CONCERNING THE IDEA OF GOD.

It is inevitable that those who promulgate new morals should be expected to disclose under what Authority they act. Authority is a permanent necessity, especially of Anarchism, and the fact that phantom authorities have been set up, in no wise affects the reality and urgency of Authority itself. The permanent seat of Authority lies in Religion. Hence while we may override and break Civil and Ecclesiastical Law, and though we may impeach an old moral code, we are compelled to make our authority for so doing contingent upon religious concerns. All changes of any serious import hark back to religion for Authority. Simple readjustment must take place unaffected by religion, but it is futile to set out to effect any radical change unless supported by its authority. Consequently, we find it incumbent upon ourselves to state the religious sanctions which we consider authorised the readjustment may take place unaffected by religion.

The idea of God, or of Gods, is universal, and we begin with the most essential aspect, that the idea shows its nature by tendency rather than by fixed state, and by considering a long stretch of time, during which the tendency continues to act, we learn its direction. We find out where it is heading.

The tendency has to do with the relative position in space of "God" and "Man." The direction of the tendency is from the God-outside-Man, external, remote, inaccessible, non-human, towards God-inside-Man, intimate, personal, seated in the heart of man, the very kernel of his existence. The idea of God has followed. Like everything else in life, the idea is growing realisation of God. The merely logical, yet so persistent, is one which may not be ignored; which may not casually be written down small; which must have some function, and that an adequate interpretation of this function lies as one of the first and most serious charges upon the capacities of human thought. It may fairly be stated that a characteristic so integrant with life itself must have an interpretation of function with regard to the very meaning and purposes of life, and that, when independent evidence goes to establish the untenability of existing interpretations, it merely makes the demand for a tenable one still more urgent and imperative. Apparent rebuttals of accepted interpretations of God do nothing more than make this question more insistent: "What, then, is God?"

It would seem that our best means of obtaining an answer to this question would be secured by tracing the long trail of evolution which the idea of God has followed. Like everything else in life, the idea shows its nature by tendency rather than by fixed state, and by considering a long stretch of time, during which the tendency continues to act, we learn its direction. We find out where it is heading.

The tendency has to do with the relative position in space of "God" and "Man." The direction of the tendency is from the God-outside-Man, external, remote, inaccessible, non-human, towards God-inside-Man, intimate, personal, seated in the heart of man, the very kernel of his existence. "Closer than breathing, nearer than hands and feet." A certain kind of modernism, translating itself into religion, has attempted a conception of God as unified mathematical law. God has been the "All," the "Comprehensive Being." Such attempts have broken upon the hard rocks of human experience among those who have most realised God, and have felt the force of tendency in the growing realisation of God. The merely logical,
mathematical conceptions have been crumpled up by the force of the tendency. The first thing experience can postulate of God is that he is personal. From God conceived as a malign or friendly Nature force; God as the beneficent Sun; God as Immanuel, God as the humanised personified; God the Great King, the tribal panther—the Jehovah of Israel; from these to God the Father are seen the workings of the tendency, the growing intimacy between God and Man. The culmination of the tendency is found in Christ. Christ for humanity marks an epoch. So intimate, so closely gripped was the idea of God by Christ, that the man of the West can say, “When I saw God.” When man knows that he is also God, he is then more than Man. He has achieved the purpose for which he was human. He has achieved his own personality. He has arrived.

Let us consider what our God is. We must say “our” God, because the God of each of us is individual. That is what we mean when we say God is personal. The God which any individual worships is that personality. It is impossible for the individual to conceive. My God is not my neighbour’s God. My God has kinship with me, and my neighbour’s God has kinship with him. As the oak has kinship with the acorn, my God has kinship with me; rather, as the unwritten story of creation had kinship with the soul of the poet Cardan, while he was yet dumb, so has our God kinship with us. The God of each of us is separate: separate as we are separate one from another. This separateness is a characteristic which must be laid hold of; its retention is essential if ever we are to attain to God; it is, indeed, in the necessity for separateness that all struggles for freedoms find their justification. It is impossible for the individual to emphasise it also because it is overlooked—even replaced by its contrary. The religions of the East, which are exerting a powerful and yet fundamentally misleading influence in the West, have done much to blur that definiteness which is the special and particular contribution of Christianity to the world of thought. When Christians understand the potency of their own philosophy; when they really achieve Christian articulateness, the Eastern faiths, notwithstanding their elements of profound wisdom, will succumb to the faith of the Western world. Christianity in the evolution of life represents a higher grade of development than the Eastern; it is the more matured because it has achieved the idea of God by Christ. Christ mystifies Christians. Men seek to unlock the mysteries of his passion with the wrong key. At present, Christ has to be grasped as the way, the truth, and the light, not because he died on the Cross, but because of the quality and kind of belief which led him to and beyond the Cross. A belief has to be lived into, and Christ evidently had attained the range of life wherein belief was thrust upon him. To describe Christ as the way is to give the very essence of descriptive truth. It describes what Christ may be to the humans who can comprehend him. “I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto me,” said Christ, with the conviction of one who is preaching the gospel of ultimate humanity. This last is a tremendous affirmation. It affects all the human values. Yet it is the natural corollary of the affirmation that in him man had reached the God, affirmed also the possibilities of human immortality. This is long ages ahead of intellectual truth) is barely done much to blur that definiteness which is the special and particular contribution of Christianity to the world of thought. When Christians understand the potency of their own philosophy; when they really achieve Christian articulateness, the Eastern faiths, notwithstanding their elements of profound wisdom, will succumb to the faith of the Western world. Christianity in the evolution of life represents a higher grade of development than the Eastern; it is the more matured because it has achieved the idea of God by Christ. Christ mystifies Christians. Men seek to unlock the mysteries of his passion with the wrong key. At present, Christ has to be grasped intuitively, or not at all. In spite of the two thousand years which have passed, poetic truth (which is long ages ahead of intellectual truth), is barely able to grasp his significance. If he almost eludes the diviners, he utterly baffles the logicians. So we must leave him, and gather together the strands of truth which for us trace a way through the dim meanings of life.

The higher principle is that which tends towards the individual, the separate; the lower is the reverse. The higher principle, given its way with human life, sets towards distinct personality, which achieved is God. Our strivings after God are the strivings after the highest in us. Thus we must leave him, and gather together the strands of truth which for us trace a way through the dim meanings of life.

Lord in the land of the living.” Thus the awakened soul pants towards the realisation of its highest destiny. For the soul can mould its destiny. It can only too easily turn away from the vision of its own highest fulfilment.

With a personality to achieve—a soul to save—we postulate free-will, and thus show another age-long controversy. We also find the function of prayer another stumbling-block in the path of the Uninitiate. “More things are wrought by prayer than this world dreams of.” Perhaps the world is beginning to understand more. Prayer, which is communion with our own personality, has through countless ages been adopted by men, even when all reason seems to show its futility. The reason for its persistence is found in the fact that prayer is a great reaffirming and reassuring of the personality. Any means of turning the eyes of the spirit inward is a prayer. Any rallying of our personality to assert itself in conditions adverse to it is a prayer. All the aridity of intellectual persons would vanish if they were free to be the validators of the sense that we have defined prayer. Faith, too, finds its meaning. By faith we rally and call to our service the powers we know of not merely in ourselves, but in our God—our intuition of our Self-that-shall-be.

And immortality. Christ, alongside his great affirmation that in him man had reached the God, affirmed also the possibilities of human immortality. This is the salvation of the world as its delectable mountains of hope.

GODS:

Our gods are the selves we attain not, that sit throned—while we grope—

Mid a sunset of dreams on delectable mountains of hope.

JAMES A. MACKERETH.
The Great Dynamic.

FROM three hundred and seventy-eight pages, an answer to a conundrum and two vivid aspirations! The conundrum—"Why is a State not a State?" Aspiration number one: To place a bundle of live-wires in the hands of Mr. Wells' co-editor, Mr. Stirling Taylor. Aspiration two: A few words of prayer with Mr. Herbert Trench. Why is a State not a State? Because it is a dynamic. One gathers this by strength of contrast from the pages of "The Great State." Mr. Wells has depicted a State perfected—drawn it out big so that its essential features become clear. In a little State features are often blurred—the essential confused with the non-essential. In the Great State the essentials find their true relation, and we recognise their orderly, exquisite arrangement, an arrangement excellent for things which are forces, computable reservoirs of energy. It is so beautifully done, that it seems a thousand pities it will not square with personalities. If only the human were not human; if they were tractable and amenable to calculation and logic, a State would lighten all our darkness. But as human beings persist in their incalculable, alogical tendencies, these excellently organised States rather miss their vocation in a human world. A more grateful reception in a lover would be theirs, but in this world an ineradicable pig-headed obstinacy militates against them. Mr. Wells, with happy nomenclature, notes the tendencies which are observable among the Chaos reigning now. There is the condition from which we have emerged—the "Normal Social Life," being that in which the people, in small groups, are attached to the land. This Normal Social Life, Mr. Wells points out, is in a state of unrest, and may develop in either of two directions, either in that of the Servile State, producing "the controlled, regimented, and disciplined Labour Class," or in that of the Great State, that in which there is a "general labour conscription, together with a scientific organisation of production, so reabsorbed by re-endowment into the Leisure Class." To an unprejudiced observer the difference between the "regulated" labour in the Servile State, and the "enforced" labour in the Great State reduces itself to nothing more than the trimmings of rhetoric. The Great State is the Servile State smiled at; the Servile State frowned at, and as Mr. Wells considers the Servile State unthinkable, the Great State likewise becomes unthinkable. We are therefore left by a process of elimination with the "Normal Social Life." It is somewhat significant—one wonders whether it is merely by chance—that here the word "State" is left out, and "Life" is used in its stead. Doubtless when Mr. Wells examines the nature of his own classification, and when he feels drawn, as he will be, to repudiate the essence and not merely the name of the "Servile State," he will find that the tendency must be towards the "Normal Social Life," developed by free co-operation and knowledge. A man or woman, to be free, must work out their freedom in toil, and to do this they must have the potential means of subsistence guaranteed them by inalienable right. To this extent a man must have property. It is indeed only by having so much right in property that a man can be free, holding the point of vantage from which he may tell his interfering fellows to go eat coke, so to speak. Ordinarily, he would co-operate with his neighbour, but it is just at the point when a man wishes to act independently of his neighbour that freedom counts. Hence it is likely that when the human world again finds its equilibrium in industry, it will find itself under conditions resembling more those of the Normal Social Life than the hideous, unspeakable, herd-like conditions of the factory-slave. Mr. Wells speaks of "the Normal Social Life, with its atmosphere of hens and cows and dung, its incessant toil, its servitude of women and its endless repetitions." Some of these conditions are necessary, and some are not, and those that are necessary can be matched by the evil necessities inseparable from the factory system.

But we will leave Mr. Wells, who is serious, and turn to some of his assistants, who are amusing. There's Mr. Taylor, whose job is to tell us how the thing is being done. Being an ardent feminist, he devotes fully half his space to the development of us, the women. "One refers to the position of the Mother. Stated in cold economic terms, detached from all the true and false glamour that clusters round her, the Mother is, as such, a worker engaged in the industry of producing that most valuable of social wealth—children."

If Mr. Taylor cannot understand why a woman may be offended by the above quotation, it is not possible for us to tell him. It is a fundamental matter of taste. The following is fundamentally silly. Silly because, dealing with psychological concerns, it ignores all psychological factors. "We are not concerned here with the sex relationship except in so far as it results in a child, the only point where the community seems to have any right to interfere. A calm consideration of all the facts leads one to believe that the State as a whole is far more concerned in the production and control of children than either the Father or the Mother, and that it will be the State, not the Father, which will in future pay the Mother the wage due for the work she expends on the child. The endowment of Motherhood (which has already become a definite wage for a social service, on exactly the
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same grounds that any other work is rewarded. This system of payment of Mothers (which may be established much sooner than many of us imagine) would be the longest step towards the collectivist community that the world has yet seen." We really have no doubts on the matter.

What is the State? It is the great illusion. And what is there to lead one to suppose that women are yearning towards collectivism? And why is there not something self-evidently absurd for Mr. Taylor as there is for us in the phrase that "the State as a whole is far more concerned in the production and control of children than either the father or the mother"? Has the Slave-virus destroyed his sense of humour?

Close upon Mr. Taylor's contribution follows one by Mr. Herbert Trench. By reason of its peculiar style, Mr. Trench's essay is unique among its companions in that it gives an impression of profundity. As there is much that is highly provocative in the article, we had the impression that the feeling that Mr. Trench's literary effects were not true was due to the fact that we disagreed with his arguments. This, however, proves not to be so, for, turning to his essay again, we find this: "Man has to move in two regions, and to draw Wisdom from each. Two teachers only he has, the Family and Anangke. First, from the Family he learns, and then from extended activities in the Polity, which is a delegation from (the human wall round) the sanctities of the Family. Secondly, from Anangke he learns, that is, from the hard and bracing Universe, unguided by Finite Mind, whence the Family itself first issued." Now, why, why could not Mr. Trench have said, "First, he learns from the Family"; and again, "Secondly, he learns from Anangke"? The difference has something to do with sincerity. For instance, we know very little concerning Anangke. We are, indeed, very sceptical—on the verge of the flippant—when we read that "the Family lies upon the Breast of Anangke." He makes us hear "the lily-handed, snowy-banded, dilettante priest intone."

If a writer has a serious proposition to bring forward regarding something of the nature of Anangke, it is unfortunate that he should create additional scepticism by the style of language in which he seeks to explain it. We put the Anangke proposition aside, therefore, and consider the Family, upon which the humble and uninitiated may speak. Mr. Trench says the Family is the Social unit. Plain and flat we deny it; we believe he is totally and seriously wrong. The Family may have been the Social unit, but if the progressive forces among women are capable of any interpretation at all, that interpretation is that the Social unit is the Individual. We will not labour the point. It is the crux upon which the struggle, representing the revolution among women, turns. It may be that Mr. Trench will prove right in the issue, but if so, the woman's movement will have failed. But it is an issue yet to decide, and our faith is that Mr. Trench is wrong.

The next utopia we hope will find expression as the Kingdom of One. Paint the heart of a freeman, and we shall see what arrangements he will need. Represent men as independent springs of life, each acting out its own inner will, and we shall be growing nearer an understanding of the needs of a multitude, each a universe in himself. We shall begin to envisage the Great Dynamic.

The Hunger-Strike.

Mr. McKenna is outrageous. An utter and brazen-faced snobbery continues to have its way with the suffragists. Mrs. Pankhurst and Mrs. Lawrence have been released as the result of hunger-striking, and the remaining forty prisoners, all hunger-strikers, are still in prison. Mrs. Pankhurst and Mrs. Lawrence have been released on "medical grounds," but we have not the slightest hesitation in saying that there existed no more serious medical grounds for release in their case than already exist and have for some time existed in the case of the other prisoners. The authorities can very easily furnish themselves with doctors' reports. The situation is detestable. It outrages every instinct of justice and good faith. It is so utterly disgusting that there is only one tolerable cause open to those who are in part responsible for the conditions of affairs. Let those who have been released get back into the prisons. They are armed with their own "medical" condition. They are not afraid to be fed by force. They will not, therefore, be fed by force. Their physical weakness, yoked to indomitable spirit, can place them above the law. They can make the law ridiculous. It has already made itself contemptible. If they are leaders, they must lead their forces out of the dangerous impasse in which they now find themselves. If the "leaders" were thrust out of prison, means were at hand by which they could return. They have raised an issue, and their hunger-strike, inasmuch as it has merely secured their release, has not solved it. It is true that this issue has been raised again and again, presumably to suit the whim or convenience of those directing their affairs. However ill-founded as we believe it to be, the issue at this moment has reached a degree of urgency at which it cannot be left, as it has been left hitherto. When "leaders" get first division treatment; when they secure release by means of a hunger-strike; when "followers" get second division treatment, and are set upon by the forcible feeders as a result of hunger-striking; when the horror of the thing becomes so great that one of the tortured—Emily Davison—the bravest, most loyal and self-sacrificing woman in their ranks—who has already been in prison five months, and undergone the hunger-strike time and time again—when such a woman risks suicide by leaping from the galleries of the prison, matters have reached a pitch where the leaders must find a solution or abdicate. The straight and direct way is for these latter to re-enter prison, and continue to find re-entry until the last "follower" has her first division treatment, or is released. This, to be sure, is not "votes for women," but it is the ground upon which the "leaders" decided to wage the hunger-strike battle. Considerations of the health of the "leaders" are considerations wholly in favour of the carrying out of this policy, which is, indeed, a trial of powers between physical force and physical limitations. If they do this, they will merely be following, somewhat tardily, in the footsteps of their followers.
Interest.

Reprinted from "The Money Question" by kind permission of Mr. Arthur Kitson.

No subject within the field of Economic Science has excited so prolonged, so universal, or such bitter contention as that with which we have now to deal, nor have the effects of any Economic system upon social life and civilization been more marked.

Originally denounced as immoral by the founders of the Christian Church, and legally prohibited for many centuries, it has become the very foundation upon which our so-called Christian civilization is built. The practice of charging for the loan—formerly termed Usury—was expressly forbidden among the Jews by the laws of Moses. Permission to exact usury from the Gentiles was, however, granted—a permission of which the Jews were not slow to avail themselves, and to which is attributable more than to any other cause the terrible persecutions they underwent during the Middle Ages, as well as in later times.

Usury, or, as it is now designated, Interest, was condemned by ancient writers like Plato and Aristotle, the Mohammedan Koran forbade it, and under the Christian Church's influence the severest penalties were inflicted by states against usurers. Even now the system is controlled in most countries by special legislation, which limits the percentage which may be charged for the loan.

Notwithstanding that interest is now legitimised universally, there still remains considerable prejudice and a feeling that it is based upon injustice.

Quite recently, during the trial of a famous libel suit in the Courts of France, an eminent advocate (for the defence) spoke as follows:

"St. Gregory of Nyssa, the immortal thinker of the fourth century, wrote these lines:

"'He who would give the name of robbery or parricide to the iniquitous invention of interest would not be very far from the truth. What, indeed, does it signify if you have made yourselves masters of the wealth of another by scaling walls or by killing passers-by, or if you have acquired what belongs to you by the merciless method of the loan?"

"If anyone had prophesied to St. Gregory as follows:

"'A day will come when what thou treatest as robbery and assassination will become the law of the world, and when an Attorney-General will indict in an assize court the writers who share thy opinion. The whole of society will be founded upon usury. They will build a temple, which they will call a Stock Exchange. This temple will fill the place of thy cathedrals, even as thy cathedrals have filled the place of the temple of Venus or Jupiter. The priests serving in this new temple will be called bankers, stockbrokers, and financiers. They will swindle others out of all the gold that will insure to them omnipotence. They will buy everything that is buyable, and some of the things that are not. And vain revolts against their frightful empire will serve only to make more manifest its terrible solidity.'"

"If anyone had prophesied that to St. Gregory, St. Gregory, who believed in God, would have joined his hands and cried: 'Lord, deliver us from such a moral malady!'

"The malady has run its course.'"

Thus it is that the phenomenon of interest, as a whole, presents the remarkable picture of a lifeless thing producing an everlasting and inexhaustible supply of goods. And this remarkable phenomenon appears in economic life with such perfect regularity that the very conception of capital has not infrequently been based on it.

"Whence and why does the capitalist, without personally exerting himself, obtain this endless flow of wealth?

"These words contain the theoretical problem of interest."

After exposing every theory hitherto advanced in favour and against interest to the most searching and merciless criticism, he concludes that interest is

"It is generally possible for anyone who owns capital to obtain from it a permanent net income, called Interest.

"This income is distinguished by certain notable characteristics. It owes its existence to no personal activity of the capital, and flows in to him even where he has not moved a finger in its making. Consequently, it seems in a peculiar sense to spring from capital, or, to use a very old metaphor, to be begotten of it. It may be obtained from any capital, no matter what be the kind of goods of which the capital consists; from goods that are barren as well as from those that are naturally fruitful; from perishable as well as from durable goods; from goods that can be replaced, and from goods that cannot be replaced; from money as well as from commodities. And finally, it flows in to the capitalist without ever exhausting the capital from which it comes, and therefore, without any necessary limit to its continuance. It is, if one may use such an expression about mundane things, capable of an everlasting life.

"Thus is that the phenomenon of interest, as a whole, presents the remarkable picture of a lifeless thing producing an everlasting and inexhaustible supply of goods. And this remarkable phenomenon appears in economic life with such perfect regularity that the very conception of capital has not infrequently been based on it.

"Whence and why does the capitalist, without personally exerting himself, obtain this endless flow of wealth?"

"These words contain the theoretical problem of interest."

The Craze of the Moment.
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just, because "The loan is a real exchange of present goods against future goods. Present goods invariably possess a greater value than future goods of the same number and kind, and therefore a definite sum of present goods can, as a rule, only be purchased by a larger sum of future goods. Present goods present an agio in future goods. This agio is interest. It is not a separate equivalent for a separate and durable use of the loaned goods, for that is inconceivable; it is a part equivalent of the loaned sum, kept separate for practical reasons. The replacement of the capital plus the interest constitutes the full equivalent."

In short, a loan transaction may be represented thus: \( A + \Delta = A + \Delta A \) where \( A = \) the sum loaned = present goods; \( t = \) time of maturity of loan. \( \Delta A = \) increment of \( A = \) interest.

In spite of the elaborate defence of interest by the great Austrian economist, I do not think the last word has been said on this subject, nor do I believe its apologists have yet rendered the system invulnerable to attack. The main contention they make is that the justification of interest, is that capital assists in production, renders labour more productive, and hence capital is clearly entitled to a return for its use. And since in the hands of the owner it is likewise productive, and he is enabled to get a return (called natural interest) by using it himself, he is naturally justified in demanding a return equivalent to this. At first sight this seems plausible enough; but loans are not made from capital which its owners can themselves use profitably. It is surplus wealth that is usually put out at interest.

Consideration of certain examples given by economists to illustrate the origin of interest will make this clearer: take, for instance, the well-known, oft-quoted illustration of Bastiat.

The story concerns two carpenters, James and William, one of whom, at the expense of ten days' labour, produces capital in the shape of a plane. The other, for some unaccountable reason, instead of making a plane, borrows his neighbour's, producing at the end of twelve months to return him the plane. James receives a plane and a plank. He lends the plane again for another year, receiving another plane and plank, and continues to lend, year after year, until his son becomes possessed of the plane, and he in turn acts the part of capitalist by lending the plane on interest. This annual gift of a plank which its owners can themselves use profitably, is surplus wealth that is usually put out at interest.

The other, for some unaccountable reason, instead of making a plane, borrows his neighbour's, producing at the end of twelve months to return him the plane. James receives a plane and a plank. He lends the plane again for another year, receiving another plane and plank, and continues to lend, year after year, until his son becomes possessed of the plane, and he in turn acts the part of capitalist by lending the plane on interest. This annual gift of a plank which its owners can themselves use profitably, is surplus wealth that is usually put out at interest.

The answer which the opponent of interest would give to this illustration is that it lacks the condition that renders labour obligatory. The answer to this is that wealth is perishable. It seems to lose sight of the fact that under the terms capital and labour, it is really dealing with flesh and blood, and not with machines.

It is the contention of economists that if interest were abolished the production of capital would be curtailed—a contention that appears to me unsound. The great desire on the part of mankind is to escape from the condition of society just as James is, and the condition of society is dependent upon its members. The more William advances the better for society, and the better for James. The condition of individuals affects society, and the condition of society reacts on all its members. This fact many writers have hitherto been blind to in defending its vast economic importance. Current political economy seems to lose sight of the fact that under the terms capital and labour, it is really dealing with flesh and blood, and not with machines.

It is the contention of economists that if interest were abolished the production of capital would be curtailed—a contention that appears to me unsound. The great desire on the part of mankind is to escape from the condition of society just as James is, and the condition of society is dependent upon its members. The more William advances the better for society, and the better for James. The condition of individuals affects society, and the condition of society reacts on all its members. This fact many writers have hitherto been blind to in defending its vast economic importance. Current political economy seems to lose sight of the fact that under the terms capital and labour, it is really dealing with flesh and blood, and not with machines.

It is the contention of economists that if interest were abolished the production of capital would be curtailed—a contention that appears to me unsound. The great desire on the part of mankind is to escape from the condition of society just as James is, and the condition of society is dependent upon its members. The more William advances the better for society, and the better for James. The condition of individuals affects society, and the condition of society reacts on all its members. This fact many writers have hitherto been blind to in defending its vast economic importance. Current political economy seems to lose sight of the fact that under the terms capital and labour, it is really dealing with flesh and blood, and not with machines.

It is the contention of economists that if interest were abolished the production of capital would be curtailed—a contention that appears to me unsound. The great desire on the part of mankind is to escape from the condition of society just as James is, and the condition of society is dependent upon its members. The more William advances the better for society, and the better for James. The condition of individuals affects society, and the condition of society reacts on all its members. This fact many writers have hitherto been blind to in defending its vast economic importance. Current political economy seems to lose sight of the fact that under the terms capital and labour, it is really dealing with flesh and blood, and not with machines.
an offer meet with, and merit, a reward? Surely the man who saves for me wealth which otherwise would be lost is entitled to a remuneration. Under modern conditions the loan, however, takes a very different form.

By virtue of certain legal enactments, wealth is, as stated before, owned by nobody, and nothing is realised. By a system of exchange, man's surplus commodities are converted into money, and when capital is borrowed it usually takes the money form, so that perishable wealth is transformed into an order on wealth producers at all future times to reproduce wealth in any form, and at any time the holder may choose. To negotiate a loan the modern industrial man has recourse to the bank, and it is in this direction that our present investigation must be conducted.

When a merchant seeks to negotiate a loan of money from a bank he must first provide security, either in the form of collateral or personal credit for the return of the money, so that the element of risk is eliminated; in fact, it is customary for banks to exact a deposit of collateral worth more than the amount of the loan. Having provided sufficient wealth to guarantee the return of the sum borrowed, he has further to agree to pay a percentage as interest. Let us take a special case. A manufacturer, having been informed that there was likely to be a strike amongst the coal miners, and, in consequence, the price of coal would advance, he determined to lay in a good supply. He applied to his bank for the loan of £5,000 for six months. He offered as security for the loan, a mortgage worth £10,000 on an improved property in a neighbourhood where rents were advancing; the bank undertook to direct the investment, it is customary for banks to provide sufficient wealth to guarantee the return of the loan was made, and at the end of the six months he returned the £5,000, plus £100 interest. The information regarding the strike proved to be erroneous, and in place of the price of coal advancing as he expected, it actually declined, and he found he had paid £500 more than if he had waited and bought it as required. He therefore lost not only this amount and the interest on the loan, but had to pay for the storage of some of the coal during this period. The question arises, what did the bank give in exchange for the £100? It made no sacrifice, nor underwent any risk, since it held the power to convert the amount covered by the mortgage into currency. The wealth of the bank was not diminished by taking the loan. What justification was there in asking a sum for the loan of the money? This is the real interest problem under modern industrial conditions.

Economists would say that the bank was deprived of the use of the money during the six months which it might have profitably invested to bring a return. It is customary in giving illustrations and examples on this subject for writers to say that the borrower gained considerably by the loan, as he would not have made the profit. But the instances of such investments being unprofitable are by no means uncommon—in fact, it is questionable whether fully one-half are not so, and, if the bankers undertook to direct the investment, it is doubtful whether they would be any more successful than the average merchant and manufacturer.

The correct answer as to why interest is chargeable is, in a word, the demand for money is practically always in excess of the supply—a condition existing by virtue of special legislation. The purchase of commodities and the payment of debts are effected in the legalised medium of exchanges, and mortgages are not legalised means of payment, whilst bank notes and coin are, and so the holder of mortgages and every other form of wealth except gold and government or bank money is unable to pay his debts unless he can exchange his wealth for money by means either of a sale or the loan. The loan is really an exchange of stationary for circulating credit, of special for general purchasing power, and interest is a tax for the privilege of converting the one into the other. All the bank has done was to enable the manufacturer to pay his debts, hence it is question whether controlling this metal to exact a tax upon all other wealth. Interest is therefore the price of a legally acquired monopoly.

The money loan is not "an exchange of present goods for future goods," but merely an exchange of one form of purchasing power for another. The general purchasing power of legal tender is a legally acquired privilege, whilst purchasing power comes from and is due to Society. It is not due to any thing existing in any metal or instrument, nor to any quality possessed by it, except the function granted by legislation of paying debts. Money is essentially an instrument of credit, and interest is the price paid by borrowers for the privilege given to exchange gold and bank notes. The merchant who bought the coal would certainly not have paid interest for the £5,000 if mortgages had the same rights of monetisation as gold.

After all, the judgment which must eventually be passed upon interest as a legalised system will depend upon the social results. Is it harmful or benefical or injurious? Does it make for the prosperity and happiness of nations, or for their misery and destruction? If the former, why have Governments interfered so often in seeking to control and limit interest charges? And if five per cent. is a national blessing, why is not ten per cent. a still greater advantage? Governments have not sought—except in a few isolated cases—to limit rent charges, nor have they stipulated to what extent a merchant may make profits in trade.

Why has this one system been of so much greater solicitation on the part of governors, rulers, and legislatures, than the other factors of distribution, rent, wages, and profits? Why have the religions of nearly all lands denounced and forbidden it?

It seems to me that experience must have taught nations in the past that usury is fraught with danger, and only possible within strictly defined limits. Money is the life-blood of trade, and therefore of wealth production, and anything that interferes with its free circulation must be as serious a menace to a nation's welfare as interference with the circulation of the blood would be to the life of a human being.

Interest is necessarily a tax upon production—for surely, if a nation could procure for its trade a non-interest bearing currency, it would be in a still greater advantage? Governments have not sought—except in a few isolated cases—to limit rent charges, nor have they stipulated to what extent a merchant may make profits in trade.

The rate of interest, in fact, determines often whether an industry can be worked profitably or not. Nay, more, it determines whether nations shall prosper or become bankrupt.

Startling as it may appear, it is nevertheless an easily demonstrated fact, that under the current rates of interest, the debtor classes of nearly all civilised nations are rushing into bankruptcy. The
fact is, that the wealth productions of nations cannot keep pace for long with their interest charges. In fact, interest as a universal working principle is—at all ordinary rates—an impossibility. Five per cent. interest means a doubling of wealth every twenty years. At compound interest it is doubled in about 14 years. Let us take a broad survey of this question.

Suppose the Pilgrim Fathers had invested the little capital they brought from the old world on a five per cent. usury basis, the people of this country* would owe them more than all the wealth they possess.

"Suppose," said Proudhon,† "that a man in the reign of St. Louis had borrowed 100 francs, and had refused—he and his heirs after him—to return it. Even though it were known that the said heirs were not the rightful possessors, and that prescription had been interrupted always at the right moment, nevertheless, by our laws, the last heir would be charged with returning these 100 francs with interest and interest on interest, which in all would amount to 107,854,010,777,600 francs; which is 2,606 times the capital of France, or more than twenty times the value of the terrestrial globe!"

"Suppose, when Virginia was settled in 1607, England had sold to the first settlers the whole of the United States for $1,000, and had taken a mortgage for this sum covering the whole property, but instead of paying the interest yearly at seven per cent., the settlers had agreed to take up their bonds at the end of every six months and add in the interest. Allow the $1,000 and the accruing interest to remain outstanding until 1859, and the sum would amount to $3,000,000,000, a sum which more than absorbs the entire yearly increase of wealth in the United States. During the last decade the wealth of this country has increased about $22,000,000,000. Adding but the single item of this interest, and interest on interest, which in all would amount to $33,554,432,000.† This state of bankruptcy is chronic. Counting the interest on interest, and interest on interest, which in all would amount to $33,554,432,000. The industrial world is analogous to a mammoth business concern. When it contracts greater liabilities than it can meet it falls, and we have a financial panic.

"This state of bankruptcy is chronic. Counting everything, the liabilities of the country are always greater than its assets. The industrial world is always in a state of potential bankruptcy, but credit tends to keep it out of the hands of a receiver. Then the same persons are in part payers of this debt, and credit tends to keep it out of the hands of a receiver. Then the same persons are in part payers of this debt, and creditors, like the merchants in the hands of a receiver, experience the pangs of bankruptcy, but credit prevents them from the stock of the present. There is not wealth enough to meet all these obligations, and the business of the world must go into the hands of a receiver every now and then, so that a new start in business may be made. The country, with all its allied industries, is analogous to a mammoth business concern. When it contracts greater liabilities than it can meet it falls, and we have a financial panic.

"This state of bankruptcy is chronic. Counting everything, the liabilities of the country are always greater than its assets. The industrial world is always in a state of potential bankruptcy, but credit tends to keep it out of the hands of a receiver. Then the same persons are in part payers of this debt, and creditors, like the merchants in the hands of a receiver, experience the pangs of bankruptcy, but credit prevents them from the stock of the present. There is not wealth enough to meet all these obligations, and the business of the world must go into the hands of a receiver every now and then, so that a new start in business may be made. The country, with all its allied industries, is analogous to a mammoth business concern. When it contracts greater liabilities than it can meet it falls, and we have a financial panic. Any disturbing of credit precipitates a crisis.

"An odd proposition, but one capable of mathematical demonstration, is that the very foundation principles of our industrial system lead us to recognize obligations which we can never pay. A simple, specific statement of what they are compels us to admit that they are too large to meet.

"The borrowed capital of the United States," says a writer in the Arena, * "claims more in remuneration than the country can produce. Every dollar invested in business claims a return called interest. Every dollar representing debts unpaid, claims a like remuneration. This must all be paid out of the production of each year, and from each year's product men must be fed and clothed and sheltered. The wealth of the world must be kept up. Buildings, machinery, everything must be kept in repair; and improvements for use in the future must be made from the stock of the present. There is not wealth enough to meet all these obligations, and the business of the world must go into the hands of a receiver every now and then, so that a new start in business may be made. The country, with all its allied industries, is analogous to a mammoth business concern. When it contracts greater liabilities than it can meet it falls, and we have a financial panic.

* United States.
† "Capital and Interest," Kellogg.
‡ "What is Property?" Humboldt Series.
© I. W. Bennett, in March No., 1894.
country's citizens will, in the short period of ten years, fall $8,000,000,000 below their liabilities. The principal falls due in that time, and the business of the country, if fixed in the hands, would bankrupt in that time. It does actually feel the shock. But the fact that many persons are creditors as well as debtors, and the debtors and creditors change places, puts off the final accounting. The tendency of the enormous fixed charges on business is to amass the wealth of the country in the hands of large property owners, who are almost exclusively creditors.

"The mightier the fortune, the more interest it draws, and the more exempt it is from the dangers of speculation.

"Fortunes go on piling up under the laws of interest, and after all checks and counter-tendencies are allowed for, the country has a panic—becomes bankrupt—every twenty years.

"There is a well-defined financial flurry of more or less violence, every decade, or even oftener. The fact is, that whereas the creditor class demands its money there is a panic, for there is not money enough in the country to satisfy the demand, and all property must be turned over to meet liabilities. Indeed, the cash in the country is principally in the hands of the creditor class, having piled up there under the laws of interest.

"An extraordinary mass of confidence business is kept moving by a shifting of liabilities, but in times of doubt and uncertainty, from whatever cause brought about the business of the country finds it impossible to meet its obligations and is obliged to file into bankruptcy. The cleverest of speculators cannot long keep up their business by borrowing from one to pay another, unless debts are very small as compared with the capital invested. Just so the business of the country, taken as a whole—the piling up of debts always ends in collapse. It is nonsense to say that want of confidence is the cause. Unless the ground principles of business produce instability, want of confidence can have no effect. Men realise that the business of the world cannot pay its debts, and therefore lose confidence."

Now, a scientific principle is one which is universally applicable to the phenomena with which it deals. The greater the field over which it operates, the more is its truth and exactness established. Interest, as we have seen, becomes impossible as soon as applied universally or over a considerable period. It is only applicable on a small scale or for a limited period.

Every certain period there is a universal breakdown; panics and bankruptcy become world-wide; interest-bearing wealth is swept away, and equilibrium is restored only after interest-bearing capital has been greatly reduced. In fact, capital is being constantly devoured to pay interest on other capital. Here is a builder whose vacant house refuses to pay the ground rent; finally the house is seized for the rent. There, a manufacturer, unable to pay the interest on borrowed money, is compelled to assign his machinery, buildings, and grounds to the usurer.

This is of such ordinary and every-day occurrence that it excites no comments and scarcely any notice; yet it is only by the continual destruction of capital that rent and interest are maintained. Wealth under usury devours itself. Starting as it may seem, it is an indisputable fact that panics, bankruptcies, and failures are absolutely necessary in order to keep the system alive. Wealth cannot be produced at a sufficiently rapid rate to meet its demands; hence capital, after devouring its own children, devours itself. The first capital sacrificed is that which is the least strongly intrenched. It is the small capitalist who goes under first, then

Usury, like gravitation, causes large bodies to attract and eventually absorb smaller ones. The small capital of individuals is being constantly absorbed by the greater capital of corporations. This is its inevitable tendency. The forces of attraction and absorption are as strong, constant, and relentless in the monetary as in the physical world.

"Usury," says Lord Bacon, "bringeth the treasure of a realm into few hands."

Usury is suicidal, and abstinence leads to death. The more abstinence is practised, the more capital is piled up; the more capital, the greater the amount swallowed by interest; the greater the volume of wealth taken on interest, the heavier the burden on labour; and the heavier the burden upon labour, the less wealth labour is capable of producing.

It seems to me, therefore, when considered on sufficiently broad grounds, interest is not a desirable nor a socially beneficial institution. It leads to bankruptcy, and is the parent of those financial disturbances which some writers have ridiculously attributed to sun spots. It forces the industrial world into liquidation every few years. It has created and perpetuated an idle rich class, which, as Professor Cairnes asserted, "is a formidable obstacle to economic laws, and from the existence of which no public benefit of any kind arises."

Finally, as a universal principle it is impossible. ARTHUR KITSON.
Modernism in Morality.  
THE ETHICS OF SEXUAL RELATIONSHIPS.  

II.

every perfect organism desires the sexual act. Every mature man and woman of healthy disposition desire and need sexual intercourse. There is nothing irregular or immoral in this concept. The instincts are anterior to and emphasised by its mutual experience. The position desire and need sexual intercourse. There is nothing irregular or immoral in this concept. The instincts are anterior to and emphasised by its mutual experience. The position desire and need sexual intercourse. There is nothing irregular or immoral in this concept. The instincts are anterior to and emphasised by its mutual experience. The position desire and need sexual intercourse. There is nothing irregular or immoral in this concept. The instincts are anterior to and emphasised by its mutual experience. The position desire and need sexual intercourse. There is nothing irregular or immoral in this concept. The instincts are anterior to and emphasised by its mutual experience. The position desire and need sexual intercourse. There is nothing irregular or immoral in this concept. The instincts are anterior to and emphasised by its mutual experience. The position desire and need sexual intercourse. There is nothing irregular or immoral in this concept. The instincts are anterior to and emphasised by its mutual experience. The position desire and need sexual intercourse. There is nothing irregular or immoral in this concept. The instincts are anterior to and emphasised by its mutual experience. The position desire and need sexual intercourse. There is nothing irregular or immoral in this concept. The instincts are anterior to and emphasised by its mutual experience. The position desire and need sexual intercourse. There is nothing irregular or immoral in this concept. The instincts are anterior to and emphasised by its mutual experience. The position desire and need sexual intercourse. There is nothing irregular or immoral in this concept. The instincts are anterior to and emphasised by its mutual experience. The position desire and need sexual intercourse. There is nothing irregular or immoral in this concept. The instincts are anterior to and emphasised by its mutual experience. The position desire and need sexual intercourse. There is nothing irregular or immoral in this concept. The instincts are anterior to and emphasised by its mutual experience. The position desire and need sexual intercourse. There is nothing irregular or immoral in this concept. The instincts are anterior to and emphasised by its mutual experience. The position desire and need sexual intercourse. There is nothing irregular or immoral in this concept. The instincts are anterior to and emphasised by its mutual experience. The position desire and need sexual intercourse. There is nothing irregular or immoral in this concept. The instincts are anterior to and emphasised by its mutual experience. The position desire and need sexual intercourse. There is nothing irregular or immoral in this concept. The instincts are anterior to and emphasised by its mutual experience. The position desire and need sexual intercourse. There is nothing irregular or immoral in this concept. The instincts are anterior to and emphasised by its mutual experience. The position desire and need sexual intercourse. There is nothing irregular or immoral in this concept. The instincts are anterior to and emphasised by its mutual experience. The position desire and need sexual intercourse. There is nothing irregular or immoral in this concept.
capital. Similarly, a superficial examination of the social position of any civilised country reveals the fact that comfort, and to a greater degree luxury in life conditions, tends to restrict the production of children. Wherever the conditions of life are by comparison good, freedom of childbearing is more general. The reason for this is not far to seek. Childbearing is accompanied by difficulties and dangers. Childbearing, if each child is to be afforded due care and attention, involves the sacrifice of considerable leisure from both parents. Amongst the rich these duties are devolved wholly upon others, excepting only the bearing and birth. Amongst those less well off the other duties have also to be undertaken in the home. The tendency, then, is to produce small families only, and to take greater care of each of the units. The inference justly to be drawn is, that a wholesale raising of the standard of life for every man and woman would be to eradicate all danger from excessive production of children pressing upon the limits of subsistence. The danger to be apprehended would be the failure of race continuity. Because with an increase of luxury, there is a proportionate but invariable decrease in the number of children produced. Such restriction of family is not instinctive. It is intellectual.

The instinctive desire for the sexual act, and the gratification its commission affords, even tempered by the intellectual desire to escape its normal consequences, will always provide for the continuity of the race, till its purpose, if it have any, be effected. The intellectual phase in the race is a later phase than the instinctive. The individual reflects it his life the growth of the race. The instinctive period precedes the intellectual one. The instinctive period makes for child production. Only under conditions which are manifestly wrong and bad, a luxurious life without work, does the intellectual desire completely overshadow the instinctive desire. The instinctive desire of every normal woman is for motherhood. The woman who does not desire motherhood is not normal. The desire may not be exhibited. It may not be consciously apparent. But it is there. It is inherent. The abnormal woman may not desire motherhood. She may desire that her creative powers be exercised in other directions. The intellectual desire is the sexual act. He may desire that her creative powers be exercised in other directions.*

But it is with the normal man and woman we are mostly concerned. It is the greatest good of the greatest number which has to be sought. It is seen now that the instinctive desire for the sexual act freely indulged in will provide children, and does provide children, in great profusion. It is further evident that such children are almost always born in great numbers in poor surroundings. Poverty is the hotbed of fecundity. And this is so because the instinctive desire is not overshadowed by the intellectual growth. There is less opportunity for leisure and mental growth. Comfort and luxury are not present to stimulate the imaginative faculties. Both parents toil all day to provide bare subsistence. The provision of food and shelter occupy their whole day. They toil worse than the beasts. They have to provide profits, rent, and interest for others to live upon in luxury. Kept by the present social system fast to the instinctive level for food-getting, they scarcely emerge above it for the other functions of the brain, merely to satisfy the sexual appetite. They place no check upon its normal consequences, and large families result.

Now as each child born is a potential asset for wealth production, it would appear that the birth should be recognised by the community at its intrinsic worth. The birth of a child is the creation of capital in potentio. Under our present system it is allowed to remain a tax upon the income of those least able to afford it. The most fertile class in the community is the poorest. Their fertility, which ultimately adds to the aggregate wealth production, is permitted to still further deplete their own income. It is idle to urge that such children are not of the class desired. By class is meant of the mental calibre desired. The mental calibre is the result of the environment. The character of the man is formed by the influences with which he is surrounded. JULIAN WARDE. (To be concluded.)

An Engaged Young Man.

(Continued from the issue of May 26th.)

THAT it were well to insist upon the soul of work, and things serious rather than frivolous, and where no such doubt can thrive Romance has yet a goodly chance to root and flourish once again. Concessions must be made, no doubt, to the Imp of Progress enconced in the very branches of our Tree, like some dread bird of night equipped to spoil the dreams of youth and make men mad; who, at the dawn of sky flaps his wings “Freedom! We spread on the air, and slink into thickest covert, fearing the sun’s bright rays. From bondage into bondage things leap, and, likewise, we ourselves, unheeding. And though Freedom, become herself a thing of terror, were an infamy beyond our comprehension, the cry of the Imp has a warming ring, portentous of the ultimate consummation encompassed thereby, bidding us beware her subtler bonds.

But Romance is ours, whose elements we know, our anodyne. No “oughts” and “waits” there assail us, nor petty limitations. A broad sweep of plain-land lies before—low-lies, with many a fertile spot, brightening even to the heights on the horizon, seducing to fuller leaps the upstriving mind. We become in her hands free spirits, freely hoping, illimitably soaring; not as they who, aping Progress, bend a bough that shall lift them from their feet to hold them, comically dangling, over an abyss of Certitude, lurking wherein is the grimmest of Doubts.

One of our sages has declared that to let slip Romance were to exchange a sky for a ceiling. But the Imp, despairing, would have us know that this latter may be lovely—tells of nymphs to be seen there, some, he avers, bedecked in many a myriad stars—discerned only, we must believe, in a down-glance at the less of a fifth cup, vilely concocted, whereby we learn his worth. Brighter stars in a distant, dark sky deserve our ampler reverence.

In quest of relief from his brooding, troublous unrest, Newland passed a pleasant, long summer evening in an obscure small village skirting Charnwood, with a mug of rustic ale at elbow, and but little else for diversion than tales of a House that had once been great; whose greatness was not wholly spent, as we shall see. There, from a loquacious landlord, he learnt how in old Charnwood our Tree is of sturdy stock, anciently planted in primal soil, firm from of yore, and immune from the Imp’s attacks. For the broad white road, eastward winding to the river, borders a great demesne—rolling, unbroken miles of woodland spread to the far hills, purple under late summer suns, declining. Into the forest the longest coach-drive in England descends between high, mossed banks, yew-capped, to rise again in the terraced glade, where stands the Priory, presenting in our day a
penurious aspect, pointing reproach to redundant past glories. Clearly, the minds of our ancestral great houses were not set too intently on the welfare of their sons.

This and other thoughts had so preoccupied him that Newland was arrived within sight of the Priory before it occurred to him that he was trespassing; and, though the law in that matter did not concern him, he would have regretted the indelicacy which should prompt him, however —getting to disturb the privacy of others. Recalling his own seclusion, and the irritation he had felt at the merest momentary violation of it, he turned away, and would have retraced his steps through the scene that had so enthralled him. He saw, however, and without surprise even, that his retreat was barred. Advancing towards him down the drive, an observant witness of his indecision, was a young girl. As she swung towards him he watched her intently, fascinated by her perfect motion; so rhythmic, it seemed to him, that, as she moved, the whole round world moved with her: an illusion which, noted, gave him a sense that her coming was inevitable, and prepared him for the almost disconcerting suddenness of his intimacy with her.

Not here and now (he was convinced) did he for the first time meet with her; it seemed, rather, that she had stepped out from himself, as it were, from the very sanctum of his soul, to stand for a little while apart so that he might the better perceive her. She was the vision of his dreams: she was the dream incarnate of his ideal world —a world to him more sound, by reason of his so conscious dwelling therein, than was ever world of realities to the most soul-starved realist.

He had an impulse then and there to reclaim her; to hold her again, who for a moment had left him, in his arms, to his heart—altogether to possess her. He had visions of her sweet, enfranchised eyes, veiled beneath the quick passion of his kisses, as the world was veiled by a night in June; he pictured her long upper lashes hung darkly on her crimsoned cheeks, like dim woodland fringes distantly seen under morning mists before sunrise.

She paused while yet a dozen paces from him, encountered his full, dark gaze, became at once intensely conscious of him, and was demurely surprised to find her own glance inward directed on his, wherein reflected shone the passion of his lips and upon the veils of her burning eyes.

"Who are you?" she questioned, knowing it did not matter. "What was he in the world she had no desire to learn at present; she was concerned only with his relation to herself, and that she already knew. She came even nearer to him, her eyes cast down; and he, watching, would have held her un-

conscious of the movement, so natural and spontaneous was her approach. The touch of his hand on her arm told her how near she was come to him. She drew back, startled, raised her eyes at length, wherein reflected shone the passion of his own.

He stretched out his arms to her, and she put her hands in his. She was but a child awakened, no longer avoiding his eyes. With tilted chin she scrutinised him keenly, till all her embarrassment bid fair to become his own.

"Why," she demanded, in piquant, lingering tones, "why did you not come to me sooner?"

There was a pause, wherein they looked on each other's soul. Then did he seize her to him in so passionate a clasp that she, sweetly moaning, lay supine upon his breast. Lost utterly in wonder at her loveliness, he put kisses on her warm red lips and upon the veils of her burning eyes.

"Little fool!" he murmured, between his kisses, "it was because you did not need me, little fool!"

SELWYN WESTON.

(A to be continued.)

A Free Woman.

This woman was not meant
A man's desire to bless:
No mind hath she to mate
A soul-disturbing eagerness:
On joys we never did possess
Her womanhood is bent:
She is compact of discontent
Of any else than Life.

No mind hath she to mate
On joys we never did possess
Her womanhood is bent:
She cannot be the wife
Of any else than Life.

Her life to comprehend:
Needs must her heart take liberties,
With any that would be her friend;
And thus his lack of love amend
By living as she please
Till all her discontent
Be utterly forspent.

All we had boasted dies,
Confessing itself null
Beneath her joy-expectant eyes:
And how incontinently dull
Our pride is grown, how pitiful
Our labour and its prize!
Yet doth she not condemn,
But only look on them.

She is the enemy
Of our accomplished good,
Our comfort and complacency:
Her enfranchised womanhood
Laughs at our freedom; and it would
Methinks have set us free,
For it is nearer far
To manhood than we are.

—HENRY BRYAN BINNS.
The Savarkar Infamy.

MALATESTA has been saved from a life-sojourn in an Italian dungeon by the infamy of the man who previously betrayed the sovereignty of France. As early as June of last year, I estimated the situation correctly will be seen from the following excerpt from an editorial I wrote in the Herald of Revolt for March, 1911, criticising and summarising the Hague award:

"Savarkar has been damned to a life sojourn in an Indian dungeon by the infamy of the man who previously betrayed the French proletariat. But for the latter's agitation against the Hindu patriot's irregular arrest at Marseilles, on July 8th last—and Briand's fears of a general strike—the French Premier would never have invited the decision that brought about his resignation three days later. The Hague award, annulling the right of asylum, was only possible because Briand voluntarily abandoned his rights over the prisoner. The action of the British Government has lost, according to international law, its rights over the prisoner. The action of the French police in handing him back was illegal. . . . The entire French press upheld this view. The French Socialists support the French Government in demanding the return of Savarkar to France in vindication of the rights of asylum, and they look to the English Socialists to support them in this demand."

The above excerpt from this leaflet of mine is an exact statement of the situation at the time. Everyone thought that the French Government was acting in good faith; and when, as a result of public agitation in France and England, the matter was referred to the Hague Tribunal, Savarkar's early release was taken for granted. That we had not estimated the situation correctly will be seen from the following excerpt from an editorial I wrote in the Herald of Revolt for March, 1911, criticising and summarising the Hague award:

"... ‘Savarkar has been damned to a life sojourn in an Indian dungeon by the infamy of the man who previously betrayed the French proletariat. But for the latter's agitation against the Hindu patriot's irregular arrest at Marseilles, on July 8th last—and Briand's fears of a general strike—the French Premier would never have invited the decision that brought about his resignation three days later. The Hague award, annulling the right of asylum, was only possible because Briand voluntarily abandoned his rights over the prisoner. The action of the British Government has lost, according to international law, its rights over the prisoner. The action of the French police in handing him back was illegal. . . . The entire French press upheld this view. The French Socialists support the French Government in demanding the return of Savarkar to France in vindication of the rights of asylum, and they look to the English Socialists to support them in this demand.'"

The above excerpt from this leaflet of mine is an exact statement of the situation at the time. Everyone thought that the French Government was acting in good faith; and when, as a result of public agitation in France and England, the matter was referred to the Hague Tribunal, Savarkar's early release was taken for granted. That we had not estimated the situation correctly will be seen from the following excerpt from an editorial I wrote in the Herald of Revolt for March, 1911, criticising and summarising the Hague award:

"... ‘Savarkar has been damned to a life sojourn in an Indian dungeon by the infamy of the man who previously betrayed the French proletariat. But for the latter's agitation against the Hindu patriot's irregular arrest at Marseilles, on July 8th last—and Briand's fears of a general strike—the French Premier would never have invited the decision that brought about his resignation three days later. The Hague award, annulling the right of asylum, was only possible because Briand voluntarily abandoned his rights over the prisoner. The action of the British Government has lost, according to international law, its rights over the prisoner. The action of the French police in handing him back was illegal. . . . The entire French press upheld this view. The French Socialists support the French Government in demanding the return of Savarkar to France in vindication of the rights of asylum, and they look to the English Socialists to support them in this demand.'"

Let me give a statement of this case, our non-resentment of which has led to the recent Malatesta outrage. The facts had best be presented as they became known to the better to understand the nature of the secret diplomacy that runs riot among the agents of the governing class in this workaday "democratic" world. I will quote, first of all, from a leaflet which I circulated broadside immediately after my release from prison in July, 1910, and addressed: ‘The English Proletariat’—:

"Comrades!—I address the present appeal to you on behalf of Mr. Vinayaka D. Savarkar, B.A., who was arrested at Victoria Station, on March 15th, 1910, at the instance of the Indian Government. Mr. Savarkar's two brothers had already been entrapped by the British Government, and whilst one had been transported for sedition and the other was on his way to receive a like sentence. The English proceedings—at the Bow Street Police Court, the Divisional Court, and the Court of Appeal—were characterised by the usual illegality. The English Government had determined on Savarkar's return to India. This was proven by the reasons given for this decision in good faith; and when, as a result of public agitation in England, the matter was referred to the Hague Tribunal, Savarkar's early release was taken for granted. That we had not estimated the situation correctly will be seen from the following excerpt from an editorial I wrote in the Herald of Revolt for March, 1911, criticising and summarising the Hague award:

"... ‘Savarkar has been damned to a life sojourn in an Indian dungeon by the infamy of the man who previously betrayed the French proletariat. But for the latter's agitation against the Hindu patriot's irregular arrest at Marseilles, on July 8th last—and Briand's fears of a general strike—the French Premier would never have invited the decision that brought about his resignation three days later. The Hague award, annulling the right of asylum, was only possible because Briand voluntarily abandoned his rights over the prisoner. The action of the British Government has lost, according to international law, its rights over the prisoner. The action of the French police in handing him back was illegal. . . . The entire French press upheld this view. The French Socialists support the French Government in demanding the return of Savarkar to France in vindication of the rights of asylum, and they look to the English Socialists to support them in this demand.'"

Let me give a statement of this case, our non-resentment of which has led to the recent Malatesta outrage. The facts had best be presented as they became known to the better to understand the nature of the secret diplomacy that runs riot among the agents of the governing class in this workaday "democratic" world. I will quote, first of all, from a leaflet which I circulated broadside immediately after my release from prison in July, 1910, and addressed: ‘The English Proletariat’—:

"Comrades!—I address the present appeal to you on behalf of Mr. Vinayaka D. Savarkar, B.A., who was arrested at Victoria Station, on March 15th, 1910, at the instance of the Indian Government. Mr. Savarkar's two brothers had already been entrapped by the British Government, and whilst one had been transported for sedition and the other was on his way to receive a like sentence. The English proceedings—at the Bow Street Police Court, the Divisional Court, and the Court of Appeal—were characterised by the usual illegality. The English Government had determined on Savarkar's return to India. This was proven by the reasons given for this decision in good faith; and when, as a result of public agitation in England, the matter was referred to the Hague Tribunal, Savarkar's early release was taken for granted. That we had not estimated the situation correctly will be seen from the following excerpt from an editorial I wrote in the Herald of Revolt for March, 1911, criticising and summarising the Hague award:

"... ‘Savarkar has been damned to a life sojourn in an Indian dungeon by the infamy of the man who previously betrayed the French proletariat. But for the latter's agitation against the Hindu patriot's irregular arrest at Marseilles, on July 8th last—and Briand's fears of a general strike—the French Premier would never have invited the decision that brought about his resignation three days later. The Hague award, annulling the right of asylum, was only possible because Briand voluntarily abandoned his rights over the prisoner. The action of the British Government has lost, according to international law, its rights over the prisoner. The action of the French police in handing him back was illegal. . . . The entire French press upheld this view. The French Socialists support the French Government in demanding the return of Savarkar to France in vindication of the rights of asylum, and they look to the English Socialists to support them in this demand.'"
ordinates to guard against any possible escape. In accordance with the instructions a commissionaire of the French police was placed at the disposal of the British Government for this purpose. The English Anarchists and Socialists have carefully ignored raising a protest against any stage of the Savarkar case, placed two on the arm of his chair and lit the cigarette-case. William was a manly bachelor. "Give me one of your excellent cigarettes," said the old gentleman. "And explain over his cigarette-case. William was a manly bachelor. "Give me one of your excellent cigarettes," said the old gentleman. "And explain further delay. "Do not have a word of protest against the Savarkar scandal. I say to the Anarchist movement that this campaign of reaction can be won by demanding Savarkar's release... The right of political asylum must not be tamely surrendered to that capitalistic govern-ment. From pure selfishness, we would all become the victims of the insatiate monster of Governmental despotism. From pure selfishness, we should raise our voices without any further delay. GUY A. ALDRED.

**Done For.**

*(With apologies to the author of "Provided For.")*

"UNCLE mine! Hast heard the gloomy tidings? Henry has been and gone and done it." "Give me one of your excellent cigarettes, William," said the old gentleman. "And explain yourself further." "Henry is engaged," announced William, handing over his cigarette-case. William was a manly fellow, and earned quite a lot per annum in a bank. Uncle Albert abstracted three cigarettes from the case, placed two on the arm of his chair and lit the other.
"Convey my congratulations to Henry," he said at length. "You may manage to keep cool over it, anyhow, dear uncle," observed William.

Uncle blew two rings. "You are not to infer from my disinclination to agitate myself during this hot weather, my dear nephew, that I am not deeply affected by your good news. I can only wish that your dear father had been spared to give Henry his blessing. Nevertheless, I shall have mine." "Yours, dear uncle," remarked George (a flourishing junior reporter), "would come better, to put it in the vulgar, if you had ever been there yourself."

The old gentleman brushed some ash from his expanse of waistcoat.

"If, George, I am to interpret your coarse phraseology as implying that my lifelong celibacy debars me from feeling genuine delight at hearing that one of my nephews has at length chosen the better path, I can only—"

"There, there!" said George, stroking his uncle's hand. "But you haven't troubled to ask who the lady is."

Uncle lifted his shoulders ever so lightly. "That, my dear nephew, is of secondary importance. Any good woman—and I am sure that, after his upbringing, Henry could be acquainted with none but good women—any good woman, I say, will be able to assure Henry of those simple home delights and joys which every man should strive to deserve."

"How beautifully put, Uncle Albert. Yet you, for example, seem to have kept fairly healthy without said joys."

Uncle shook his head sadly. "I do not like, George, your flippant tone when speaking of sacred subjects. You will express yourself differently when you have known the love of a good woman."

Both the nephews bowed their heads.

"Anyhow," said William, "Henry is done for. Sentenced for life! On his screw, too! Poor Henry!"

"She'll bleed him," murmured George, in a deep voice. "She'll hold him in. What a fate!"

The two youths caught one another's eyes. There was a tense silence. They were both thinking of their poor dead father. Uncle was lighting a second cigarette.

"Man's lot is hard," sighed William at length. "Either a poor, lonely, pathetic bachelor like uncle, or a lowly, hard-driven slave like—"

He caught his brother's eye again, and mentioned no names. Even George and William had moments of reverence . . .

Henry, in the meantime, was buying a third box of chocolates for his Beatrice in the stalls of the nearest cinematograph theatre.

"You're sure you can afford it, dearest?" she murmured.

"Darling," he breathed, "all I have is yours!"

And so it was—and always will be.

F. O'ROBIN.

LADIES BLANCHARD'S APIOL and STEEL PILLS

Are unrivalled for all Female Ailments, &c., they speedily relieve and never fail to alleviate the suffering.

‘BLANCHARD’S are the Best of all Pills for Women.’

1½d per box, of Bootstrap and all Chemists; or post free from LESLIE MARTYN, Ltd., 34, Dalston Lane, LONDON.

“The Freewoman” Discussion Circle.

The fifth meeting of the Circle took place on Wednesday, June 19th, at Chandos Hall. Before the discussion took place, the question of the chairman was brought up for settlement. It was decided that for this session a permanent chairman and vice-chairman should be elected, and the voting resulted in the election of Mr. Charles Granville and Mrs. Gallichan as chairman and vice-chairman respectively, a decision which will give, it is certain, satisfaction to the members of the Circle.

The discussion for the evening was opened by Mr. Selwyn Weston, who spoke on "Ideas of Freedom," and his opening was followed by a long and heated debate. There was much interest in the opener's remarks, and in the discussion which followed.

Several speakers expressed a strong desire for discussions on vital problems which could be handled in a practical way, leading to definite action.

One member suggested the formation of a special "Actionist Group," a suggestion received with marked approval. The secretary will be glad to receive names of members desirous of joining such a group, and further requests members to send in any practical suggestions they may have.

In accordance with the wishes of some members, the session's programme is reprinted below. Will members kindly preserve this programme, as in future each meeting only will be announced in turn?

The next meeting will be held on Wednesday, July 3rd, at Chandos Hall, Maiden Lane, W.C., at 8 p.m. Mr. Guy Aldred will open a discussion on "Sex Oppression, and the Way Out."

PROGRAMME FOR SESSION, JULY—OCT., 1912.

DATE. SUBJECT. SPEAKER.
July 3. Sex Oppression and the Way Out Mr. Guy Aldred
July 17. Some Problems in Eugenics Mrs. Havelock Ellis
July 31. The Problem of Celibacy Mrs. Gallichan
Sept. 4. Neo-Malthusianism Dr. Drysdale
Sept. 18. Prostitution Mrs. Melvin and Dr. Drysdale
Oct. 2. The Abolition of Domestic Drodgery Miss Roma Robinson and Miss Rona Robinson
Oct. 16. The Reform of the Divorce Laws Mr. E. S. P. Haynes

N.B.—No meetings held during August.

B. LOW (Acting Secretary).
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STRINDBERG.

To the Editor of The Freewoman.

MADAM,—Miss Skovgaard-Pedersen is so polite in her criticism of an article that I feel most reluctant to tell her that I am not really as ignorant as I may appear. However, in emulation of her admirable letter, I will put it mildly.

When I labelled Strindberg "disagreeable," I did so under an obvious reservation. I need hardly direct Miss Pedersen's attention to those much-quoted words of the citizen; "unhappy love," says the woman; "sickness," the sick man; "disappointed hopes," the bankrupt. So with every human judgment—each is coloured out of all recognition, by the particular temperament or mental attitude of its maker. My designation of Strindberg as "disagreeable" was made, as a reference to the context will show, from the point of view of society. I called him "disagreeable" for much the same reason that Molière called his Alceste a Missanthropist. As a matter of fact, Alceste possessed every one of those qualities of kindness and ultimate benevolence which Miss Pedersen (and I think I) emphasised in the character of Strindberg.

With regard to Strindberg's mania for "many women," I'm afraid Miss Pedersen has missed my point, and I'm afraid the fault is mine. I used the word "manly" in a sense elaborated at some length in a previous article (Vol. I., No. 23), as simply the antithesis of that sympathetic and self-sacrificing element which—for convenience sake, and following Goethe—I called "womanly," and which I attributed to Strindberg himself. I think if Miss Pedersen will read my article in that light, she will find plenty of evidence for my thesis—both (and I think I) emphasised in the character of Strindberg. The real Strindberg was the enthusiast who found joy in his plays and novels. His second point was that I made covert gibes. So irony has to suffer at the hands of innocence. That he is innocent is shown by the number of "ifs" he introduced. If men were so much as missionaries to women, they would be only too glad to hear of one in which it did not exist. His second point was that I said Strindberg had any more than the aberrant Wilde was the real Wilde. I, a doctor, could be grieved at what seemed to me an inevitable diatribe, and suggested that Japan—not England—should not abandon her method of treating it too readily.

There is no further need to answer this mixture of "ifs," "oughts," and disbelief. As Mr. Watson would agree, to expose them is sufficient.

G. T. WRENCH.

shall the Yoshinara be rebuilt?

MADAM,—Whilst entirely agreeing with R. McDuckham's letter, it appears to me that the desires of men are not quite so easily overcome, nor the evils of prostitution so lightly crushed as he—or she?—seems to imagine. But I certainly think that, had Dr. Wrench lived for any considerable period of time in a country where prostitution is a State-protected institution, he would not have written as he does. If one or two abuses are lessened by this means—the power of the souteneur, for example, or the exploitation of the client too naive or too tipsy to take care of himself—it gives rise to many other and far worse ones. The kidnapping of young girls that the bordels may use with which the wares is one of these, and is exceedingly difficult to prevent in any country where bordels are tolerated, though I am aware that it may also exist to a lesser extent in countries where they are not. When there is the police de moeurs. Some of these men may be honest and respectable members of society—very many of them are not. Dr. Forel, in his book, "The Art of Love," gives an instance of a girl who came under his care at one time. Although perfectly honest and pure, she had been forced to become the mistress of one of these police officers, as the only way of getting rid of a threatener. "She gave her a ticket," that is to say, to brand her as a professional prostitute, and oblige her to lead a life of shame. An alert police officer may discover many of these on the trade illicitly and reports them is sure of speedy prosecution. If they cannot discover them in the ordinary course of events they will descend to trickery of the meanest and most abominable description. I have heard of numerous cases where they have deliberately seduced girls, persuaded them to accept some little present

should be scattered in our midst, without any attempt to mitigate its degradation or its disease?

As regards my statement that all men acknowledge prostitution to be the most distressing evil of our cities, I mean the men who know history and the world. Men who say "if," I should more expressly have excluded. If men and women were all pure, then I agree that prostitution would not be inevitable. But I have said as I know that all civilized peoples of the past and present it has always existed. I would be only too glad to hear of one in which it did not or does not exist. I have heard, as a single instance, that it did not exist among the Indians before the white man's occupation, and would be most grateful for any confirmation of this report. If it can be abolished, and the chastity of married life at the same time preserved, I should be only too glad to abolish it. But unless someone can bring forth probable evidence—that is to say, something more substantial than "ifs" and hopes—that this is possible, and unless the means of abolishing it are shown, it is an idle question as to whether the Japanese should adopt the European mode, which forces these women to parade the most frequented streets, makes the streets a danger to chaste girls and young women when alone, and allows sickness to be scattered abroad, or whether they should rebuild the Yoshinara, where, during the period of their contract, the women are segregated, and protected as far as possible from disease and degradation, is a perfectly legitimate question.

A second letter stood over the name of Mr. E. M. Watson. He began in his first paragraph by expressing the opinion that when I wrote "this pitiable business of prostitution" I did not mean what he understood me to mean. His second point was that I made covert gibes. So irony has to suffer at the hands of innocence. That he is innocent is shown by the number of "ifs" he introduced. If men were so much as missionaries to women, they would be only too glad to hear of one in which it did not exist. His second point was that I said Strindberg had any more than the aberrant Wilde was the real Wilde. I, a doctor, could be grieved at what seemed to me an inevitable diatribe, and suggested that Japan—not England—should not abandon her method of treating it too readily.

There is no further need to answer this mixture of "ifs," "oughts," and disbelief. As Mr. Watson would agree, to expose them is sufficient.

G. T. WRENCH.
in return for their favours—and instantly reported them. In Russia, in certain parts of Germany, in Copenhagen
until recently, and no doubt in other countries as well, the life as units comprising millions, bolts in the construc-
coarsened and corrupted. They have no chance of escap­
ing, except the purchase of their freedom, and the majority of them end their days miserably in the hospital.
That the spread of venereal disease is not in the least prevented by these measures is a well-known and
proven fact, those countries where prostitution is State-
protected being at least as bad in this way as the others.
Forel—who's book I would earnestly recommend to any-
one interested in the subject, especially to any­
advocates desire. Take an example of social morality—
and perverted passions of men" are not always to blame
for it. Whilst prostitution exists men will succumb to temporetical passion of the flesh. It is, to a
certain extent, a case where the supply creates the de­
mand, and a readjustment of our social laws might work
wonders in diminishing the numbers of what we are
pleased to call "the lowest profession in the world " may
be never entirely abolished. We do not, at least, need to encourage or condone it, nor to
hold out to its exploiters the protection and approval of
the State. One would like to hear the opinion of other
British medical men on the subject. Do they agree with Mr. Donnish­
rorpe has a little overstated his plea for
truth. The basic elements of Morality, Truth, Purity, Faith,
Hope may be fundamentally the root of all heroic action,
but how?
"Confidence," between husband and wife on such a
subject forsooth! Confidence in oneself perhaps, and
the tricks of a fool to blind his own eyes to his weakness and irrationality. Rather work, and
smile, and lie wholesomey and heartily, till gradually
old nature patches up the broken heart, and herself
suggests new methods of life and conduct.
Suppress these horrible mistakes, for they are mistakes
as society is now constituted, and they will die a natural
dead. Put them into words to another, and they will
invariably become a source of new errors. This
brings me to confession, that most luxurious of mental
baths.
Nine persons out of ten repent of a confession a week
after it is made.
"Confidence," between husband and wife on such a
subject forsooth! Confidence in oneself perhaps, and
one's powers will not enable the self-suspicous to
produce understanding. Far from asking favour for the offenders,
hope may be fundamentally the root of all heroic action,
but how?
"Confidence," between husband and wife on such a
subject forsooth! Confidence in oneself perhaps, and
one's powers will not enable the self-suspicous to
produce understanding. Far from asking favour for the offenders,
this is merely endeavouring to open official eyes to the defects of which ultimately involve us all in the guilt of persecution.

It would surely seem that the standard of endurance expected from saints and political rebels may be left to themselves, and that even in a humane community their trials and suffering, and spiritual conflict will be sufficiently exacting. In the meantime, is it not permissible to welcome wherever it occurs, but not intrinsically impossible, educational endeavour to create a preference for hearing the prophet rather than building his sepulchre?

W. HINDSHEW.

"SPIRITUAL PASSION."

MADAM,—Mr. Granville, in his recent paper given at the Discussion Circle, very emphatically insisted on the desirability of every speaker and writer connected with THE FREEWOMAN, when he endeavoured to explain in his own way or expression used by him or her, to explain it in a reasonably clear way. I am therefore moved to ask whether the following definition of that expression, "spiritual passion," so often used by you recently, is adequate and perhaps preferable to "vital principle," which I believe you once suggested as an alternative term to spiritual passion simply continuous emotion, as contrasted with an ephemeral emotion, which may be termed sentimental? Will it not appear upon reflection that the one, i.e., continuous emotion, is evoked not by the objects or events themselves, but by the mental pictures of them formed and retained in the mind or imagination, and that the ephemeral emotion is roused directly by the sight of the physical objects themselves, or immediate experience, without the mental emotion, i.e., passion evoked by the mental part of man. That spiritual passion should denote something noble is not essential. Moral implications slip into expressions which often obscure their primary meaning.

A spiritual passion probably will be noble, because the law of survival tends to suppress ignoble passion, passionateness of character, which is continuous that is the essential characteristic of spiritual passion, and not its moral nature.

Take the simple instance of the ordinary man and a social reformer in face of distress among the poor. When the former has poverty brought to his immediate notice, he is moved and gives alms, and, perhaps, goes on and forgets. His emotion vanishes when the object that evokes it is withdrawn. It was no doubt perfectly normal, and perhaps even violent, but it did not last, hence it is called ephemeral, but can be considered of small value. The social reformer, on the other hand, may or may not be immediately moved, but he remembers the object of his benevolence, the poverty he saw, and his emotion, passion evoked by the mental part of man, which he cannot forget, and lives in this mental part of man, and the object of the reformer's benevolence.

In reply to the question: "What name serves the best use? Personally, we think what name we like, or (which is the sole consideration) what name serves the best use? Personally, we think the best solution is to retain both the names in a conjoint name, and it was merely to save space that we did not do this in the letter under consideration.

With regard to "B. L.'s" second point, we confess that our writings are of course, but we do feel strongly how much the complete success of free unions depends upon their seriousness of motive and purpose. Especially is this so while our present society, with its moral atmosphere, persists. Thus the body--emotions will retain their place, while continuing along with the higher developments of mind and spirit.

MADAM,—Can you inform me whence the beautiful pledge given by the man, "With my body I thee worship," is derived? I have never heard this quoted as one so frequently disobeyed and ignored.

What we worship, we protect. What we worship, we adore and never injure.

The expression, "With my body," is so significant that the originator must have had in his mind the possibility of using such words and procedures as—With my body I thee insult. With my body I thee trample on. With my body I thee terribly oppress. The perjury committed by those who, uttering this vow, flagrantly ignore it, must often come to the minds of those who are the victims of such substitutions.

June 17th, 1912. MARY AND STANLEY ROGERS RANDOLPH.

THE MARRIAGE SERVICE.

MADAM,—We beg your further indulgence in order to correct the interpretation which our letter to last week's FREEWOMAN, as printed, must surely have given. The controversial point which we raised, and which was the main object of the letter, was unfortuately misunderstood, no doubt for reasons of space. The point was this: That the sex-relationships, given true unions and freedom of expression, so far from ending in momentary transitory experiences of joy and creation, is really meant to be the centre and source of all future development in creation, as it has been in the past stages of evolution, from the union of two elements to form a new substance, or the union of two cells resulting in further cells, and so on, through all the stages to the human one. And all these acts of sex, or unions of affinities, are actually contained and repre-

sented together, and, at the same time, in ourselves—in our bodies. So will the same process of sex-union and its resultant creation hold through all the other stages of human and superhuman development.

And it is here that the practice of the doctrine of Karezza (an old name for an older theory); it comes in just now, at the time not many (including "Northerner") are eager to use their love forces to more than physical ends. Also it is here that the prevailing prejudices about sex and sex-relationships are likely to, and actually do, lead even the freest thinkers on these matters in the wrong direction. Even THE FREEWOMAN, in Article II. on "Interpretations of Sex," talks of "momentary semi-physical sex-experience," which cannot be "fixed" mentally because "there is nothing left over," as if it were in any case limited by the ephemeral nature of all other forms of service—physical, mental and spiritual.

The momentary physical climax is not necessarily the only end to sexual relationships, as is the temporary nature of the emotional phase so often used by you recently, is adequate and possibly preferable to "vital principle," which I believe you once suggested as an alternative term to spiritual passion simply continuous emotion, as contrasted with an ephemeral emotion, which may be termed sentimental? Will it not appear upon reflection that the one, i.e., continuous emotion, is evoked not by the objects or events themselves, but by the mental pictures of them formed and retained in the mind or imagination, and that the ephemeral emotion is roused directly by the sight of the physical objects themselves, or immediate experience, without the mental emotion, i.e., passion evoked by the mental part of man. That spiritual passion should denote something noble is not essential. Moral implications slip into expressions which often obscure their primary meaning.

A spiritual passion probably will be noble, because the law of survival tends to suppress ignoble passion, passionateness of character, which is continuous that is the essential characteristic of spiritual passion, and not its moral nature.

Take the simple instance of the ordinary man and a social reformer in face of distress among the poor. When the former has poverty brought to his immediate notice, he is moved and gives alms, and, perhaps, goes on and forgets. His emotion vanishes when the object that evokes it is withdrawn. It was no doubt perfectly normal, and perhaps even violent, but it did not last, hence it is called ephemeral, but can be considered of small value. The social reformer, on the other hand, may or may not be immediately moved, but he remembers the object of his benevolence, the poverty he saw, and his emotion, passion evoked by the mental part of man, which he cannot forget, and lives in this mental part of man, and the object of the reformer's benevolence.

In reply to the question: "What name serves the best use? Personally, we think what name we like, or (which is the sole consideration) what name serves the best use? Personally, we think the best solution is to retain both the names in a conjoint name, and it was merely to save space that we did not do this in the letter under consideration.

With regard to "B. L.'s" second point, we confess that our writings are of course, but we do feel strongly how much the complete success of free unions depends upon their seriousness of motive and purpose. Especially is this so while our present society, with its moral atmosphere, persists. Thus the body—emotions will retain their place, while continuing along with the higher developments of mind and spirit.

MADAM,—Can you inform me whence the beautiful pledge given by the man, "With my body I thee worship," is derived? I have never heard this quoted as one so frequently disobeyed and ignored.

What we worship, we protect. What we worship, we adore and never injure.

The expression, "With my body," is so significant that the originator must have had in his mind the possibility of using such words and procedures as—With my body I thee insult. With my body I thee trample on. With my body I thee terribly oppress. The perjury committed by those who, uttering this vow, flagrantly ignore it, must often come to the minds of those who are the victims of such substitutions.

June 17th, 1912. MARY AND STANLEY ROGERS RANDOLPH.

THE MARRIAGE SERVICE.

MADAM,—Can you inform me whence the beautiful pledge given by the man, "With my body I thee worship," is derived? I have never heard this quoted as one so frequently disobeyed and ignored.

What we worship, we protect. What we worship, we adore and never injure.

The expression, "With my body," is so significant that the originator must have had in his mind the possibility of using such words and procedures as—With my body I thee insult. With my body I thee trample on. With my body I thee terribly oppress. The perjury committed by those who, uttering this vow, flagrantly ignore it, must often come to the minds of those who are the victims of such substitutions.

June 17th, 1912. MARY AND STANLEY ROGERS RANDOLPH.

THE PROTESTANT.

[We have not the information at hand.—Ed.]

"PASS THE BILL." MADAM,—I am quite unaware of the fact that I have modified in any way my attitude towards the "Pass the Bill." Committee. I have stated, in my opinion, the Bill is a bogus measure, of no utility in suppressing the real criminals; but will only harass
persons who are already too much at the mercy of "moral" persecution. One cannot state every argument with or in an handwriting. White Slave traffic and prostitution should be dealt with would be no market for the White Slave; and the traffic cannot follow her reasoning—it may be the printer's fault. For the present, I will pass them by.

I repeat, that your correspondent is wrong in saying a man can be arrested upon suspicion of being a prostitute, or a night-walker. Women and men alike can be arrested for "loitering," "accosting," and similar charges. Both men and women are liable to be arrested on the suspicion of brothel-keeping accounts. A woman of good character can easily show her innocency, whereas a man of good character stands much less chance of escape.

P.S.—There is a most serious error in the article on "The Immorality of the Marriage Contract." The writer states a man "can claim total conjugal rights over the woman he marries, and can also obtain social intercourse elsewhere without prejudice to his claims upon his wife." That is utterly untrue. One act of adultery on the part of a man, without anything else, entitles a woman to a judicial separation, and to alimony for the rest of her life. No woman is compelled to live with a man who has committed adultery. I contradict this suggestion so emphatically, I regret the thought of it would become too dangerous, as it would be far more difficult to conceal. There are several paragraphs in Mrs. Villamay's letter which are so obscurely worded that I cannot follow her reasoning—it may be the printer's fault. For the present, I will pass them by.

Consider for a moment, as an example, the detail of the Sabbath a day of added toil, instead of a day of rest, to her—not merely because of the cookery, which cannot be left unattended to, but also because of the added work of scouring extra plates and cooking utensils which the preparation of the festa subsequently involves. The housewife, therefore, excludes her from public worship, if she desires to join in it; and, indeed, even from the freedom to upraise her thoughts, for one day in the week, above the circumscribed level of "What shall we eat and drink?"—What shall we drink, and wherewithal shall we be clothed?

Such is the housewife's position at the present moment, whereas a thoughtful mind, considering the question fairly, sees many ways in which economic science, as expressed by co-operative housekeeping, might improve her position and upraise her outlook on life. Yours, etc.,

ALICE C. BURNETT.

THE ORDER OF THE GOLDEN AGE.

MADAM.—The recent libel case, in which Dr. Robert Bell was awarded £2,600 damages, has aroused considerable interest in the cancer scourge, and the possibility of a cure. As a philanthropic society we have been instrumental in spreading knowledge in regard to this disease, having published a letter of the Hon. Mr. Pethick Lawrence, containing the first division, claims that the same privilege shall be extended to the other sex, unless it is proved that they have not yet served the whole of their sentences, and urges the acceptance of the principle, that all political offenders are entitled to be thus treated.

THE HUMANITARIAN LEAGUE.

The following resolution has been passed by the Committee of the House of Commons:—"That this Committee, while expressing its satisfaction at the interference of Mrs. Pankhurst and Mr. and Mrs. Pethick Lawrence to the first division, claims that the same privilege shall be extended to the other sex, unless it is proved that they have not yet served the whole of their sentences, and urges the acceptance of the principle, that all political offenders are entitled to be thus treated."

A BOOK FOR MARRIED WOMEN.

By DR. ALLISON.

The information contained in this book ought to be known by every married woman. The book will not harm anyone. It is thoroughly into matters relating to married women. Some may think too much is said; such carelessly be the case, for knowledge is power and the means of attaining happiness. The book can be had in an envelope from Dr. T. W. Allinson, 381, Room, Manchester Square, London, W., in return for a Postal Order for 1s. 2d.
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"What we should have missed had so fine a piece of art, so subtle a piece of reasoning been withheld from us."—ROBERT BLATCHFORD in the CLARION. "Sensitive translation of M. de Gourmont's exquisite book."—OBSERVER.
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By CONAL O'RIOORDAN (Norreys Connell). Crown 8vo, cloth, 3s. 6d. net. "Mr. O'Riordan has talent of a very exceptional character. . . . There is something here that is fine, completely achieved, unique."—DAILY NEWS.

IRISH HOME RULE: THE LAST PHASE
By S. G. HOBSON. 3s. 6d. net. "Mr. Hobson," says the ATHENEUM, "puts the case for Home Rule with a freshness which is remarkable at this stage of the controversy." Reviewers of all parties agree that he treats the problems of land and finance with equal acuteness, picturesque ness and lucidity.

FROM THEATRE TO MUSIC HALL
By W. R. TITTERTON. 3s. 6d. net. This is an attempt to account for the weakening of the dramatic sense in modern England, and to explain the enormous importance of the music hall, and the desperate necessity of maintaining it as a means of popular expression.
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IN A GERMAN PENSION (Third Edition)
By KATHERINE MANSFIELD. Miss Mansfield knows the Germans at home, and analyses them with remorseless minuteness and delightful malice in a book which the critics have termed "masterly," "uncommonly bold and artistic," "strikingly realistic" and "amazingly clever."

SHADOWS OUT OF THE CROWD
By RICHARD CURLE. "The author has a wonderful analytical faculty of laying bare the secrets of the human heart."—SCOTSMAN. "They never leave the reader unmoved."—TIMES.

A SUPERMAN IN BEING
By LITCHFIELD WOODS. This most original novel has everywhere received especial attention from reviewers in the Press. One critic says: "If Mr. Woods can continue to write novels as clever and original as 'A Superman in Being,' his work is well worth watching." The MORNING POST devotes a special position to the work. It says: " . . . A book of distinguished promise . . . We hope to hear more of Mr. Litchfield Woods."
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