily for the working classes. It has been so wherever Labour has risen to power on opinions unsupported by new ideas; and it would be so here.

* * *

It might be supposed that an admitted despair would itself be provocative of fresh thought; and that, before finally throwing up the sponge or appealing to the jungle, responsible Labour leaders would at least explore every avenue promising (as we do) a way out of the wood. The Executive of the Miners' Federation, however, is not so easily reduced to the exercise of its mind; and thus we have the continued spectacle of the Miners' leaders wandering round and round within their self-imposed prison. Escape, except by a flight of the imagination, is arithmetically impossible; and there are even Miners' leaders who are fully aware of the fact. The present wage-rates, said one of them, can only be maintained by means of (a) increased output, (b) higher prices, or (c) a Government subsidy. And since, for different but equally effective reasons, not one of these conditions is attainable, the conclusion that wages must be reduced seems to be admitted. Nevertheless, such is the inability of the Miners' Executive to face their own conclusion, that at this moment they are engaged in attempting some other means of circumventing logic and arithmetic. By pooling insufficient amounts, for example, it is hoped to make them sufficient, as if addition were multiplication. Or, again, by nationalising the ownership and administration of the Mining industry, the Miners hope to be able to get more out of the industry than the consumer puts in. It appears to be useless to affirm that, under the existing *financial* system, profits might be abolished without enabling wages to be maintained; or, indeed, that the Miners might be given the mines and still could not maintain their wages on the proceeds—they are convinced that things are otherwise, and that, by some means or other, twice two can be made greater than four. The tragedy of the matter, unfortunately, is even more apparent than its comedy; for while the Miners' leaders are working out impossible sums in arithmetic, their rank and file are rapidly going from bad to worse in the facts of life. Unemployment is increasing; and we see nothing to prevent it. Either more mines must close down, or there must be a tremendous increase in the selling-price of coal. The alternatives to one or other of these sufficiently desperate courses are even more desperate courses, of

which the most obvious and most probable appears to be another war.

* * *

The "Times" has formulated the prevalent and fundamental idea with commendable clarity. "The cost of Production under any system," it says, "must be less than the selling-price which the consumers are able and willing to pay, if the industry is to be solvent." Once accept that principle—as, apparently, not only the Miners do, but every species of Labour and Socialist politician and economist—and we affirm that Capitalism, meaning by Capitalism precisely what Labour means by the word, is tacitly admitted, together with all the consequences inherent in the mechanical system that rests upon this assumption in practice. There is not the smallest doubt possible about it in the mind of anybody who will take the trouble to examine the proposition; and with a lucidity which we envy, Mr. Arthur Kitson in the "Times' Trade Supplement" is engaged in driving home the practical conclusions to be drawn from it. Let it be granted that the selling price must cover the cost of Production (including, of course, in Cost, not only the cost of Output but the cost of Development), and it inevitably follows, as a mere arithmetical corollary, that the sum of purchasing power distributed to consumers must always and increasingly be less than the price of the product by exactly the difference between the value of the Output and the value of the Development; in other words, that Capital appreciation in the most comprehensive sense will never be purchasable by the community as consumer. For ourselves, we challenge the validity of the original proposition on every possible ground; it is as utterly false as any proposition that "works" at all can possibly be. And see, in fact, how monstrously it works. Not only is the natural play of the system it supports responsible for the present chaos of the world, but, contrary to the opinion of the "Daily News," but for the amazing *virtues* of the men who work it, the same system would produce even more disastrous effects. Let us remember that but for "charity," outside the system, the system itself could not last a day. Without the subsidy of the wage-earning classes by hundreds of millions annually, their wages alone would be unable to discharge even the cost of their living. The "system" would starve nine-tenths of them; and it is only the sentimental "virtues" of the men who work it that conceal the fact. It is, we affirm, the very contrary of the proposition that alone can form the basis of a new dispensation: not "Costs must be less than Price," but "Price must be less than Costs." We agree that the new proposition appears to be paradoxical and impracticable, though Mr. Kitson is demonstrating how easy and simple it is in reality. We agree, furthermore, that the older proposition is plausible to the point of being apparently self-evident. But remark that the practical outcome of the plausible proposition is the present industrial situation—a demonstration sufficiently vivid of the inherent defects of the accepted axiom. May we not conclude that from our apparently paradoxical proposition that Price must always be less than Cost, the *practical* outcome would be the elimination of paradox from life itself?

* * *

Having accomplished their object of squeezing the weaker manufacturers and incidentally creating the worst period of unemployment of recent years by the simple means of raising the price of financial Credit, the Banks are now proposing to reverse the engines and to raise commodity prices again by reducing the Bank rate. The precursor of this policy is the lowering of the discount rate upon Treasury Bills last week, nominally, of course, by the Government itself, but actually by the wirepullers of the "City." It is contended or, perhaps, only pretended, by the "Times" that the cheapening of financial Credit or bankers' loans will not have the effect of "inflation," the old distinction being

made between "inflation" and "expansion." But unless the purpose of the reduction of the Bank rate, namely, the cheapening of Money, is to be defeated, its effect must necessarily be the extension of facilities for obtaining loans: in other words, the expansion of actual spending power; and unless, again, the expansion of purchasing power in the hands of producers can be shown to be *immediately* followed by an expansion of purchasing power in the hands of consumers, the consequences can only be inflation and a rise in commodity prices. We may expect, in fact, a gradual ascent in the cost of living from about the end of April onwards. That the situation either here or abroad will be improved by the change of policy on the part of the Banks can hardly be expected; for the obvious deduction to make from the change is that the existing consumptive capacity of the world will be still further curtailed. Once again, in short, the orthodox financial remedy for a condition of over-production (or under-consumption) is more production at the expense of less consumption—a paradox which if it were now presented for the first time would certainly be riddled with criticism by every "expert." What is the explanation of the repeated failure of the "City" to discover a policy that is not ruinous to one or other great class of the community? It is not, as the "Daily News" likes to believe, the exceptional "wickedness" of City men and bankers. On the whole, in fact, a remarkably high standard of probity prevails among them. Nor, again, is it that they deliberately and callously cause the evil consequences their policy brings about, however clearly they may foresee and accept them. The simple explanation is that they mind their shareholders' business and employ their control of Credit for no other object than to derive the greatest possible profit compatible with security.

* * *

We shall not speculate, as we might, on the objects of the Franco-British policy of occupying more and more of Germany ostensibly to enforce payment of the war-indemnity. Credit is known to be the condition of Germany's ability to pay; Credit, furthermore, is alleged to be, and is, of such an imponderable and psychological character that confidence and security are the breath of its being. How, therefore, German credit and Germany's consequent ability to pay are going to be increased by thrusting a foreign army deeper into her vitals, we are at a loss to understand. The object of Franco-British policy, in fact, can scarcely be the recovery of the indemnities in any legitimate commercial form—gold or goods or services; but it must, we suppose, be of another character; possibly the annexation to France of several of the more profitable of the German provinces. However that may be, the reflection cannot be avoided that, in the matter of the indemnities, the German politicians (for there are no statesmen in Germany either) have played directly into the hands of the Allied financiers and chauvinists. With the ineptitude of our own publicists, German publicists have not only declared that their country is "too poor" to pay a few hundred millions of indemnity per annum, but they have carefully refrained from preparing or demanding the means. And the German Labour movement, with the same outlook as our own, is forced to the same conclusion. In common, no doubt, with the rest of the Press, we have received, for example, a Manifesto from the German Federation of Trade Unions echoing and repeating the familiar contentions of German capitalists based on identical misconceptions. Admitting the justice or, at least, the necessity of indemnities, the German trade unionists plead that Germany is now a poor country, that the indemnities would fall upon the German working-classes, and that international Labour should intervene to moderate the Allied demands. The facts, however, are against German Labour, as they are also against Labour opinions everywhere; and they are as follows: that German real credit

(or ability to produce) is more than equal to the payment of the indemnities in addition to providing amply for the German workers; that if Germany will not pay the indemnities, reorganising her financial system for the purpose, neither will German Labour be any the better off; that, in fact, the forced export of 1,000 millions of goods per annum *without return* would be the temporary salvation of the German working classes, providing them with work and wages over a long period as the indemnity is repayable. What German Labour has done is to look at the indemnity question from the same point of view as German Capital. Instead of welcoming the opportunity for work afforded by a "foreign demand" of 1,000 millions a year, and doubly welcoming it just because there would be no "return" upon it, German Labour, while still wedded to the notion that it must live by work, has flown in the face of Providence and rejected an "offer" which English Labour is craving, let us say, Russia to make. We know what our own Labour people would say if the Government authorised Russia to import 1,000 millions of English goods a year, with or without the prospect of goods in return. So long as there was plenty of work (and wages) the question of return goods would never be raised; and we may add that, from Labour's point of view, there is a defence for such ignorance. German trade unionists, however, are even more short-sighted than our own; and they will not take the chance of unlimited employment even when it is offered them.

* * *

Mr. Raymond Radclyffe, the financial editor of the "New Witness," is the latest victim of the delusion that war between Great Britain and America is impossible. "I say confidently," he declares, "that a war between Great Britain and the United States is impossible . . . We could not under any circumstances support Japan in a war with the United States." In the certainty that the barometer will be accused of bringing about the weather—Mr. Radclyffe, in fact, as good as says that people who predict an Anglo-American war are making themselves responsible for it—we venture to question again the assumption of its impossibility, and even the assumption of the impossibility of our co-operation with Japan. That such an alignment of forces as is implied would be criminal in the superlative degree and only to be compared with the tragedy of the Fall we perfectly agree with our colleagues, M. M. Cosmoi. Nothing less sublime, in fact, than their vocabulary can even begin to suggest the significance of the impending events in terms of our terrestrial humanity. Mankind is at a crisis in the history of cosmos. But that nevertheless such an "error" or spiritual sin as the suicide of the Aryan race is possible we not only have theoretically to conceive, but unfortunately the actual indications of its probability are abundant. We have read Mr. Harding's Presidential Speech with the utmost care to find in it, if we could, any sign of America's realisation of the paramount necessity imposed upon and not merely assumed by England to maintain the supremacy of the seas, and *not* primarily or even mainly for commercial, but for cultural reasons. We have been disappointed. On the contrary, Mr. Harding envisages the "brilliant destiny" of America as of a paramount world-power, speaks of America's resolution to expand, and talks in no veiled terms of America's ability to show the world how to make war. All this is, of course, perfectly legitimate on the assumption that world-values are equally distributed among the races and nations, and that rivalry between Great Britain and America is of no more importance to the world than rivalry between, say, America and Japan. But, on the assumption and fact that the British and American race is the divine custodian of the highest created and revealed world-values, rivalry between them is nothing less than the repetition of the original and disastrous War in

Heaven. As for Mr. Radclyffe's confident assertion that "we could not under any circumstances support Japan in a war with the United States," the reply is that it may, under too easily conceivable circumstances, be "necessary." At this moment we are building warships for Japan. A week ago we sent over to Japan 30 expert men to construct flying boats for the Japanese Admiralty. For the first time in history, a Japanese Prince has left his country and is now on his way to London, where he is to receive a royal welcome; and Count Chinda, who attends him, has informed the Press (by official consent) that "no doubt the visit will cement still more closely the good relations so long existing between the two nations."

World Affairs.

ALL force is evil, and there is no other evil but violence, necessity, force; the inherent cosmic Evil is nothing but the eternal existence of Force. For the eternal Logos is the eternal determination, and therefore determinism; and the evil and terrible dominant of cosmic and human existence, Fate, is only the omnipresence of the defining, shaping, determining Logos of God. For the System of things and the Eternal Reason are the basis and the everlasting stronghold of Destiny; and what must be, not what ought to be, not what can be, is done by Necessity. Necessity is Force. Destiny is Pain. Force is Evil. But the Aryan will and Christian reason know that Evil is the antithesis of good and the condition of it; that Force is an antithesis of Love and the condition of it. There is no other Satan in the infinite existence except the infinite but finiting Son Himself, the awareness and the reason of the eternal Father. There must be necessity and logic in the world. There must be Destiny. And it is this all-mighty power that in its working precedes the most precious of powers and dominants, the Freedom of Man; this eternal antithesis, this Satan, however, is ever grounded in the abyss of the Creator's will in Providence. All force and all consciousness is only an instrument and modality of the divine abyss of Providence. What ought to be drives and leads that which must be; not contrariwise. Freedom, the end of God and Man, ultimately realises its own most inscrutable function. While Providence is infinite and *infiniting* and Destiny finited and *finiting*, *Freedom* is indefinite, *indefiniting*. Human will is the final grievance of the world and of the infinite universe itself, however thrice-fathomless its human, synthetic, divino-satanic indefiniteness may be. Humanity can obey Providence and can use Destiny; for Destiny is all-mighty in order that the Father of Creation and his own human self-realisation can realise their divine and fathomless will.

* * *

The severe law of the antithetic development of humanity and creation holds good for the relations of the hemispheres of the Geon and of the humanities inhabiting them. Love precedes Reason, but Reason precedes Pleroma in human cosmogony; so that the harmony and fullness of pan-human life will be the last stage of history and evolution. Our age is the age of the æonian transition from the entithetic and forcible order of history and of existence to the Sophian, organical order of Pan-human ripeness and responsibility. We will return to this definition of our divine chaos, of the Æon of the Geon of our moment; and of the century; and of the millennium. The universal crisis in which the flesh and the soul of our globe, and the flesh and the soul of its humanity, are now crucified, is the crisis of the exchange of spirals, of the spirals of Aryandom and supra-Aryandom, of the Logoic and Sophian life. What is of greatest essentiality for the study and the solution of the world-problem to-day (for the world to-day is *one*, indivisible world and is sufficiently *a world lost* in its own insanity and criminality to be a problem), what is of supreme essentiality for the understanding of the world to-day and for its salvation is to know that the organic order of the world is inherent in the world; that Pan-

humanity, that Loka Samgraha, therefore, is willed, desired by Providence itself, and predestined by Destiny. Pan-Humanity, the World-Organism, however, is an organism, a functional whole. There must be order and law organism, a functional whole. There must be order and even in the freedom and in the salvation of humanities. This order and law is the inherent nature of cosmic, historical, human reality. The primary command of the Law of Reality, of all Being, is the law of the polarity and inward tension of every Identity on the one side, and the unity and identity, harmony, completeness of the Contrariety on the other. In the case we are considering this law of the antithetic structure of realities, this absolute law, necessitates and demands that Western mankind should lift up to itself, should categorically raise up to itself, to its own divine height of Logoic ecstasy the hemisphere of the East. The essence of the East is not China nor Japan, but India, Siam, Burma. India it is, not China and Japan, that is the infinite antithesis, the real antithesis to the entire West; the country enchanted by the sight of the Absolute; the antithesis to the entire world, to all history. This Realm of Spirit, this deific power in the pan-human order, this India needs to be conquered, trans-substantiated and created anew by the West. If the West and the world-civilisation are not able to lift up and trans-substantiate the continent of India, to make an active and dynamic value of India, the West will be shown to have been incapable of its world-function.

* * *

World-civilisation is a value universal, objective. Cultures of the One Humanity are many, and they cannot but be racial and national and tribal. Civilisation, however, needs to be one and supra-national, "international." Speaking in a material and incarnational sense, in an instrumental sense, in an inferior sense, it is obvious that the universal value of the world, its highest value, is its one, united civilisation. The gift of the Western genius to the human whole, speaking, as we do, in a material sense, will be the mechanics and the engineering of Loka Samgraha. The West can contribute the plan and the machinery for the World-Civilisation, and ought to contribute it. The spiritual and proper contribution of the Logoic hemisphere to Universal Humanity, however, is the self-governing, self-existing personality. This gift of Personality is one of the essential dispensations of mankind. Pleroma, Sophia, the Kingdom itself, are to be a higher dispensation than this; for Socialism Universal, the paradisiacal Life Seraphic, the Community of Freedom will be a *community of personalities*. This state of synthetic, ecstatic life, let us emphasise with all persuasion, can only come after the society of the Race passes everywhere and entirely through the furnace of trial, of infernal suffering, of crisis, of struggle. The Synthesis is reached through the crisis of Antithesis. Just so in the racial life of humanity. The kingdom of Sophia will be reached by the Universal Man after the Western and individualist Man spiritually conquers and transforms the collectivist Eastern world. Of this conquest and transformation reason and materialism are the inevitable instruments, materialism and imperialism. Yet what is pan-humanly is just that which is most merciful, sacrificial. Sophian sympathy and insight are pan-human justice. That the West endeavours to impose its own materialist civilisation upon the world is functional. World-civilisation must be one; and civilisation, the technique of human organisation, cannot but be material. To these heights of frozen and omnipotent Reason and of necessity, of Western magic, of deadly organisation, India must consent to be aroused and accustomed. For these heights are depths and the way to them is a descent. To this descent and self-violence India must be compelled before she can be reborn as the India of the regenerated world.

M. M. COSMOI.

Our Generation.

AN action of great self-denying stupidity took place the other week, and was naturally reported in the "Spectator." It happened in the firm of Messrs. Robert Williams and Sons, Gorton. "The workers requested that their wages should be reduced by 10 per cent., as they recognised that 'the present high cost of living is mainly due to the very high cost of production.' They expressed a hope that 'our example will become contagious in other trades as well as our own, and the result will then be a lowering in the cost of living and consequent increase in purchasing-power.' The employers accepted the offer. This is the first voluntary and genuine effort we have heard of by workers to stop the disheartening pursuit of wages after prices round and round the vicious circle. It is an admirable example of taking the long view." The workers in Messrs. Robert Williams and Sons' factory are evidently convinced that they have achieved a good action; the tenor of their exhortations to their fellow-workers outside indicates as much. But it is still permitted us, doubting the validity of a virtuous glow, to inquire whether their action was good or not. And considering it coolly, we doubt its goodness, and, despite, or perhaps because of, its quality of self-denial, we can only see that it is ignorant, and, being an action committed in ignorance, is therefore presumptuous. These sublime employees do not know—it is shocking, but it is so—the cause of high prices; and not knowing that, any steps which they take to bring prices down cannot be good. This is the simple truth, whatever their consciences may say. For virtue, to repeat a truism again, is not more "good," but more enlightened than we take it to be. We do not need more self-denial but more light; and the early Christian disciples of Messrs. Robert Williams and Sons should not have sacrificed a portion of their livelihood to the firm; they should have spent it in buying Major Douglas' "Credit Power and Democracy." Moreover, that would have been more virtuous, for it is sure that to them it would be a greater sacrifice. As it is they have only succeeded in committing a faux pas so unmistakable that the "Spectator" approves of it. "The employers accepted the offer." So now we may expect our eggs and butter by some occult process to become cheaper; but if they do not we shall feel inclined to call the evangelical workmen of Gorton comedians of the spirit.

When a scientist says "It might well be argued," everybody may be sure he is about to saddle us with a new and terrifying superstition. It is a curious fact that science, the avowed enemy of superstitions of all kinds, has provided us with more superstitions in the last fifty years than popular prejudice or even evangelical religion. There has been the superstition of "nature red in tooth and claw"; and now there is the menace of the "harnessed electron," on which Lord Headley was recently as garrulous as a savage about his fetich. "It might well be argued," he said, "that in the future, when the days of war in the shape of harnessed electrons were unloosed, not a single human being would survive on any battlefield. A general officer, sitting at his comfortable desk in the War Office, might touch a button and release destructive agencies capable of sweeping hundreds of square miles and depriving of existence every living creature thereon." We know that "comfortable desk," and that "button," which is now so battered and disreputable that it should be sent to Ibsen's button-moulder to be melted. We know that fear also; it is the primal fear, before knowledge, from which mankind has been struggling to free itself for thousands of years. We have killed by the life-giving exercise of our intelligence the fear which

lies in the past, but if we have to combat fears, undefined, unprognosticable fears, which lie in the future, then our task is impossible of consummation, for in the future every possible and impossible thing exists, and the worst is that we cannot give evidence for or against one of them. To foresee is one thing; it is the prudence of men and of communities. But to be terrorised by the projection forward of the imaginations of our minds is to be no better than ignorant savages. In the mouth of a man of science "It might well be argued" means "It might ill be argued." For it is the fundamental and sublime instinct of the scientist to doubt his fears, not to be deceived by them; and to inquire fearlessly what is the truth. He is mankind's priest of emancipation; the dispeller of terror, which is born in darkness. As it is, the only thing that is left for all of us is to be more scientific than Lord Headley, and to banish his nightmare from our minds until there is more than imaginary reasons for believing in it. It is sure, at any rate, that science is not a mixture of Sir Oliver Lodge and the Grand Guignol.

The recent manifesto by Signor F. T. Marinetti on "Le Tactilisme," is full of his usual amusing violence, and his customary distressing ingenuousness. What world can he live in when he can say that the masses "have come out of the war with one care, to conquer more fully their material well-being"? The masses have not yet entertained the notion of well-being, and they scorn to listen to anything about it. About the minority, composed of philosophers and artists, he is more credible. These are suffering "d'un mal profond et mystérieux," and its symptoms are "an almost feminine neuræsthenia, a pessimism without hope, a feverish indecision of the disordered instincts, and an absolute lack of will." The surprising thing is that both these classes are fighting against progress, civilisation, "le Forces mécaniques de la Vitesse, du Comfort, de l'Hygiène"—and the still more astonishing thing that these great values of life are being supported by the Futurists alone! This is Signor Marinetti's view of the world drama; and considering what a terrible enemy of romanticism he is, how much romanticism there is in it! The Futurists are willing, he says, to fight along with the revolutionary majority; and that, of course, is all right. They ask the sad minority not to dream of bye-gone ages, but to perfect and to create their own age; and that, too, is all right. But in order to perfect their age, it appears they have to be absurd—after all, the Futurists are absurd. Signor Marinetti has discovered that human intercourse is carried on mainly through the mouth, by speaking, and the eyes, evidently by ogling. It is not enough! We must educate our hides, for these "are still mediocre conductors of thought." Hence "le tactilisme." Signor Marinetti wants tactile houses, tactile theatres, tactile streets; so that when, like Dr. Johnson, we have acquired the habit of touching every lamp-post on our way, each of them will give us a different thrill. Romanticism will never survive this latest onslaught upon it.

Why is it that a hundred years after a poet's birth or death it is considered learned, enlightened, superior, anything you like, to insert a page or so in all the papers proposing his health? The usage is universal, sanctioned by custom; yet existing in the world of culture, there is something incongruous and a little displeasing in it. For there is nothing more integral in a hundred years than there is, say, in fifty-seven; the only difference between them, other than length, is that a century seems to fill critics with sentimental good nature and that fifty-seven years leaves them in possession of their wits. The most considerable evil of the custom is that it appears to give an intellectual sanction to the prejudice that there is something occult in a hundred years.

EDWARD MOORE.

Drama,

By John Francis Hope.

IN Mr. C. K. Munro the Stage Society has discovered a playwright who may reasonably be expected to do work suitable for the ordinary stage—if he will take the trouble to learn his craft. "At Mrs. Beam's," of which Mr. Allan Wade secured a far better performance than it deserved, was, I should think, written in about a fortnight, and never revised—in accordance with a stupid theory of inspiration affected by young playwrights. It is full of *longueurs*, senseless repetitions, meaningless "curtains"; Mr. Munro did not know when to stop, and I suppose wrote "Curtain" whenever his fountain pen needed refilling. Nor was it easy to discover the point of his comedy; he used two themes as a man might use a double-barrelled gun in the hope that if he missed with one barrel he would hit with the other. He seemed to want us to take his diatribes against marriage seriously, and he certainly bored us with them; but in that case, why did he discredit his advocate of free love by making him a professional thief? On the other hand, he seemed to want us to agree that the bores "At Mrs. Beam's" were nothing but bores; but, if so, why did he write the part of Miss Shoe so cleverly as to give Miss Jean Cadell the opportunity of making a brilliantly comedic study? Impossible in real life, it was a wonderful character on the stage; one marvelled not at Miss Cadell's genius, but at the completeness, the vividness, the reality, of the character. This was life happily presented by art; full of subtlety and satirical shades, and it kept the audience laughing the whole afternoon. Yet I dare swear that Mr. Munro wrote it in a mood of exasperation, just to show you how awful life in a boarding-house can be. He did not know what he was doing; he was not thinking in terms of the theatre, but outlined this little masterpiece unaware. Out of the bored one came forth comedy, and he did not know it until the genius of the actress showed it to him. I dare swear that Miss Jean Cadell's performance, and its effect, was as much of a revelation to him as it was to me; I saw her in "Mary Rose," and certainly did not expect this from her. If only our playwrights could write up to the level of some of our actors, we should not talk about the decline of the English drama.

To return to Mrs. Beam's at Notting Hill (or Notnill, as the Cockney calls it). Take Mr. Munro's view of it. Here is a stronghold of English morality and respectability, living a blameless life varied by suspicions and innuendoes that their neighbours are not living a blameless life, and enlivened by shocks caused by the revelations of the wickedness of the world made by the Press. There was a man in Paris, for example, who according to the lowest estimate was supposed to have killed thirty-five women (and eaten them; the nephew declared every two minutes that the knife and fork had been found). It was rumoured that the man was in London; and as the new boarders had come from Paris, and the woman was obviously foreign, and the man had a mole under his left eye (like the murderer), Miss Shoe had every opportunity for the exercise of her peculiar gifts. She proved by evidence, by statistics, by deduction, that the boarder was the murderer; Mr. Munro managed very deftly to let her build up her case into a conviction by which she was prepared to stand or fall. The whole scene was very ably managed, with the spinster appealing for support to a creature who had once been a man, but seemed only to remember that he had been a boy, and had forgotten all incidents of his boyhood that had any relevance to the subject under discussion. The comfortable matron refusing to be thrilled by the proximity of the "murderer," asking: "Why don't you inform the police if you are so sure of it?" Her son, interjecting the "knife and fork" at any odd moment, completed as pretty a picture of a set of bores as one could wish to see.

But when Mr. Munro introduced us to the bedroom of the new boarders he became a bore himself. All these disquisitions on the sexual significance of the bed, on romance being "the pathos of distance," on the nature of the man's power over the woman being due to the fact that she did not understand him, on the absurdity of marriage, etc., were the merest common-places. It was supposed to be a picture of passionate love, treated realistically with a considerable amount of horseplay; but neither Mr. Baliol Holloway nor Miss Adela Mavis could make it quite alive. She pouted, and pleaded, and stormed, and wept, and pelted him, and pitched the table over, and slapped his face, and all the rest of it, made love to him like an Apache, and behaved, as he said, like the second act of a melodrama; the only thing that Miss Mavis did not do successfully was the hysterical laugh. But neither of the players produced the feeling that there was any bond of passion between them; they could not, with the stuff they had to deliver. If she talked like the second act of a melodrama, he talked like the third act of a repertory theatre play. He was not satisfied with lecturing his paramour on the absurdity of English marriage, but he repeated the lecture to the boarders in the second act, and again in his farewell speech in the third act. If he had had anything new to say on the subject, something that had not been said, and said better, in Shaw's *vade mecum* to the discussion of the marriage problem, "Getting Married," he would have been tolerable; but Mr. Munro's cleverness deserted him when he tried to be shocking. I heard Mr. Baliol Holloway expound the merits of quack medicines in "Volpone"; and it was not his fault that the exposition of the quack morality of free love in Mr. Munro's play was so tedious. An immoralist must be witty; it is his only saving grace on the stage.

Mr. Munro was obviously aiming at the *imbroglio*. The male adventurer was considering the problem: "How to be removed?" the female adventurer was considering the problem: How to make this man care seriously for her? Miss Shoe was hard at work trying to discover the truth about the new boarders. She believed that they were not married; the male adventurer calculated that the announcement that they were "living in sin" would get him immediate notice to quit; the female adventurer calculated that she could make him jealous by flirting with a boy, and leading her confederate to think that his plans of burglary would not, this time, be accomplished with her aid. It should have been a pretty kettle of fish, but was not; certainly, Miss Shoe was told everything by the female adventurer, and saw all the flirtations, etc. (there was a great deal too much of this), and thereby gave the male adventurer what he wanted. The confession scene was delightfully played, with Miss Cadell playing the "elder sister" and "woman of the world" to the Apache; it remains in the memory just as the flirtation of the male adventurer with a grass widow (an extraordinary study of silly femininity by Miss Phyllis Stuckey) does. But the *imbroglio* did not embroil; there were no cross purposes, but only a retirement according to plan. Dermott was not in doubt concerning Laura, nor had she, in spite of her spoken dubiety, given him any cause to be. She had confessed to Miss Shoe, given Dermott the chance to deliver his lecture on free love, in return for the notice to quit he desired; she might have had her face kissed off by Colin Langford for all he cared, he knew that she would go with him. The jealousy theme between these two was childishly conceived, and so feebly handled that it never began to seem real; and it made no difference. Mr. Munro's invention needs to be checked, to be made to concern itself only with relevant issues. Another instance of this useless fertility is the drunken scene in the third act. Why should Mr. Durrins, without any warning, any hint, suddenly be converted from an old fool into a drunken sot? He was intended to provide a screamingly funny ending; but

Dermott's farewell speech on free love had bored us, we did not expect humour from him even in a final farewell message, and the addition of a drunken messenger talking drivel was not funny. So far as this play shows, it is observation of character that inspires Mr. Munro's comedic power; in his revealed intentions, he shows bad taste and a complete ignorance of the effect he is producing, and he has everything to learn of construction—but he is capable of learning.

Art.

INDEPENDENT GALLERY: PAUL SIGNAC.

Signac, with Seurat, is the founder of neo-Impressionism. In order to represent light better, they tried to identify the colours on the palette with those of the spectrum, and painted in juxtaposed points, using pure colours exclusively (or rather as pure as can be manufactured). They refused to mix the colours on the palette, asserting that they would mix on the retina. But however mixed the impression of colour they managed to give, their final aim was not reached, as whatever juxtaposition of colours they used they never succeeded in getting white light. Signac in the water-colours exhibited here, which were painted last year, is still pursuing the painting of light, but with a different method. He still avoids neutral tints, but does not insist any longer on "pointillisme," which is replaced by patches of strong colour placed almost regardless of the rules of the "mélange optique." It seems that he has now shaken off his theories and can show the full emotional strength of a sensitive artist. I cannot point to any water-colours possessing greater effect of plein-air, stronger construction, or greater brilliancy of colour. No. 2, "Chalutier à la cale," is a very good example of his skill in this medium. Nos. 5, 7, and 11 give an overwhelming feeling of burl and sunlight. In No. 15, "Nature Morte," Signac shows a sense for volume which can hardly ever be seen—to such an extent—in his earlier works. Besides this, with very simple means, he obtains in this picture a very good effect of material.

Paul Signac's importance in modern art is not often mentioned, although he was the first to break the old tradition of colouring by introducing an equivalent. It would not be too much to say that his effort to schematise the palette gave the impulse to the cubists, who found an equivalent for the rest of traditional art. Signac, who is now over 50, judging by this last work, is still full of freshness and energy, and we may yet see other and still greater developments of his art.

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY ARTISTS' CLUB EXHIBITION OF MODERN PAINTINGS.

Outside London (and even in it) opportunities of seeing modern art in England are still rare, and it is a hopeful sign that the younger spirits at the two older Universities are making enterprising efforts to get over this obstacle to interest and appreciation. Societies of those who realise that art did not stop short with Sir Joshua Reynolds and the Pre-Raphaelites have been formed at both Oxford and Cambridge. Oxford has had at least one interesting exhibition of English modern art, and the Cambridge University Artists' Club has just held an exhibition of modern painting which, besides works by Roger Fry, Walter Sickert, and other English painters, included such well-known French names as Marchand, de Segonzac, Friesz, Lotnon and Frélaud. "La Belle Rose," by Anton Friesz takes a really important place in modern art both by its conception and its execution. The "Nude," by Segonzac, is characteristically broad in treatment, and has besides a remarkable sense of volume. The landscape by Frélaud ("La Petite Eglise") has an original spiral design, which successfully centres the interest on the small white church in such a way that the light in the picture seems to come from the church.

It is perhaps not too much to hope that this Club will prove to be a nucleus for an organisation embracing all forms of modern art.

R. A. STEPHENS.

Readers and Writers.

My advice is frequently asked concerning the initiation and establishment of new journals. As the lady said of children, I ought to know something about them, having metaphorically buried quite a number of them; but, in fact, I do not pretend to be cognisant of much more than the difficulties to be overcome. In my time I have not only been directly connected with a goodly number of journalistic ventures, but I have observed some scores, I might almost say hundreds, of similar argosies set out upon the high seas and sink within sight of home. It is difficult to pronounce in advance what journals will prove seaworthy and what not. Experience seems to be the only conclusive test. Moreover, it is not always the case that an apparent shipwreck is really fatal, since in some instances journals have astonishingly recovered from what seemed irretrievable disaster. Merits alone and in the abstract have, I am disposed to think, little to do with success or failure. We have all known magazines endowed with merits sink after the first launch; and others with no valuable cargo on board whatever proudly sail into popular success. I have long ago given up the pretence of being an expert in these matters. Success, like kissing, appears, on the whole, to go by favour.

* * *

Having said so much in self-depreciation, I can now proceed to be dogmatic with a good conscience. Success is not quite so mysterious a thing as to be altogether beyond analysis. Let us take, for example, the chief "sixpenny" weekly reviews of this country and consider some of the reasons why they are still running. It will be found that they each express primarily a mood or mode of thought of the common mind of England; and that they are successful more or less exactly to the degree that this mood or mode exists and desires expression. The "Spectator," for instance, expresses the predominant mood of the English country gentleman; it reflects him as he likes to see himself; he recognises his features in it. The "Nation," on the other hand, expresses the English "gentleman" of the new plutocracy, the second and third generation of the Manchester school. They have inherited their success from plebeian grandfathers and are a little ashamed of it. En revanche, they try to atone for the sins of their forefathers by an excessively moral concern for the victims of the system. It is a common trait in retired plutocrats or in plutocrats of the second and third generation to take up with liberalism and radicalism; and the "Nation" perfectly represents their indulgence in communion with their consciences. As the "Spectator" is the flattering mirror of the English gentleman old style, the "Nation" is the flattering mirror of the English gentleman new style. I hasten to add that the "gentleman" in both cases is anything but a gentleman in the broad sense; neither type has the least notion of what a thorough sudra he often is.

* * *

Enough has been said to make it appear probable that if either the "Spectator" or the "Nation" did not exist, it would be necessary to invent them. In other words, for as long as the moods they represent exist in the mind of the reading public, they or their equivalents are certain of success. There remain now the "Saturday Review," the "Outlook," the "New Statesman," and the "New Witness." (I have not, of course, forgotten THE NEW AGE, but it is scarcely in the foregoing gallery.) Both the "Saturday Review" and the "Outlook" are representative of a "complex" or set of characteristics in the "gentlemanly"

mind of England, the former being, so to say, the male of the "Spectator," and the latter the female of the "Nation." Nine out of ten opinions the "Saturday Review" shares with the "Spectator" and the "Outlook" with the "Nation"; but the differential is in both cases a matter of emphasis. The "Saturday Review" is louder than the "Spectator," and the "Nation" is louder than the "Outlook." And since loudness is only a characteristic, an idiosyncrasy, an occasional indulgence, of the English gentleman, while usually he prefers to be "nice," the "Saturday Review" only pleases him when he finds the "Spectator" too "nice," and the "Outlook" only when the "Nation" is not quite "nice" enough. The "Saturday Review," in other words, is read by those readers of the "Spectator" who do not read the "Spectator," and the "Outlook" by those readers of the "Nation" who do not read the "Nation."

* * *

The "New Statesman" has been called the Fabian "Spectator"; at the same time I have heard it called the Fabian "Nation." As a matter of fact, it represents the coalescence of the two moods already mentioned, the approximation of the old-style country gentleman to the nouveau riche, and the similar approximation of the second-generation industrialists to the gentility of tradition. Mr. Clifford Sharp, the founder and editor of the "New Statesman," is a journalist of considerable ability. Like many other successful editors and journalists, he graduated on THE NEW AGE. He had, of course, in the initiation of the "New Statesman" the inestimable advantage of the prestige of Mr. Bernard Shaw and Mr. Sidney Webb. For the first twelve months of his journal, in fact, its readers were under the distinct impression that they were reading the ipsissima verba of one or other of these two well-known writers. But Mr. Sharp, if he knew how to make use of Mr. Shaw's prestige, knew also how to dispense with it; and Mr. Shaw's well-advertised departure from the journal left the "New Statesman" launched favourably, it is true, but nevertheless well able to sail under its own steam. The fact is that Mr. Sharp himself is the representative blend of the blend in the common genteel mind; and the "New Statesman" is the typical mirror of it. It is needless to say that, being a mirror, it is without dynamic; its success is assured if it only "reflects" properly. For anybody on the "New Statesman" to think in advance of its readers, would be to smash the looking-glass. My conclusion is that the "New Statesman" can go on lasting as long as it likes.

* * *

The "New Witness" is in a different category altogether. Begun under the auspices of Mr. Belloc and Mr. G. K. Chesterton, it may still be said to be a personal journal. People who quote the "Spectator" do not think of Mr. St. Loe Strachey; and few of its readers are even aware that Mr. Clifford Sharp is the editor of the "New Statesman." Everybody knows, on the contrary, that Mr. G. K. Chesterton and Mr. Belloc (though the latter is not now) are the editors of the "New Witness," and far more people refer to what Mr. Chesterton or Mr. Belloc says than to the opinions of the "New Witness" as a journal. This undoubtedly is a weakness from a journalistic point of view, since it means that the "New Witness" does not represent its readers so much as its well-known writers; that, in fact, it is not a representative journal at all, but a presentative journal. Absit omen that either Mr. Strachey or Mr. Clifford Sharp should cease to edit their respective journals, but, if they did, both the "Spectator" and the "New Statesman" would carry on much as they do now, since both are really edited by their public. But if Mr. G. K. Chesterton should cease to edit the "New Witness," I can see myself no future for it. Its present readers would be a flock without a

shepherd, and inevitably they would scatter and be lost in other flocks.

* * *

It will be seen from this brief survey of living journals that the conditions of survival fall into two main classes: representation and presentation; and that of the two the former is much the more secure. In value, of course, the merits are the reverse; for a presentative journal is necessarily more dynamic than a merely representative journal. It would not exist at all without a considerable dynamic behind it. On the other hand, for survival and security the representative journal, edited, that is to say, by and for its readers, is to be preferred. It is useless, but it can last. Correspondents who in future ask my advice are invited to define the type of journal they propose to bring into the world.

R. H. C.

Towards National Guilds.

THE "Daily Herald" has at last published a review of "Credit Power and Democracy," though we may remark that its review of "Economic Democracy" still remains unpublished. The present review is by Mr. Emil Davies, a practical financier himself, the financial editor of the "New Statesman," and a well-known propagandist of Collectivism. On the face of it these qualifications should be sufficient to enable Mr. Davies to grasp the leading ideas of our Credit Scheme without much difficulty. Far humbler persons than Mr. Davies have succeeded in getting to the bottom of the subject; and their number, moreover, is being added to daily. Yet Mr. Davies is not ashamed to confess that "much of the book is altogether incomprehensible to me," and that "what precisely the scheme is I cannot explain." It is no crime, of course, in "the ordinary reader" (with whom Mr. Davies compares himself) to fail to understand the intricate simplicity of a Scheme whose terms are mostly new to him. But Mr. Davies is not an ordinary reader, or he would not be paid to write as a financial expert, and he cannot therefore claim the privilege of an ordinary reader. For him to confess that he cannot understand a financial scheme, which many an ordinary reader has, in fact, learned to understand, is to invite the question what, then, is he doing in professing to guide opinion on the subject of finance? Suppose that Owen should have said that he couldn't understand Darwin, or that a chemistry expert should confess that he couldn't make head or tail of Professor Soddy's works, the conclusion would certainly be drawn that it was not Darwin or Soddy who was at fault, but their critics. We have waited long for the "Daily Herald" review of "Credit Power and Democracy," but we would cheerfully have waited longer for a review which should have been competent. As it is, Mr. Davies' review is, on his own confession, worthless, since he admits that the idea and the Scheme are unintelligible to him.

Mr. Cole's attitude in the "Guildsman" is, if anything, worse than Mr. Davies' in the "Daily Herald." Mr. Davies does, at least, refrain from positive hostile criticism; he simply says that he doesn't understand the Scheme and that it may therefore, for all he knows, be as good as it claims. After an almost equally explicit confession of failure to understand the Scheme, Mr. Cole, however, proceeds to attack it as "unworkable practically, unsound economically and undesirable morally," a comprehensive denunciation that might have followed a demonstration of his complete knowledge of the Scheme, but that assuredly carries no weight after his confession that, in fact, he does not understand the nature of what he is attacking. But let us assume that this is Mr. Cole's way and that he can use no other; and examine his triple alliance of objections to the Scheme. What do they amount to?

Before, however, dealing with these objections serially, there is one admitted confusion in Mr. Cole's

mind that may perhaps be cleared up. He says he fails to appreciate the importance of the distinction between industrial power (resident in the ownership of plant) and financial power (resident in the control of Money and financial Credit). We should have thought, on the contrary, that both the distinction and the importance of the distinction would have been made self-evident by now, if not by our reiterated explanations, by the notorious facts. Why are manufacturers complaining of the banks' restriction of credit? What is all the fuss about currency and credit if, in fact, the industrialists (the owners of plant and real credit) are in a position to command financial credit at will? Mr. Cole will find, if he applies to the industrial capitalists, that their ownership of real credit is by no means synonymous with power to control financial credit; moreover, that they *are* within the power of the banks. Banking is not just an annex, a specialised function, of industry; it is the mobilisation and control of purchasing power or Money or Credit; an independent industry capable of controlling all industry, for the simple reason that no industry can be carried on without Credit. If only machine-power existed and a Trust monopolised all the *oil* in the world, would Mr. Cole say that the owner of machine-plant actually or virtually controlled the oil supply? Or that the distinction between the ownership of plant and the control of oil was "unimportant"? To a far greater degree than plant is dependent upon oil, all industry is dependent on financial credit; and since the collection and direction of financial credit is the special work and function of Finance, the mere industrialist who owns only plant is, strictly speaking, at the mercy of the financiers. There is and can be no doubt about it among those who are in the least degree familiar with actual business to-day. The mere ownership of plant or real credit may be a *condition* of obtaining financial credit; but it does not constitute a *right* to financial credit. As Mr. Leaf has recently admitted, the banks exercise a directive control.

Now to the three objections. Mr. Cole first says that the Scheme is "unworkable practically" because it presupposes for its initiation the good-will of the State, that is, of a force friendly to capitalism; and "if the State," he adds, "had been effectively conquered . . . there would be much shorter cuts than the Douglas Scheme to a sane financial system." The confusion, we should say, is almost palpable in Mr. Cole's reasoning; and it rests, like most criticisms we have seen, upon a misrepresentation (of course unintentional) of the pre-suppositions of the Douglas Scheme. The "price-regulation" implied in the Scheme is merely a matter of statistics, such as the Board of Trade deal with every day of the week; it implies no more Government control than the publication of the Nautical Almanac or the statistics of the food-index. The "peculiar conditions as to the investment in the industry in future" are, again, not matters for the State to decide. The only question is whether the Miners' money is not as good as the money of the ordinary Banks; and the decisive authorities are the owners and the Miners jointly and severally. Finally, the admission of the Miners' Bank to the Clearing House, though it may conceivably require the cachet of the Government, may equally conceivably be under no such necessity. It may be remarked that the American Labour Banks, formed on the Douglas model, found no difficulty in obtaining a seat in the American Clearing House. Their admission was made without a murmur. After all, we have to suppose, or, rather, we have to recognise, a condition of things which is already "practically unworkable." If, say, the Coal industry can carry on without fundamental change, well and good; not only is the Douglas Scheme superfluous and impracticable, but Mr. Cole's plans for establishing National Guilds thick end first are even more superfluous and impracticable. On the supposition, however, which is really no sup-

position but a fact, that, say, the Coal industry cannot carry on without a radical change, the question is whether a radical change thin end first is not more practical than a change by methods of violence. We could, if we were at liberty, set all Mr. Cole's imaginary fears at rest on authority beyond possible dispute. All we shall say is that if the Miners' Federation Executive cares to take up the Scheme we are prepared to answer for its practicability. We guarantee success.

Mr. Cole's next criticism is that the Scheme is "economically unsound," and once more he rests his case upon a complete misunderstanding. In fact, he asks a question as if he were in doubt (as he plainly is), proceeds to answer it wrongly, and then builds his criticism upon his own incorrect answer. Is the surplus purchasing power, represented by the difference between Cost and Price, the ultimate source, he asks, of the capital to be contributed by the Miners' Bank to the Mining Industry? And if it is, will it not mean "a wide distribution of property and a correspondingly wide distribution of interest"? The correct answer to Mr. Cole's first question is that the source of the Miners' contribution of capital to the Mining industry is not savings of purchasing power or deposits in the Miners' Bank, but *the real credit inherent* in the ability of the Miners to produce coal. Let us be clear about this point at least. Money deposits (or financial credit) are only of value in so far as they represent real credit—the ability to deliver goods; and since the Miners' Federation control the factor of Labour, in the same way that the Owners control the factor of Plant, the Miners' Bank has both the power and the right to issue financial credit up to the limit of their real credit. It follows, as we say, that the source of the Miners' capital contribution is not "money" or "savings," but real credit; and it is, in fact, the function of a Bank to convert real credit into financial credit. Mr. Cole would be well advised to read the Commentary on this subject again.

Views and Reviews.

THE HUMAN AURA.*

TALKING with a Theosophist recently on this subject, I was airily informed that it was "only the Health Aura" that Dr. Kilner inspected. Perhaps it is, and perhaps Dr. Kilner is a "grovelling materialist" therefore; but the name, "the health aura," is not very enlightening. It certainly tells us nothing of the nature or properties of the aura; and I confess a radical preference for demonstrable knowledge. Dr. Kilner's experiments have certainly demonstrated far more concerning the nature and properties of the aura than have all the clairvoyants known to me; and he has raised a number of difficult questions as a consequence which I am sure are not susceptible of immediate answer. I have already referred to the fact that the auric forces are intimately connected with and dependent upon the activities of the central nervous system; and in some cases, but only of women, the colour of the aura is to some extent under voluntary control. The colours of the aura can be changed to blue or green with comparative ease by a voluntary effort, but the colour yellow is much more difficult to produce, and the result is very unstable. There are various anomalies of colour perception to be explained; Dr. Kilner says: "The above observations suffice to show that the natural line of the aura remains a blue when looked at through a yellow screen, instead of following the common rule of becoming a green; that yellow in some shade is constantly perceived when a dark blue or violet is employed—an impossibility under ordinary circumstances. Again when by voluntary

* "The Human Atmosphere (The Aura)." By Walter J. Kilner, B.A., M.B.(Cantab.), M.R.C.P. (Kegan Paul. 10s. 6d. net.)

effort on the part of the subject the aura has been changed in hue, the colours seen through the screens do not coincide with those that might naturally have been expected." Evidently there is a whole field of research open to the optician and oculist to find an explanation of the effect of dicyanin on the human eye.

But the colour of the aura is also susceptible to change by chemical means. Dr. Kilner had noticed that the aura emanating from a part of the body which had been painted with iodine was different from the adjacent portions; and he decided on the use of chemical vapours for his experiments. Fumigation with the vapours of iodine, chlorine, or bromine produced changes of colour in the part affected (readers must consult the book for the details); but when the vapours were applied to the spinal column, both sides of the aura were affected—equally. It was argued that the vapours did not act directly upon the auras, but influenced the skin and through it the auric forces, making the colour changes secondary. To obviate this, a subject was fumed while partially dressed, under circumstances that would reduce the amount of vapour which could possibly reach the skin to an infinitesimal quantity; but after dissolving, a result identical with that of the previous experiment was observed. It would seem that the chemical vapours affect the auric forces directly, and not as a result of any physiological change. The colour of the aura, then, can be affected both with and without physiological activity—although what "colour" may be I do not profess to know. Mr. Arthur E. Baines, in another connection, suggests that it may be "in electrical association" with vital activity, but I leave the problem as a problem.

It would be interesting to know (and perhaps further research will reveal) exactly how much conscious control women can exert over the aura. The difficulty experienced in voluntarily producing the colour yellow (which is a colour much more marked in ill-health) corresponds to the difficulty of inducing disease by hypnosis; but can the subjects alter the colour of a yellow patch to normal, or effect any change in its colour by voluntary effort? What effect has the change of colour made by fumigation on such patches? Is the aura merely an index to the state of physiological activity? It seems to be only an emanation resulting from physiological activity, being most marked around the head, and varying in women with their periodical functions around the parts affected. It is certainly affected by contact with other auras; and more than that, if the observer holds his finger some eighteen inches from the subject, he will find that the emission of a ray from his finger tips towards the subject is so far under voluntary control that by an effort the gap can be bridged. If, like the Lord Buddha, we had aura three miles in extent, "telepathy" would have a possible *modus operandi*, or, at least, *telæsthesia* would.

But the subject is only in its infancy; Dr. Kilner, although able to determine what the aura is not, is not yet able to determine what the aura is. Probably more than one force is concerned; Dr. Kilner argues: "The force or forces that give rise to the human aura are probably generated in the body itself. It seems hardly possible that the two auras can be the products of one force, when it is recollected, firstly, that the inner aura is striated, and that its margin is fairly well defined, and that it is frequently prolonged into rays passing into or even through the outer aura without any concomitant alteration in the latter. Again occasionally in disease, the inner aura disappears locally in toto, or, what is more common, leaves a partially void space. This empty space, when it does not include the whole width, is situated close to the body, superficially resembling a very broad etheric double, while the residue of the inner aura may retain its lineation, or may become granular. In none of these cases does the outer aura invade the territory

of the inner, but it may be simultaneously affected. The inner aura can be made to vanish by artificial means from every part of the body, leaving a void space, as when acted upon by electricity or by a chemical. Secondly, the outer aura is entirely nebulous with an indefinite distal margin, its visible proximal edge coinciding with the outer border of the inner aura. The presumption that there must be more than one force concerned is thus further strengthened by the crenated appearance of the inner aura and the phenomena associated with the production of rays. Were both auras produced by one and the same force, it would be reasonable to expect that the outer aura would also show a tendency to adopt a wavy outline, the results of varying activities in adjacent areas, and would also participate to some extent in the production and emission of rays. Thirdly, the outer aura is more developed around the trunk in females from the age of puberty upwards than in males, and there is no corresponding increase or modification of the inner aura."

The final fact that the auras "vary in distinctness from time to time, being generally clearer on days which, as tested with the actinometer, are most favourable for photography," establishes a connection with the sun; and as catalysis by radiant energy is a fact, a possible cause both of health and disease is plain. If the physical effects of the planets on the human atmosphere could be similarly demonstrated, a possible *modus operandi* for medical astrology would be apparent. For the distinctness of the aura, I presume, is an index of the intensity of the auric emanations; and although the auric forces seem to be neither magnetism nor electricity, they are affected by both, as they are by chemical forces. If transits of the planets can affect the magnetic needle, they can presumably also affect the human body, which has its magnetic haze, and its surface and other electrical phenomena, as well as its auras. But it is obvious that we are at the beginning, not at the end, of investigation; and ready-made conclusions, such as those offered by mysticism generally, and the Theosophists in particular, are not only useless but, as Mr. Robert Briffault says in his "Psyche's Lamp," a "dishonest filling in of the blank cheque offered by a 'mystery.'" I certainly do not intend to commit the "intellectual felony" of filling in this blank cheque with a "world-view," as I have been asked to do; I am content to keep an open mind regarding the world, and to believe nothing that cannot be demonstrated. Dr. Kilner's valuable book contains more puzzles than solutions, a blessed relief from those world-views that contain more solutions than puzzles. A. E. R.

Reviews.

Warfare in the Human Body. By Morley Roberts. (Eveleigh Nash. 18s. net.)

MR. MORLEY ROBERTS has already made two reputations for himself; Professor Arthur Keith, who sponsors this book, mentions that "for several years there were many besides myself that had no suspicion that Morley Roberts, the erudite writer on medical and allied problems, was the same Morley Roberts who is known in Bohemia as an artist of noted skill with pen and brush." We may gather from Professor Keith's willingness to endorse Mr. Roberts' bills on "the Bank of Science," and from Professor W. M. Bayliss's appreciative review in "Nature" of January 13, that Mr. Roberts has something to communicate of importance, that, as Professor Keith says: "He has earned for himself the freedom of the City of Realities or Science." His first chapter, "On Method In Science," is a powerful plea for synthetic reasoning on scientific subjects, the chief means being the use of analogy; for as he very cogently argues, general laws apply in all things, and the more points of resemblance that can be shown between one set of facts and another, the nearer to

complete induction do we arrive. It is by co-ordination of knowledge that advances are made; and Mr. Roberts rightly points to "the evil results of extreme specialism" in proof. "In private, a professor of pathology may, and too often does, pour scorn upon the labours of the physiologist, which looks much as if he believed that the right method of teaching ship-building was to study wrecks upon the beach. Again, the physiologist, aware though he may be of the pathologist's failing, is yet apt to take a similar view as regards biology, while the biologist himself, whose work should necessitate an appreciation of all that appertains to all life, completes the vicious circle by ignoring what has been done by students of disease." If Huxley's definition of an educated man as one who knows everything of something, and something of everything, is to stand, the specialist is only a half-educated person.

It is true that the use of analogy has its pitfalls, of which no one could be more clearly aware than Mr. Roberts himself; and some of his own analogies drawn from social phenomena are more interesting as figurative language than as explanations. But he is on surer ground when he reviews work done on definite subjects, such as "Malignancy." He is an ardent advocate of the catalytic theory of tissue re-actions; but his analogy between catalysts and tools is hardly defensible in view of the specificity of most euzyme catalysts. He has much to say that is interesting and to the point concerning "Malignancy," and his use of the endocrine gland theory suggests very strongly, as Professor Bayliss says, that "much of the cancer research of the present day is beginning at the wrong end." Mr. Roberts does not seem to be acquainted with the work of Forbes Ross on "Cancer"; but Ross's demonstration that "the main solution of the problem of the causation, treatment, prevention, and cure of new growths, benign and malignant, will be found to lie within a ring-fence formed by the minerals, of the body—e.g., potassium, sodium, magnesium, calcium, and iron, along with the elements phosphorus, sulphur, chlorine, and iodine, and any break away from the normal will be due to want of balance or derangement as regards their normal proportions and combinations inter omnes," seems to us to be the completion of Mr. Morley Roberts' argument. The essay on "Repair In Evolution" is a most fascinating piece of biological reasoning. It propounds the thesis that the evolution of an organ is frequently a case of the mending of a break-down. The heart seems to be a patchwork of repairs; and the analogy with the stresses and strains met with in engineering and architecture is well worked out. Incidentally, Mr. Roberts brings forward evidence that should make us revise our idea, derived from Darwin, that disadvantageous variations are not inherited. His essay on "Inhibition and the Cardiac Vagus" is perhaps more instructive concerning the physiology of the action of the vagus than illuminative of the author's general point of view; but "The Theory of Immunity," in which he urges the *lex parcimonie* on bacteriologists, who are peculiarly prone to use mythical conceptions as causes, is full of interest. His interests range widely from a consideration of "The Cannibal In Evolution" to "Heredity and Environment," "The Origin of Therapeutic Bathing," "The Physiology of Consciousness," and a mainly etymological study of "Pharmakos and Medicine." There is an interesting appendix on "The Infection Theory of Cancer," which does not satisfy Mr. Roberts, and an index.

But the chief value of the book is its suggestiveness, even more than its accomplishment. Whether Mr. Roberts' conclusions are right or wrong (and they are more often right than wrong), he has shown that a flood of light can be thrown on the problems of one science by the use of evidence from another. Everybody knows, or at least expects this; but as Mr.

Roberts says: "A belief may produce small results if it is not put into practice"; or, as it was said long ago: "If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them." We need the synthetising mind if science is not to lose itself in minutiae; and although the work of synthetising the sciences is really the task of a College, someone must make a beginning. At the very least, Mr. Morley Roberts helps us to put our ideas in order; but he frequently indicates solutions of vexed problems, or the direction in which the solution may most probably be found. The use of hypotheses is to stimulate further research; and Mr. Roberts has done that. It is a book that may be cordially recommended to every general reader who has some acquaintance with physiology.

Public Ownership of the Liquor Trade. By Arthur Greenwood. (Leonard Parsons. 4s. 6d. net.)

The drink question is partly an economic, partly a psychological problem, and there are difficulties in dealing with it exclusively as either. In this book Mr. Greenwood is concerned only with eliminating the element of profit, which makes private gain dependent on increased consumption of liquor. He is obviously a believer in nationalisation, but recognises that there is a case for State ownership of the liquor trade on different grounds from that of any other industry. "Though, generally speaking, the prosperity of our industries contributes in some degree to the prosperity of the community as a whole, in the case of the drink trade the reverse is the case." It is in fact the largest (though not the only) industry of which it can be said that it is in the public interest to decrease consumption of the product. But it does not follow that with public ownership the motive of profit will disappear. Even Governments have been known to permit or encourage undesirable traffic for the sake of revenue. Mr. Greenwood, however, gives grounds for supposing that under his scheme some of the most objectionable features of the present system (adulteration, "treating," etc.) would disappear; and his "attempt to take the drink question in hand as a problem of education rather than as a problem of forcible suppression" is a reasonable alternative to the insanity of prohibition. The only other alternative is a revolution in social and psychological conditions. But since the influence of "the Trade" was strong enough to prevail during the war, when the case for nationalisation was overwhelming, it is unlikely that merely reasonable counsels will now be heard.

The Wicked Foremen. By Maurice Colbourne. (Daniel. 7s. 6d. net.)

Mr. Colbourne declares himself to be a young man who received, but did not answer, a "call" to become a clergyman. Most of the laity have not even received a "call" to be worshippers; so he is a singular person in both camps. He has "advanced" to a sort of evangelical Christianity which has no place for a dry-as-dust priesthood; and from this standpoint, he vigorously assails (we think that is the correct phrase) the Church and all its works in war time. We have not a word to say against his denunciations of the priesthood, nor against his advocacy of certain aspects of social reform, although his style is hectic. But we think that it is a book that is more likely to make him be regarded as a remarkable young man by the Church than by the general public; his real place is the pulpit, his exhortations have the "forty-parson power" of which Sydney Smith wrote. They have, for us, the slightly faded air of Kingsley's "muscular Christianity"; "Love" is the whole of his theology, and that, too, is familiar. Against a Jane Austen background, he would seem terribly alive; we believe that he would even agree to playing games on Sunday; but really, at this moment, he seems more like a survival from the days of Bible-banging than a portent of the future. We predict the immortality of the penny-box for his book.

LETTER TO THE EDITOR.

PROPAGANDA.

Sir,—May I invite all readers of THE NEW AGE in the Sheffield district who are interested in credit-reform to communicate with me.

9, Paradise Square, Sheffield.

A. L. GIBSON.

PRESS CUTTINGS.

The ability of the public to buy goods depends upon (a) the quantity and rate of flow of purchasing power into the public's pockets; (b) the prices at which goods are offered. Over these conditions the general public have no direct control. Purchasing power (i.e., legal tender and bank credit) is controlled by the Government and the bankers, but since in all countries Governments defer to their bankers, the banking fraternity do actually exercise supreme control.

Again, the fixing of prices, although of the utmost importance to the public, is the result of conditions on which they have little or no influence. Costs of production necessarily form the lower price level, whilst the higher is determined by the effective demand for goods. Between these two extremes prices oscillate. Yet since effective demand depends upon the amount of currency available it will be seen that the control of currency means control not only of prices but of trade, industry, employment—in short, it means the control of our national existence! This control, as I have said previously, has been given, through our banking and currency laws, to those controlling our financial institutions.

Now the chief characteristic of our modern industrial system is this, that it depends for its operation largely upon the purchasing power given to employees, owners, and investors in the process of production. Wages, salaries, and dividends comprise the methods by which the bulk of the money and credit available for buying goods reaches the public, and these can only be paid whilst production continues. Stop production and the ability to purchase and, therefore, to consume is destroyed—except by some system of Government doles, notwithstanding that the country is full of goods deteriorating rapidly.

It is true that we have another field for disposing of our products, viz., foreign markets, and as will be shown later, owing to the insufficient amount of purchasing power given by our industrial system to those engaged in production, and the prices at which goods are offered to the public, our own markets are unable to absorb more than a fraction of British-made goods, and we are therefore compelled to depend upon our Colonial and foreign buyers. This does not mean that our own people are unable to consume more British-made goods if they had enough money to buy more. On the contrary, if wages, salaries, and dividends, for example, could be doubled or even trebled, *without raising the level of prices*, our mills and factories might continue running year after year without our having to be quite so much at the mercy of foreign buyers as we are at present. Further, through opening our ports to the free entrance of competitive goods "made in Germany" and elsewhere, we naturally reduce the effective demand for our own products, which also tends to foster unemployment.

Now the ideal economic condition of any industrial nation is to be self-contained—i.e., to be able to produce every necessity and as many of the luxuries of life as possible sufficient for supporting the population. The United States is probably the best example of a self-contained nation.

To a somewhat less extent, Great Britain has also facilities for producing sufficient of all the necessities of life to maintain her population in a state of comfort and well-being at a far higher general level than has ever yet been attained. The achievement of this depends upon the introduction of a proper system of distribution. Can this be accomplished under our present economic system? The answer is "not without some very considerable changes and modifications." Indeed, the solution of our problem requires the abandonment of some of our most securely entrenched ideas and theories. In

fact, the problem of unemployment is insoluble by any process which would receive the sanction of any orthodox economist.

The hope of the world lies in the direction of innovation, heterodoxy. That is why the "experts" selected from the professional classes by the Government as its advisers since the war are proving such a source of danger to the nation.

Every improvement which tends to facilitate production must be accompanied by a fall in prices or an increase in the volume of purchasing power, otherwise its tendency must be to increase unemployment.—MR. ARTHUR KIRSON in "Times" Trade Supplement (March 12).

(To the Editor of the "Co-Operative News.")

Sir,—Some six months ago I chanced to fall in with the scheme of which your contributor gave such a lucid outline in your last week's issue, under the heading, "The Peril of Prices."

Since then, close study and earnest questioning of business men and women have failed to reveal any flaw in its clear analysis of the economic basis of society, and the requisite measure for effecting a transition to sounder foundations. By controlling credit-issue and its complementary process of price-fixing, the financiers have established a strangle-hold over the community. Through association and improved machinery the potential capacity to produce has increased beyond computation. The inhabitants of the world could be provided with the necessaries of life without prolonged effort, just as in the middle ages, Professor Thorold Rogers tells us, the English labourer could support himself and his family for a year on the work of a few weeks. But the people are not allowed to enjoy the fruits of science and co-operation. The financier, like a modern highwayman, holds up society and forces it to pay tribute. And the pistol he employs is credit-issue combined with price fixing. Through the banks, which are his organ, he issues credit—which is communal property—and fixes prices to cover all cost, including that credit. By means of this process, which is subtly hidden from the public, he persuades the productive goose to lay her golden eggs for his sole benefit, in return for being allowed to live.

To diagnose the disease correctly is more than half the battle. Society must disarm this brigand of the powers which he has stolen from her and use them. In other words, it is essential that credit and price fixing should be controlled by the community in its own interests.

Co-operators are already half-educated towards this conception, for they have always recognised the right of the consumer to dividends. But the consumer is entitled to dividends not merely on account of the goods consumed, but also in virtue of the credit created, for credit depends as much on the demand of the consumer as on the effort of the producer. In the recognition of this truth is implied the right to the universal distribution of dividends.

But it is not on the material side alone that the benefits lie. The profound thinkers to whom we owe this idea have as their ultimate aim the self-development of each member of society through economic freedom, which is to them a means and not an end. They state that the trend of evolution is to subordinate material to mental and psychological necessity, but that at present economic questions are of paramount importance, because the economic system is the great weapon of the will-to-power which must be met on its own ground by the will-to-freedom.

FRANCES PREWETT.

Subscriptions to THE NEW AGE are at the following rates:—

	United Kingdom.	Abroad.
One Year	30s. 0d. ...	30s. 0d.
Six Months.....	15s. 0d. ...	15s. 0d.
Three Months.....	7s. 6d. ...	7s. 6d.

All communications relative to THE NEW AGE should be addressed to THE NEW AGE, 38, Cursitor Street, E.C.4.