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"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 men who work it, and not the structure of the system itself, that produce the characteristic effects of a given 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" ' despirit is, as might be expected, of an even feebleter 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 paramountly 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 well as should have swamped the "in-"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 not the radical idea capable of activating 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. But devoted to power, in fact, 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' leaders 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. 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 conclusion 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 pur- chasing 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 approximates in the appreciation of the only thing 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 incidently 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. The outcome would be the elimination of paradox from life itself. **  **  **
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 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 is a part of the Bankers 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; again, it is that the deliberate 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. We know that war-indemnity. Credit, further more, is a condition of over-production (or under-consumption) and that war-between Great Britain and America is of no more importance 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, requisitioning 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 payable. What German Labour, in fact, 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 doubtless welcoming it just because there would be no "return" upon it; German Labour, while still wedded to the notion that is 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) and a 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 logical; our想像 is very far and they will not take the chance of unlimited employment even when it is offered.

***

Mr. Raymond Radclyffe, 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 superlatively 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 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
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 in the world and in the organism, a functional whole. The entire order and law of the world is inherent in 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 Logico 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 divine plan 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 India, the active and dynamic value of India, the West will be shown to have been incapable of its world-function.

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, what must be of necessity, cannot be, is done by Necessity and force. For everything is the infinite. 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. This 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 Fate, however, is ever greater in the awareness 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 driven and leads that which must be; not contrariwise. Freedom, the end of God and Man, ultimately realises its own most ineradicable function. While Providence is infinite and infiniting and Destiny finitised and finiting, Freedom is indefinite, indefinite. Human will is the final grievance of the world and of the infinite universe itself, however thrice-fathomless its human, synthetic, dual-saturated universe. Man must 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 geonian transition from the enthetic and forcible order of history and of existence to the Sophia, organical order of Pan-human ripeness and responsibility. We will return to this definition of our divine chaos, of the Geon 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 Ayroandom and supra-Ayroandom, of the Logico and Sophia 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, as Mr. Radcliffe'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 a necessary evil. This moment we are building war-ships for Japan. A week ago we sent over to Japan go 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, the Tosadhim, has been ordered by the Press (by official consent) that "no doubt the visit will cement still more closely the good relations existing between the two nations."

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, material and international 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 world, 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 Logico hemisphere to Universal Humanity, however, is the self-governing, self-existing personality. This gift of the Indian will and Christian reason 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 parasitical Life Satanic, 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. Sophia 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 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.

As 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 and genuine effort we have heard of by workers to stop the firm; they should have spent it in buying eggs and butter by some occult process to become cheaper; but if they do not we shall be inclined to call the evangelicial workmen of Gorton comedians of Christian disciples of Messrs. Robert Williams and Sons should not have sacrificed a portion of their livelihood for such a cause of high contempt. It is they have only succeeded in committing a faux pas 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 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 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 fancy turned to a moment of effulgence. 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 Cadell's genius, so to offer the opportunity of making a brilliantly comic 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 unwarily. 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. The shouting, the kissing, the confessions 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). 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 every means, 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 sinister 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," "don't you inform the police if you are 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 personal pathos of the new boarders'" 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 commonplaces. 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 a child with a snowball. 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. (though she resolved to keep much of this, and thereby gave the male adventurer what he wanted. The confession scene was delightfully played, with Miss Cadell playing the "eldest 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 doubts, 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 paper on this subject, "Why don't you inform the police if you are 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.
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 comical 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. 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 "pointillism," which is replaced by patches of strongly coloured tints, which he 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 pure 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 those who realise that art did not stop short with those who realise that art did not stop short with 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 up 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 irreparable 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 notion of being an expert in these matters. Success, like kissing, appears, on the whole, to go by favour.

Havenhuis said so much in self-deprecation, 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; 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. In revanche, they try to atone for the sins of being their forebears 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 sordid lie 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 the working of the system, it 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 I have left 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," but with the "Nation," but the differential is in both cases a matter of emphasis. Tho' the "Saturday Review" is louder than the "Spectator," and the "Outlook" only pleases him when he finds the "Spectator" 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. Tho' the "Saturday Review," in other words, is read by those readers of 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 as the "Spectator" or the "Outlook" does, but, in fact, it is not a representative journal at all, but a representative journal. Abise omen that either Mr. Strachey or Mr. Clifford Sharp should cease to edit their respective journals, and, 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 make Mr. Davies, the leading economist, 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 intricacies 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, 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 understand the second law of thermodynamics. 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 unintelligible to him. 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 unintelligible to him. 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. Let us assume that this is Mr. Cole's way and that he can only do it no other; and examine his triple alliance of objections to the Scheme. What do they amount to? Before, however, dealing with these objections seriatim, 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 our reiterated explanations; that is, of a force friendly to capitalism; and "if the

Mr. Cole's next criticism is that the Scheme is "economically unsound," and once more he rest his case upon a complete misunderstanding. In fact, he asks a question double (as it were) of the contrary, that both the distinction and the importance of the distinction would have been made self-evident by our reiterated explanations; that is, of a force friendly to capitalism; and "if the

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 double (as it were) of the

If, on the supposition, however, which is really no suppose, or, rather, we have to recognise, a condition of the kind is not "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 supposition but a fact, that, say, the Coal industry cannot carry on without a radical change, the question is whether a radical change thick 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.
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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 occultist 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, effort on the part of the subject the aura has been 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 with the person's 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 is affected by the subject is far from being a 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, telesthesia would.

The aura is said to have 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 with the person's 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 is affected by the subject is far from being a 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, telesthesia would.

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' appreciative review in "Nature" of January 13, that Mr. Roberts' "Psychic's Lamp," a "dishonest filling in of the blank cheque offered by a 'mystery.'" I certainly do not intend to commit the "intellectual folly" of filling in this blank cheque with a "世界观," 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.
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 the labours of the anatomist, of the physiologist, and of the pathologist, which looks much as if he believed that the right method of teaching shipbuilding 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 catalysis and the working of the specific activity of the most active enzymes. 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 rearrangement 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 contains so much that no one could be more clearly aware than 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.

Mr. Greenwood, however, of whose "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 Huxley'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 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 depends upon the amount of currency available for buying goods. Without an increase of purchasing power, 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, and bank credit) is controlled by the Government and the public are offered. Over these conditions the general public have (a) the quantity and rate of flow of purchasing power; (b) the prices at which goods are offered. Without an increase of purchasing power, 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.

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 stranglehold 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 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 people, who is 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 dishonest, 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 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 interest, and the requisite measure for effecting a transition to sounder foundations.

Co-operators are already self-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 economic 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.
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