THE SLAVE.

THERE is a time in the history of every emancipation movement when the energy of the emancipationists spends itself in diffused indignation against the forces which it fights. It is the cruelty and immorality of the tyrant which stands out as the main feature in the picture. The energy which indignation breeds uses itself up in trying to deflect those forces—to imbue them with an opposite tendency. It seeks to make the tyrant non-tyranical, to make him see himself as the tyrannised see him. It tries to transform the force; to permeate it. The period during which emancipation shows such a temper as this is its embryonic period. It is its shapeless, formless, voiceless period. It cannot yet be said to have been born. Up to this point and right into this moment the white-labour emancipationists, women and men, must be reckoned to be still in this stage: they are still seeking to influence power, rather than to fathom its character, accept its direction, and create new power of their own to overcome it. This explains why there still remains a belief in Government. Women and men believe in government because they think they can influence it in time. They fail to see that government is a convenient fiction set up to protect the status quo, i.e., to further the designs of those who have power. The "Government" of any country translates into the concrete the wishes of those who have power to enforce them—efficient power, not merely verbal "rights," which are nothing more than a collection of fables made up to amuse children in nurseries. A man has a "right" to what he can get. In a free community no man has any "rights"; he has what he can make out of his freedom. In an unfree community, the "powerful"—those who have had the strength, ingenuity, and cunning to establish force to translate their power into domination—dole out "rights" to a mean and humble rabble, who gratefully accept what is accorded them, and who but whimper feebly about "our rights" when the "powerful" take back what they have given. A people with free instincts would have nothing to do with a despicable whining about rights; they would rise up to take and hold—what they can take and hold.

So a time comes in emancipation movements which differs from this wherein we now live—this embryonic time—in that it will have become conscious of the real nature of the depraved relationship which is represented by "governors" and "governed," by any and every "government." The focus for contempt will have moved in a direction which is from "governors" to "governed," from the "tyrant" to the "tyrannised." It will be clear that if the governors are cruel as tigers and savage as bulls, they are not contemptible. They are not worms, which is what the governed are: offering themselves to be cut about, their parts severed, yet still able to live meanly on. The object for contempt is not the slave-owner, but the slave. The slave-owner acts after his kind, driven on by the power which inheres in habit, once morality is abandoned. He is under the domination of the lust for power, and, having left morality behind him long since, he is at the mercy of the fierce tendency which is the inner meaning of any lust. The "powerful" attain the accretion of power as inevitably as a weight gathers force in its fall. Spiritual force abandoned with morality, they are in the thrall of material force. They can only be saved by being met by opposing forces—life forces—and these the slave is insufficient to give. The person who is responsible for the tyrant is the slave; the person who is responsible for the selfish man is the unselfish man. It is indecent for the slavish to take
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CORRESPONDENCE:

THE SLAVE.
ceive of a condition which is not slavery. Tears of self-pity would mount to their eyes if notions of freedom were thrust on them. They feel not merely the horror of freedom, but is it their hands, and theirs alone, which must change matters, it matters not what be the possible for things as they are; that it is their hands, which must change matters, if matters can be, changed. They are respon­ sible for things as they are; that it is their hands, which must change matters, if matters can be, changed.

It is the first token of coming change, and of prescience of a different view-point, that is creating the feeling which is behind the growing dislike for sharing in politics. The anti-Parliamentarians are getting "hotter" in their search for the right explanation of their position, though as yet none of them has made the discovery as to what their restlessness relates. Let us examine the situation, and try and give the essence of it. Parliamentarians say in effect: "Since we are governed, government becomes a tremen­ dous factor in the shaping of our lives. Therefore, let us share in government: even let us govern, government becomes a tremen­ dous factor in the shaping of our lives."

Government rests on force: physical force is the last resort even for the most spiritual minded. If we have spirit, we use it to make men and women fight: Simón de Montfort, Jack Straw, Robert Ket, Hampden, Washington, Lincoln, Joan of Arc, Garibaldi, all the religions of the world, have spread the spirit abroad to make men use violence, physical force, in order to overthrow Governments. Why? Because Governments are for nothing other than the maintaining of institutions which embody force, armies, police, law courts, conscription, the police, the army and the law courts. Government lies outside Parliament, and the Par­ liamentarians make no efforts to penetrate into and dominate Government. Between the Government and the Slaves stands the Army. "Between the Government and the Slaves stands the Army." Only over the bodies of the bodies of the Army will the governed participate in government. Parliament forsorth! Talk and paper! Government is expressed in guns and batons. To participate in government the slaves must be able to converse with governors on equal terms. They too should talk with guns and batons. Unless they would be forever slaves, they too must be an army. A correspondent asks what weapons Slaves would use. The answer surely is, "Those weapons which Governments have used to keep them governed; the weapons of an army." In a community which has a Government, and where that Government expresses itself through arms, then the hapless governed, unless he would be a slave for ever, must be prepared to express himself through arms. It may be protested that there is a possibility that the army may be weaned from allegiance to the governors to allegiance to the governed. Such are the feeble frothings of nerveless men. The State power, the power of the Established. Government has no other meaning. The mere sanitation and administration work which it takes up are meant to act as dust in the common people's eyes. They are meant to supply a raison d'être adequate to satisfy the blunted intelligence of an enslaved community. They are meant to supply the mummeries and flummeries which soften the outline of (though they feel under no compulsion to hide) the bloody means of coercion, and members of Parliament are the chief of the mummers; and very well paid they are for their mumming. They are puppets, put to the front by the actual governors, at whose bid­ ding they perform. So, to wish to penetrate into government is one thing and to wish to enter Parliament is quite another. The government, i.e., the coercion of a people, is exerted by those who govern them, in whose hands is the power which are, or have become, necessities to the people.

The government of England is forced through, owing to the necessities of the stomachs of English­ men. The three monopolies which lie in the hands of the governors—the land monopoly, the machine monopoly, the money monopoly—constitute the powers of governors; the State and its officers and institutions are kept in being in order to safe­ guard those monopolies. They have no other reason for existing. They are not loved by, they are wholly useless to, the common people. The State is maintained to perpetuate the government inherent in monopoly. It has no other reason to do with the maintenance of the unity of nations. The peoples, i.e., races, clans, no longer fight each other. It is a thousand years since the irruption of peoples ceased in Europe. There is nothing in the wars of the last thousand years of the nature of the invasion of Britain by the English, in which the English people largely exterminated the Celts in order to occupy their lands. There have been wars which were merely the pastimes of kings, tournament wars, where the fighters, kings and men, fought in sheer joyousness and bravery. There have been wars where kings fought to safeguard their crowns and win a kingdom for themselves, where the kings were generals and fought mainly with hired men, to pay for whom they impoverished themselves and, incidentally, their subjects; but it is only under capitalism that wars have been made by bankers for money, wars in which the wretched squawks, the scurry knives, the money-thugs, curs, sneak in with shabby little lies under the cover of the South African War. Such as these make wars to suit their money-interests, send out honest men to mow down other honest men, lay the bill upon the starved resources of the nation that has kennelled them, and keep up Standing Armies to be ready for any little expedition that may occur to them abroad, and be ready to trample down the faces of their over-driven victims at home. The Financiers' standing-army is the Government, and the half­ awakened workers who are persuaded that while there is government they mean to share in it in should remember this. They should repeat until the sig­ nificance of the phrase has seared itself into their consciousness: "Between the Government and the Slaves stands the Army." Between the Govern­ ment and the Slaves stands the Army." Only over the bodies of the Army will the governed participate in government. Parliament forsorth! Talk and paper! Government is expressed in guns and batons. To participate in government the slaves must be able to converse with governors on equal terms. They too should talk with guns and batons. Unless they would be forever slaves, they too must be an army. A correspondent asks what weapons Slaves would use. The answer surely is, "Those weapons which Governments have used to keep them governed; the weapons of an army." In a community which has a Government, and where that Government expresses itself through arms, then the hapless governed, unless he would be a slave for ever, must be prepared to express himself through arms. It may be protested that there is a possibility that the army may be weaned from allegiance to the governors to allegiance to the governed. Such are the feeble frothings of nerveless men. The State power, the power of the Established. Government has no other meaning. The mere sanitation and administration work which it takes up are meant to act as dust in the common people's eyes. They are meant to supply a raison d'être adequate to satisfy the blunted intelligence of an enslaved community. They are meant to supply the mummeries and flummeries which soften the outline of (though they feel under no compulsion to hide) the bloody means of coercion, and members of Parliament are the chief of the mummers; and very well paid they are for their mumming. They are puppets, put to the front by the actual governors, at whose bid­ ding they perform. So, to wish to penetrate into government is one thing and to wish to enter Parliament is quite another. The government, i.e., the coercion of a people, is exerted by those who govern them, in whose hands is the power which are, or have become, necessities to the people.

The government of England is forced through, owing to the necessities of the stomachs of English­ men. The three monopolies which lie in the hands of the governors—the land monopoly, the machine monopoly, the money monopoly—constitute the powers of governors; the State and its officers and institutions are kept in being in order to safe-
horde of hungry men. Had the dockers on Tower Hill recently carried rifles, as an army should, the issue would have been somewhat different shall we say:

"When wilt Thou save Thy people? Oh God of Mercy! When?"

When they are armed. Ask Pym, ask Washington, ask Lincoln, ask Garibaldi. Ask of any who have grappled with and conquered dominion.

The historical side of this question of arms is with all sad gravity, strike anyone who studies the progress of expropriation of the people which was carried out by the landowners in the middle ages how terrifyingly patient the peasants were in suffering it. No grosser indignities embodied in law could have been practised on an enslaved, lower race than the large owners carried through against their erstwhile tenants. The laws of the various reigns show the process by which the middle ages battered our English spirit into the dulled thing it is to-day. In Henry VIII.'s reign, those turned adrift from their land, found begging, were "to be tied to a cart-tail and whipped until the blood flowed from their bodies. Found a second time, in addition to being whipped. Limbs to be sliced off. Found a third time, the rogue to be executed." In Henry VIII.'s reign 7,200 men were executed for "great and petty theft."

In Edward VI.'s reign (1547) a statute ordained that anyone refusing to work was to be condemned as a slave to the person denouncing him as an idler. This person might use whip and chains. If the slave ran away, he was to be brought back and branded on forehead and back with the letter "S."

"The master can sell him, bequest him, let him out on hire as a slave, bequeath him to his own personal chattels or cattle. If the slaves attempt anything against the masters, they are also to be executed. Justices of the Peace, on information, are to hunt the rascals down. If it happens that a vagabond has been idling about for three days, he is to be taken to his birthplace, branded with a red-hot iron with the letter V on the breast, and to be set to work in chains, in the streets, or at some other labour. If the vagabond gives a false birthplace, he is then to become a slave for life of this place, of its inhabitants or its corporation, and to be branded with an S. All persons have a right to take away the children of the vagabonds, and to keep them as apprentices—the young men until the twenty-fourth year, the young girls until the twentieth. If they run away, they are to become up to this age the slaves of their masters, who can put them in irons with them, and to use them. Every part of a slave may be branded with an iron round the neck, arms, or legs of his slave, by which to know him more easily, and to be more certain of him. The last part of this statute provides that certain poor people may be employed by a place or by persons who are willing to give them food and drink, and find them work. The kind of punishment was kept up in England until far into the nineteenth century under the name of 'roundsman.'"

And so on through the reigns.

It seems clear that only defenceless men would have submitted to such treatment. Evidently, from the time Scutage, the money-commutation for military service, was imposed, that neither the defenceless nor the armed freemen had been accepted as an excuse for letting proper weapons of defence fall out of use. Hence, when the feudal overlords elected to overstep their feudal "rights," those upon whose "rights" they encroached were powerless to withstand, and dependence apparently killed the spirit to resist. Had they had a gleam of hope that resistance would be successful, these expropriated peasants would surely have fought, and taken the precaution to secure that, if the brow were to be branded and the neck chained, the brand and chain might rest on dead men, but not on the living. They would have fought. They did not; hence, the ancestors of the Englishman to-day were, through several centuries, complete and entire slaves. This probably accounts for a great deal: for the servile spirit; the insensitive honour; the dodging yoke; the platform rhetoric and the hope of salvation by parchment. It explains why English people have allowed a foreign race, with a different religion, to set up a permanent armed force in their midst, at their expense, for the protection of these foreigners' money-interests, at home and elsewhere. It is too little thought that the Standing Army has been regarded by Englishmen previous to the Jewish occupation as an intolerable menace to their liberties. They would have none of it. When the French were ravaging the southern coast of England, at the close of Edward III.'s reign, the Commons made a small grant of money with which to hire foreign troops. But they paid the money into the hands of two tradesmen whom they trusted, and demanded an audit and a complete account. But the Jews have changed all that. It is significant that the Standing Army in England may be said to date from the time of the establishment of the Jewish settlement, from the beginning of the capitalist period. The notion that the English Army exists to protect English interests is crude. It exists to back the speculations of Jewish money-lenders who batten upon English poverty. A war with Germany would not be a war between Germans and English, though it would actually be fought out by them. It would be a war between money-lending German Jews and money-lending Jews in England. The Boer War was not an English war, though it cost English lives and English money. It was a Jews' war, and the English Army exists to fight such wars, secondarily. Primarily, it exists to overawe the millions of starving, harassed slaves who toil here in England ceaselessly for their task-masters, the financiers. That is the first duty of the Army: to overawe the populace. That explains why free Englishmen would have no mention of a Standing Army. It was not their spirit which would apply the whip to their own backs. And likewise with the Police-force. A Police-force is unthinkable save in the presence of a slave community. When the exploiters have driven the exploited into the last ditch, it becomes necessary to use even more intimate measures of control than can be secured by the Army. A Police-force is necessary to guard the hoarded wealth of the exploiters. So the Standing Army of the nineteenth century was reinforced by the Police in the nineteenth. And the English went stolidly on. Now the Jews are establishing a still more intimate form of coercion, the Spy—called an inspector. This species of human reptile crawls about, entering the People's hovels, and when they have intimidation that some poor, over-driven fool would be better out of the way, they call in their brethren, the Police, who invite the Magistrate, who hands him over to the Warder and the Warder leads him to the Police-station, and the English go stolidly on. There seems to be no epithet, no word, that could be applied, and that with truth, and flung in their faces, that would be sufficient to rouse them to revolt. A usurious Jew might set an Englishman to remove offal, spurn him with his foot, lash him with the whip, and the Englishman would lick the grasping hand. The word has not yet been coined which can make the Englishman aware of reality, stung him into revolt. The Englishman is the Slave. If he is not, we shall know it when we see him with adequate weapons in his hand. Then the rhetoric of the lily-livered, of those who would achieve freedom by crosses on paper, will have shrunk to its precise value, and that is—nothing.
On Machines.

It is indicative of the strong evidence which Marx must have found in favour of his assumption that the morality of an age emanates from its methods of production, and not contrariwise, that so few people can grasp intuitively the bad ethics of the machine. It appears to require an almost impossible effort of the imagination for the mind to lift itself out of the working habits of its age. In fact, the immoral nature of machinery cannot be grasped intuitively at all. It has to be arrived at, by inference, from moral truths which can the individualist who sets out with an intuitive knowledge of the necessity for free-will, if he is sincere, will rapidly arrive at the problem which the division of labour, necessitated by machines, involves. This problem presents the insurmountable obstacle for individualism. Neither principle—neither the individual nor the machine—will give way. The machine makes organisation compulsory; the individual refuses all organisation not voluntary. They are direct opposites. One or other will have to go overboard. The individualist, relying on the morality of the human soul, takes leave of the machine. The economist, relying on the advantages of the machine, sets adrift from morality and the soul. There are no other alternatives. It is clear-cut: Morality or the Machine. It is as definite as that between God and Mammon, Christ or Caesar. According to the attitude one takes up on this question depends the whole superstructure of philosophy. Upon this rock the new Church is built. Marx answered the question in favour of the machine. Bergson, strange to say, involving, we think, a contradiction with his basic theory, does the same. Sorel, the philosopher of Syndicalism, though influenced by Proudhon in that part of Syndicalism which matters, i.e., its Insurrectionism, follows Marx in this particular, and involves Syndicalism in confusion. Syndicalism is, in its nature, anarchist, insurrectionist, individualist; yet it is foundering about with theories of Communism. It is beginning to talk about the nationalisation of the means of production, because it is being driven in that direction by its failings on Machines. When it says “The mines for the miners,” it is in the right direction. It is showing true tendency. But that position it cannot maintain against State Socialists. It will have to move in one direction or another. It cannot stand still, and it is on this question of the machine, with the vast organisation which machines involve, that it will choose its direction. It will so decide between Communism and Individualism; between Nationalisation of the Means of Production and the Individualisation of the Means of Production. Though we say this in brief, it is a tremendously important thing we are saying. The choice they make must inevitably alter the nature of the revolution.

We might extend the list did our space allow, but enough has been said to show their different nature. The machine-infected intelligence alone has held Syndicalists back from leaping to the appreciation of the nature of Syndicalism. It is the Moral Revolt against a Materialist Organisation.

We intend, however, to develop these points later. Here we make a few replies to the critics of our Anti-Machine Morality. To be absolutely certain in these things it is necessary to have the moral sense. Unhappily (as we think), many persons are not profoundly sensed morally. Therefore, arguments have to be made on other grounds. We will not take seriously the writer who thinks that, if we abandoned machines, we should move about “on all fours.” We merely point out that all the great cultures—Greek, Roman, Spanish, the Eastern—have been in the “four-footed,” i.e., pre-mechanist, period, and that Mechanism has produced no culture at all. The very instincts of culture are now breaking away from Mechanism in a life-and-death struggle for bare survival. Those advocates of the so-called Normal Social Life, who hope to retain the bird of freedom in a mechanistic air, we merely ask to make this experiment, if only in thought: Each man and woman having land, and the preliminary start in cultivating their own property to be bothered with making machines for others. Hence, all men being likewise busied with their own property, “the refuge of their souls,” all must provide their own machinery—their tools. Machine-labour rests on an expropriated class: they are fine freewomen whose freedom requires the existence of a slave-class to keep it pink, so to speak. So with all arguments on behalf of division of labour. It is not merely that machines have been wrongly used. They are incapable of right use, inasmuch as a community of freemen could not and would not use them.

Concerning the argument that the production of necessary things should be got over quickly, by Machine-labour, in as uninteresting way as possible, we must say that there should be no production of unnecessary things. Beauty is as great a necessity as bread. We can, indeed, fare better with a shortage of bread than with a shortage of Beauty. Beauty should not be despised, and is not, divorced from ordinary things and their production. Beauty is the morality of production.

We might extend the list did our space allow, but enough has been said to show their different nature.
The Circle of Intelligence.

THE RESURRECTIONISTS.

EVERY intelligent person has an individual value which each should be set free to express so that it becomes of universal value. By “the circle of intelligence” I do not mean a compulsory circle of hard-boiled collectivists who shout “Hats off!” the moment the Master appears, but a circle of intelligent individuals working separately, yet together, to realise the extreme value of a whole of which each of their values is a necessary part. This circle must not be confused with those circles of co-operative effort which sprang up in the Middle Ages. It has nothing to do with the Guild idea of any kind. Beneath the Guild idea is a subtle and, in some cases, poisonous tyranny. But it is based upon a levelling up of intelligence, and the consequent voluntary co-operative effort which must arise therefrom. I propose in subsequent articles to make this individualistic value-basis of freedom clear.

This circle of intelligence may be used as a key to comprehension. Imagine a circle composed of the intelligences that are now creating the new forms of art. Then imagine the centre of the circle occupied by a tiny black spot corresponding to similar spots which we find on the charts of Charles Booth’s “Survey of London.” This spot we will call Atrophy or the Tomb of the Past. Issuing from this tomb are a number of strange creatures posing as gods. They come forth to hear the news brought by a messenger of the discovery of the magic circle of creative values. The messenger bids them leave their sepulchre and set out in quest of this living source of vitality. The words are no sooner spoken than the question arises, “How does a crab break out of its old shell after the new one has hardened upon it?” The reply is, “It is the old shell first.” Finding no help in this advice, the poor shell-hardened creatures known as critics set out on their own account to try, each in his own way, to reach the world of existence. They are without a creative value of any sort, and armed with dead words of dead men for immense activity in the Resurrectionists. He was condemned by everyone. From a bundle of transcripts of their dead language he displays his following views of the dead upon the living. First come references to two creations, one called a “Constructive Cartoon,” and the other a “Constructive Panel.” The first, and most important, represents the constructive idea of freedom. The artist has felt the impulse of the dull black basis of life, and succeeds in giving the spectator the feeling of being raised out of himself—of the flowing up towards space, i.e., space as spirit. The colour and line are composed to create this feeling. He has taken violet as the basis of life, and revealed it dimly forcing itself through blacks and browns as representing a structure of death which the misrepresentation of life has erected. The violet breaking through the blacks and browns reasserts itself and carries the mind from the tyranny of the purely local into the freedom of the infinite. The conception of line is not conventional. The painter has kept his line distinct from the colour, and not combined with it, in order to give the whole tremendous power. Here are some of the transcripts of views thereon:

—The Observer: “The obfuscation of what he chooses to call a ‘Constructive Panel.’ Between these extremes are his exercises, more or less in the manner of Cézanne, Gauguin, Augustus John, Matisse, and the Futurists. The ‘Constructive Panel’ belongs clearly to the Donkey’s Tail School.” The school for Resurrectionists. The Morning Post: “But in the ‘Constructive Panel’ and the like Mr. Gibb achieves simple foolishness, which it would repay no one to try to plumb.” The Morning Post ought to know. The Daily Express: “The next great Neverwaz triumph is Mr. H. Phelan Gibb’s ‘Constructive Cartoon.’” From the abyssmal depths on the left side of his exercises, more or less in the manner of Cézanne, Gauguin, Augustus John, Matisse, and the Futurists. The ‘Constructive Panel’ belongs clearly to the Donkey’s Tail School.”

Here are some general views:

—Mr. P. C. Konody: “Mr. Epstein has done here in stone what Mr. Gibb, in the upper gallery, has attempted to do in paint. Both have debased a sacred theme, though the sculptor has done so with the power of genius, whilst the painter gives no evidence of anything but a desire to attain notoriety by arous-
The Machine.

A CRITICISM.

THE challenging tone of the attack on machine production in last week's article on "The Policy of The Free Woman" cannot be ignored by the sincere Socialist. To ignore it would be tacitly to admit the truth of the charges that Socialism is a slave philosophy, possible only among a servile people; that economically it stands for bureaucracy, and ethically for the negation of free-will. These are severe charges, but they have been ably made. They must be answered.

It is realised both by the Socialist and the writer of the article in question that the fundamental problem confronting society to-day, the problem that is at the basis of the great mass of other social questions that are clamouring for attention, is the problem of the machine. Put into a nutshell, the case against the existing machine system is that it forces the great mass of the people into such an economic position that they are compelled to perform uninteresting, soul-stunting tasks in order to obtain such material necessities as are required to keep constant their supply of physical energy.

We have the paradoxical situation of men working at the machine in order that they might obtain that strength that privileges them to continue working there, the tragedy of the whole system being that, although, in forcing men to move in this vicious circle, it sometimes succeeds in satisfying their bodies, it always succeeds in starving their souls. True self-expression has become the privilege of a comparative few. The average person who could express his individuality comes on every hand into direct conflict with a force—the most potent in the whole of our society—which in the abstract is represented by Mammon, but which in the concrete manifests itself through the machine system.

The individual who is searching for a way out finds himself immediately face to face with two alternative possibilities. Either this tendency to fetter the soul of man is an evil inherent in the machine itself, and inevitably bound up with it, the solution of the whole problem lying in a substitution of the system of handicraft proposed by THE FREEWOMAN for machine, or it is proved that there exists the possibility that the evil lies not in the machine itself, but in some peculiar misuse of it which behoves us to discover, and to use all our energies in correcting. It must be fully realised that the conditions our solution must fulfil are practicability and, as far as possible, freedom from the painless effects of the system we are out to remedy. But a careful analysis of the suggestion that we should aim at the abolition of the machine shows that it falls under neither of these categories. When we discuss the question of practicability it is perfectly futile for the writer on "The Policy of THE FREEWOMAN" to talk of society exercising its free-will. Present-day society has no free-will. Both capitalist and worker, once they are caught in the mad whirl of machinery, find their whole individualities merged into the rapidly evolving industrial system. They become creatures of the machine, slaves to its every whim, and victims of its every tendency. It cannot be seriously disputed that the present-day tendency, far from being one of industrial decentralisation that the reversion to a system of handicraft would bring, is constantly accelerated centralisation. The continued existence of this system demands the rapid invention of new and more perfect machinery, which daily, before our very eyes, we see usurping functions that hitherto were essentially those of the handicraftsman. And, whether it be for good or evil, one thing, at any rate, is certain, that this tendency carries along with it the great floating mass of humanity. For them escape is impossible. No greater fallacy can exist than that of the advanced reformer who pictures a people with free-will consciously groping toward some definite end. He carefully-thought-out schemes of social amelioration are abortive simply because they do not take into account the vital factor that those for whose benefit these schemes are conceived, the people, are simply incapable of the intellectual feat of rising above their environment, and of contemplating humanity from a more elevated standpoint. Put briefly, they see the machine is here; they see that before their very eyes it is being perfected, and they are unable to do other than to take its eternal existence for granted. Free-will is to them a mere sound.

Not only, however, is the solution to abolish the machine unpractical, but also, to a very large extent,
it fails in its object. It is agreed that the abolition of the machine system, even were it possible, would mean a re-establishment of the system of handicraft that obtained in this country during the middle ages. This is, of course, accepted with certain reservations, as we must not lose sight of the fact that our needs to-day are far greater than those of the handicraftsmen of old. We have grown accustomed to a comparatively high standard of comfort, and retrogression is impossible. But if we are going to supply our vast social needs without machinery, it is clear that a great deal of the people's time will be expended in the labour of producing useful things. This must mean, in a great many cases, so much time less for the doing of those things that the expression of individuality demands. It is true that some people find self-expression in the production of useful things. It is equally true that a vast number would find the work of production an irksome necessity. Upon such people any system which compels them to spend time that they might otherwise have devoted to the expression of their individualities, in the performing of tasks that they find distasteful, imposes a tyranny. And it is a question whether slavery to a master is worse than slavery to a system. The individual requires something more than a mere negative freedom. Time in which to use his freedom is absolutely essential.

We are now left with only the alternative suggestion, that perhaps the evils of the present system are due rather to a misuse of the machine than to any fault inherent in the machine itself; and we believe that it is by careful consideration of this possibility that we can arrive at the solution of the whole problem. Before going, however, any further, we must sweep away the fallacy that humanity will ever find true self-expression through any system that makes interesting the work of producing necessary things. This work of production should always be got over as quickly as possible. Humanity wants as much time as it can get for the making and the doing of beautiful things. Therein has it always found the true medium of the soul's expression. Once this line of argument is admitted, then it becomes clear that the problem of the machine is solved, by so perfecting it that we can make it do all necessary things, and when we ensure that it does these necessary things, and no more profitable things, by owning it ourselves. At this point we are naturally interrupted by the bête-noir of the individualist, by the dread cry of "State." But it would be as well if many of those who so glibly talk about the State, and who are so eloquent in painting its horrors, would at first carefully consider what the word means. We postulate here that to talk of "State Socialism" is to make use of a contradiction in terms. Socialism presupposes the abolition of classes. The State was born when classes came into being, and its function has been to maintain class privileges. With the abolition of classes the State dies out. We admit, however, the force of the argument that, even if the machine is perfected and held in common, one will still labour under the necessity of merging his individuality into that of society in the work of production. But it is contended that, considering the very short time that society will have to spend in the production of all it requires, the sinking of one's individuality for that time will be amply compensated for by the perfect freedom of expression the individual will enjoy once that labour is over.

Paradoxical though it must appear to the individualist, man will the better express his soul in proportion as he perfects his industrial organisation.

MAURICE NEWFIELD.
Correspondence.

NOTE TO CORRESPONDENTS.—While quite willing to publish letters, we make it a condition of publication that the name and address of each correspondent should be supplied to the editor.—Ed.

To the Editor of The Free Woman.

THE POLICY OF "THE FREEWOMAN."

MADAM.—Your policy is most constructive, because it is hopes and visions which do construct. There is no fight the-wisp, step-by-step programmes—the little crank cure—and revolution is the only constructive tool. The will-o'-eugenics or free banking, are all confusions that lead right as can be in seeing that to-day's disease is want of freedom. People want control over themselves—to be free from the authority of the State and the boss. You do not hear if you have weapons to fight the oppressors with. Boldly, to put a higher value on themselves, to see in immediate action, immediate aggression against the capitalist the army, the navy, and foreign affairs. In the latter, indeed, he is almost absolute to-day. But, as we have seen, the expert may not be the right man to choose his own ends.

The criterion is the public good. Who shall apply this criterion? The people themselves, certainly, in the last resort. But need it be, or can it be, the people directly? Shall the officials of each village and town and city be selected, and their instructions given them, by a gathering of all its electors? Sometimes it cannot be, because the local affairs are not so intricate as to be settled by a particular local body. If we are to have popular self-government, it must be like that of the ancient Free Cities.

So long as human nature remains what it is to-day, anarchy means, not the greatest freedom of each, but the same obligation.

ARTHUR D. LEWIS.

ANARCHY, DEMOCRACY, AND "THE FREEWOMAN."

MADAM.—With the aim of The Free Woman to make possible the largest freedom and the fullest individual development no one is in more entire sympathy than I. But I cannot believe that anarchy, hatchet throwing, land grabbing and potato digging form the path to these.

Anarchy (tempered by co-operation) is humanity's ideal for the far distant future, when, every man having learnt to respect the equal rights of every other man and woman, the last vestige of an expert shall reluctantly admit the same obligation.

The direct rule of the people is impossible in a modern state. All Englishmen and Englishwomen, or even the former alone, cannot bear a share in regulating all the affairs of the British Empire, and its relations to other countries. Every citizen of London cannot take part in the planning and controlling his city's sanitation or tramway system. The expert is necessary, the man who shall give either his whole time, or a larger part of his time than he would most can afford, to mastering the principles and details of some department of national life.

But the question is, what is the right rule of the expert? of the expert? is necessary. In so vast an affair as the organisation of a great nation two kinds of experts are needed. There is the expert in the every-day sense of the word, the technical man who knows all the details of his department, who can work efficiently for an end that is set him. He is usually a permanent official, and an actual or would-be bureaucrat. There are those who would put up merely under his control, particularly in the army, the navy, and foreign affairs. In the latter, indeed, he is almost absolute to-day. But, as we have seen, the expert may not be the right man to choose his own ends.

The criterion is the public good. Who shall apply this criterion? The people themselves, certainly, in the last resort. But need it be, or can it be, the people directly? Shall the officials of each village and town and city be selected, and their instructions given them, by a gathering of all its electors? Sometimes it cannot be, because the local affairs are not so intricate as to be settled by a particular local body. If we are to have popular self-government, it must be like that of the ancient Free Cities.

The permanent official is that man who is to control the nation; men who, while chosen by the people, and pledged to promote their interests and carry out their wishes, shall have more knowledge of public affairs than most electors have the time (or it may be the inclination or skill) to acquire. This is the second class of expert to which I referred, the statesman. He may not know so much of one particular department as the permanent official, but he has a wider view, he is more in touch with the people, and more open to public criticism and control. Among other things the making and revising of laws naturally falls within the province of a council of such men. Hence representative government and national parliaments.

All this political philosophising brings us to much the same position as the military and civilised nations of the first centuries of experiment. The instinctive genius of the Anglo-Saxon race foreshadowed it long ago. It would not require restatement were it not that so many Anarchists, Trotsky, and Syndicalists to-day incline to forget it. As to the hindrances and imperfections of representative government in England to-day, and how we may remedy them, or again as to the ideal society we may hope to build up by the co-operation of state and individual effort, I may perhaps unbend myself on some future occasion.

JAS. FOWLER SHONE.

"CRAWLING ON ALL FOURS" AND CRAFTS.

MADAM.—In your last number you reply with much accuracy to the unbroken challenge of The Free Woman's policy. You have well grasped "that the soul of man dwindled, shuddered to nothing for lack of freedom"; your only hope is to give it more, not less. Freedom is secured by giving a man the means to keep alive. Land will do that. So tie the land to his heel.

I agree with you entirely, and Mr. Wells might have been brought to do so if he, on his part, had read The Freewoman with less amusement and more attention. Some contributors to your columns (like myself, and perhaps, also, Madam, like you) are seeking to establish a new order, or a normal social life. If you will, by free production and exchange on the boundary between the two economic systems, redeem from the twin demons of rent and capital—that is, a monopoly land system and an exchange system tied with gold. But, Madam, let us not be too strict those who cherish the idea of "back to the land" should accuse us of being back to the crawling on all fours, rather than standing on our two strong legs and looking up towards the sky. Miss Rachel Graham raises a timely cry on
behalf of the machine, and fears that in a new order leading to the destruction of the machine as a whole may be more or less lost to humanity. To this you reply, "Machinery is an inhuman trick by which a few men who drove the freemen off the land... were enabled to play upon the labour of the rest." We must go back to the land.

This statement greatly astonished me. The machinery age has, in my view, a real step won by humanity, and all the progress that has been made is due to the use of iron by our ancestors of long ago. But just as our ancestors used iron tools for good or evil purposes, so do we use machinery, either for good or evil. The human trick is not in the machinery, but in the linking of the gold monopoly to the land monopoly, whereby machinery has been turned to base uses.

You must go, but it does not mean that we should stamp the earth with our feet, if we could get electric ploughs! Back to the land we must go, but this does not mean that the benefits of the machine age are lost to humanity. To this you reply, "The mechanist... is the first of all created for his own satisfaction before they are useful to ungentlemanly... Men who commit offences against the State recognisibly to ungentlemanly..." And, therefore, "forcible feeding" is ungentlemanly, and, therefore, the Government have the consent of the governed "in the manner of our Government. Voters are practically unchanged. Women with their votes would make no material difference to the manner of our Government. Voters are governors. The situation would therefore be practically unchanged. Women with their votes would no more morally coerce men with their numerical preponderance than men coerce women with theirs. The real governors will continue to coerce both, heretofore."
with universal service to paralyse industrial uprising at the onset, and the marriage bureau to thwart their natural impulses and stop the growth of the breed, and, if irremovable, the knife of the eugenist to prepare them for spiritless drudgery in the shafts of State industrialism, how much freedom will be left for individuals? Not only will they not enjoy freedom, but they will not be. Like being shut away from light in some dark and cavernous river will they be, these blind denizens of a sub-human world.

And there is another malign influence helping to ensnare us. I mean the baleful oracle that has its eye on you—yourself and Mr. Granville—the Thing of tinsel and stage-muror construction to frighten all the country, the Thing that rouses the man in the street with the tocsin and the drum, and persuades him to lie in the dirt and have his taints taken out; the Thing that initiates the ideally impressionable elector, and scares him into legislative fits with a red-hot poker, and will presently leave him to wake up and find his own sons and daughters in the grip of the sexual inquisition.

Oh, what a mild age is this, when the degenerate son of a freedom-loving father that would have shot his woman to save her from deformation and immorality is consigned to the sedate and unctious intimacies of the State official! TALLIS AVIS.

FIDELITY.

MADAM,—A rush of the sentiments prevented me from writing in reply to Mr. d'Auvergne's article on Penelope when it appeared. Perhaps it is not too late to do so now, even in the face of Mr. d'Auvergne's reply to his critics in your last week's issue. Your other correspondents took up some of the glaring contradictions in the article, so I will confine myself only to one or two which they did not touch upon. Mr. d'Auvergne's plea for the "natural" man raises a nightmare in the modern "unnatural" mind. We don't mind natural love-birds, but save us from man in a state of nature! We can't forget the story dear to Mr. d'Auvergne's heart—his bristly, lustful eyes gleaming out of a wild forest of hair which bushily encroaches on his cheeks and forms a solid mat upon his chest; his nails are longer than the claws of any bird, and his sense of pain is his expression of a club! The natural woman—with the exception of the nails—might pass muster nowadays (her sex-sense was never promiscuous, as far as I know), but the revival of the natural man is something to be devoutly prayed against. I can only say too much of him still—Heaven knows!—his yearning for new mates still renders him so grossly promiscuous in his instincts that he will take any woman unashamed, unhealthy night companion that he may find at a street corner—which applies not only to the class from which the woman problem is drawn, but to the cultured and fastidious class which would not dream of drinking out of other people's cups.

I am wholly and indisputably in sympathy with Dr. Whipple's main article on "Divorce" in your last number. It covers for me nearly all the ground that anyone needs to save her from defilement listens so amiably while his little more is required to bring ruin on themselves; and that little more is required to bring ruin on themselves; but they seem afflicted with that blindness to portent which always precedes ruin.

And do your readers remember the proposal to discriminate in disfavour of the idle rich, put forward in the plausible phrase of "unequal increment"? In their masses for it, and now they suffer from it one at the time, or in numbers too few, to be of further use to the professional Tory, and with their cries drowned in the din of other issues. Not the grossly rich, but the moderately poor—the widow, the orphan, the thrifty person with savings invested for old age, all to whom liberal terms apply of their own; and I doubt if any wretched public minister of education, or any party's private minister of education, would have his taints taken out; the Thing that takes hold of the self and Mr. Granville—the Thing of tinsel and stage-show, and do your readers (like the indignant Tories of that period) for—without trial, and possible mutilation of any subject or subject, continue that policy, and upwards, is not pleasing to the authorities. And I admit that in the circumstances anger—evil, violent anger—is justifiable, and that the power for evil is turned to account. Officialdom, ever-devouring officiadom, is the monster we have to deal with, humanity from such a monster.

And it is not only by conspiring with the rich that they inflict on us misery and injustice; there is the subtle plan of inciting them to take their eyes off themselves to their own hurt and mortification! Have your readers (like the inglorious Tories of that period) forgotten the Budget of recent infamy, and all the legislative efforts for the poor that sprang from its authors? There was the stimulated outcry on land monopoly, which all rational people know to be due to our unnatural laws of property and the rapacious parasites of which helps its distribution; and the result of that outcry is that there has been an expansion of the omniscient State, of course—more "heads of departments"—and an increase of patronage for county councillors (as gratifying to them, by the way, as it is to the territorial magnate, and perhaps more lowering to those who come under it), and an increase of establishment charges, and more officials for the productive workers to support; and, lastly, for those workers themselves, a system of tenure which, unless they wake to a knowledge of the shameless imposture which is being practised on them, must lead to the appropriation of every inch of land, and the letting of strips at impossible rents to be sweated on under conditions that will make them mere feudal slaves.

And thus it is always under our party system of government—when all that is needed is the simple cutting of a ligature for the setting free of nature's own healthful forces, instead they are repressed and the devotional duties of the State are glorified and fastidious class which would not dream of evoking the which he affords us of that happy time when to the appropriation of every inch of land, and the letting of strips at impossible rents to be sweated on under conditions that will make them mere feudal slaves.

Oh, what a mild age is this, when the degenerate son of a freedom-loving father that would have shot his woman to save her from defilement and immorality is consigned to the sedate and unctious intimacies of the State official! TALLIS AVIS.

The CASE OF PENELope.

MADAM,—I cannot agree at all with Mr. d'Auvergne's view of man. Man is not fundamentally a rational being, and does not aim at anything that he knows; he lives for the sake of life, and sometimes commits suicide in a manly article on "Divorce" in your last number. It covered for me nearly all the ground that anyone needs to save her from defilement listens so amiably while his
ritual remaining constant, and probably Christian and Buddhist ascetics give quite wrong motives and explanations for their asceticism. Scarcely anyone knows why he does what he is said to do or does.

Mothers are often hurt by daughters leaving them to get married, in spite of the commonness of the occurrence and its complete morality. This shows, to my mind, how difficult it is, and will probably always be, for a man to tell a woman he has ceased to love her.

If I am to aim at happiness, I think I had better avoid feeding pity for others, while pretending to feel it, so that others may be ready to pity me. Why should I diminish my individual happiness? I thought the whole argument was that I ought to make it my hope and conscious aim.

September 5th, 1912. 

ARTHUR D. LEWIS.

ASCETICISM.

MADAM,—It is remarkable in all discussions of sex morality the apostles of chastity and fidelity represent sexual intercourse as a thing undesirable in itself and in conflict with the higher nature of mankind. Sex, in fact, is exhibited as the foul side of life. It does not seem to occur to the chaste and faithful that the desirable life is balanced in which the animal desire reinforces and strengthens rather than conflicts with the mental and spiritual life. We are not simple creatures; our spiritual, mental, and physical natures act and react on each other. The large proportion of ascetics who become insane indicates that a serious danger is counted by those who in their hunt for the spiritual life attempt to atrophy their sexual nature.

The calm and mellowed love of wedded life spoken of by the co-respondents is often made of a stiffness and indifference, and I venture to suggest that it is the lack of passionate sex expression which makes so many men irritable and brutal, and so many women mean and slavish, and creates that atmosphere of unclean mystery which has such deplorable results on the minds and sex habits of "the well-bred youths and maidens who regard falling in love with kindly contempt."

Personally, I have no objection to chastity and fidelity, but I resent the attitude of moral superiority adopted by the co-respondents toward those more ardent and sometimes more generous natures whose impulses cannot be confined within the limits prescribed by good society.

INA GORDON-MENZIES.

THE BANN ON "THE FREEWOMAN."

MADAM,—Enclosed is a copy of the letter I have sent to W. H. Smith and Sons, from whom I have hitherto bought my papers. I should advise every reader of THE FREEWOMAN not only to withdraw their custom, but to write and let Smith and Sons know the reason.

I am sending you a subscription, because I find it a good way of advertising a paper to buy it through a newsagent, but I promise to buy a copy of THE FREEWOMAN as long as it is extant.

HELEN FOX.

MADAM,—May I point out that THE FREEWOMAN may yet be purchased by the public through any ordinary newspaper agent, who get their supplies each week from the wholesale newsagents, and any ordinary stationer and newsagent has only to add a copy to his "sheet" each week and a few a week for it. Of course every newsagent cannot take on sale a 3d. periodical, but it can readily be put on each week, if the customer ask for it.

In the foregoing I am assuming that a lot of your readers may not wish to pay a subscription direct, but obtain their copy each week for 3d.

W. HEWITT.

THE ETHICS OF FLOGGING.

MADAM,—The point of view of the Humanitarian is hard to understand. He seems to be unable to distinguish between a man and a brute. To read daily of the cruelty inflicted on children and animals is enough to show how inadequate our present law is, and Truth has made this clear to the public as no other paper has done.

A man kicks his child and makes it a cripple for life. Perhaps a month's imprisonment follows—very degrading for the man, and not calculated to elevate his character—and this clear to the public as no other paper has done.

Perhaps a month's imprisonment follows—very degrading for the man, and not calculated to elevate his character—and this clear to the public as no other paper has done.

For the man, and not calculated to elevate his character—and this clear to the public as no other paper has done.
There are, alas! too often a number of hidden jobbings and dealings underlying social rivalry which cause at least resistance, which is universally purifying nature in all commerce is the currency of valuables from hand to hand by exchange or barter. It is inevitable and very useful in various ways that one commodity is more saleable and more frequently sold than any other. When its pre-eminence has become universally recognised a set of new and special terms are invented to mark off operations into which this commodity enters, as indeed it does almost exclusively into all bargains; for the last resort has been reached. Buying, selling, paying, price, and a host of other terms mean different aspects of various transactions with the chosen commodity, as it may now be called. It is the very height of absurdity to assert that currency should not be a commodity. Currency must inevitably be a commodity, and there is only one commodity in every market suitable for this function, which is, however, not profoundly different from that of other commodities, in being bought, sold, and promised for future delivery. Its value also is no more enhanced by its recognised election to the acme of saleability than the value of any other goods is enhanced by being hoarded, bought, and sold. The extract from Mr. Kitson in this issue of THE FREEROWMAN is a perfect saleability between gold and silver is actually very small, and it is impossible to destroy money without destroying the money value for sweeping the chimney. If these correspond to the holder without any reservation or qualification. A debt in cotton, or stocks and shares, can only be satisfied, but the merchant may be as yet far from satisfied. He now holds gold, and as no one can be compelled to sell his goods to him, or, if selling at barter at any specified proportions, he must go to the unsettled market, and make the best of the position of relative values prevailing when the money market is not making use of the gold. If they, or somebody else, had ten times as much money, it is not the mineral itself which is wanted, but the fact that the quantity of gold does not correspond in value to that of other wealth which is not in demand. There is not the least necessity for such a correspondence. Its realisation is inconceivable, and its absence is no disadvantage. An avalanche in gold might reduce the total value of gold held by all the bullion dealers and banks falling short of a complete equality with that of other commodities. The fact is that a man who suffers no loss of value through being priced in and even sold for money as an intermediate process in an exchange between baker and butcher. It would be as safe to say that the baker must sell his bread, and that the butchers get more bread for their beef, as to say that they all get less. An allegation that both the butchers and the baker may be the same man, and that the propensity to sell their cattle is not the least necessity for such a correspondence. Its realisation is inconceivable, and its absence is no disadvantage. An avalanche in gold might reduce the total value of gold held by all the bullion dealers and banks falling short of a complete equality with that of other commodities. The fact is that a man who suffers no loss of value through being priced in and even sold for money as an intermediate process in an exchange between baker and butcher. It would be as safe to say that the baker must sell his bread, and that the butchers get more bread for their beef, as to say that they all get less. An allegation that both the butchers and the baker may be the same man, and that the propensity to sell their cattle is
the heat which it is capable of yielding at the moment of its consumption. In the world's business no doubt credit intervenes very beneficially, and results in more trade being done on a non-gold commodity basis, although all the instruments are in terms of gold. But there is an immense confusion in speaking of a great mass of credit "in use," and then alluding to it as an "enormous volume of stationary credit," which the footnote still further confuses by not making it clear whether it means promissory notes, acceptance notes, etc., or are notclassed as being money or circulating credits.

Credit, as Mill recognizes, is not productive power. It may be regarded as its antithesis. It is obviously based upon a reputed productive power, and it pledges a quantity of production in advance. It is true that the state of credit greatly affects prices, although credit and price are estimates of uncertainties. All commerce, however, depends upon such guesses at the relations between the cost of different commodities, and the variation in the human appetites for them, which go to make up anticipated supply and demand in the early future.

But a free market with free, honest money is self-purifying, and though it does at times go mad with fear, as a reaction from a previous madness of hope, it cannot be improved by new inventions in monetary frauds. Possibly the editor of The Free Woman, Mr. Kitson do not propose any new species of fiat money or legal tender. Will they show the readers of the paper what sort of instrument they do propose for circulation? It is quite likely that the Bank Charter Act could easily and profitably be evaded by a bank which would issue a definitively redeemable note to the holder of 224 grains troy of gold eleven-twelfths fine, or multiples of this quantity; these promises could be redeemed by the tender of gold coin of the realm, which consists of medals of gold of the weight and fineness stipulated.

How would the editor and Mr. Kitson regard such notes, or what would they be prepared to promise in their own?

GREETZ FISHER.

AUGUST 23RD, 1912.

[The word "must" should have read "should." Had we lived in a community with a religion, "must" would have been in the plural; "must," and requires individual enforcement. The "division of labour" question is referred to elsewhere.—ED.]

Mr. Kitson's Currency Theories.

MADAM,—It is difficult to attempt to reason with those who confine themselves to unproved and unprovable assertions, especially where, in place of argument, these assertions—already demonstrated to be fallacious—are merely reiterated. Both of your correspondents—Messrs. C. F. Hunt and Greevz Fishez—are guilty of this. Taking Mr. Hunt's assertions seriatim:

(1) It will be time enough for Mr. Hunt to pass judgment on "Mr. Kitson's absurdities," when he has read Mr. Mylius will suffice as the theme for a letter. It is this: I deny emphatically that the present congested system of exchange, the credit system, is the contrary, the industrial evil is due to State interference with the free development of that essential mechanism of exchange, the credit system. Let us look back to the period of the industrial revolution in the latter half of the eighteenth century. Presumably it will not be denied that under the previous handiwork system of production, in consequence, the individual in respect of his selection of his area of employment, or his purchase of commodities, produced none of the evils now manifested in our industrial system; these evils only appeared with the introduction of expensive steam-driven machinery. Now, the Marxian declares simply that, at the period of the industrial revolution, monopoly of machinery enabled factory owners to under sell the hand-workers and drive them to work as wage-earners at low wages. I have spent a considerable portion of my leisure in asking Marxians to explain how such a monopoly of machinery was rendered possible. I have never yet received a satisfactory reply, because the aver-

As to "flat money," where can Mr. Fysher find a nation where "flat money does not work?" There are dozens of ways in which currency notes could be issued. Supposing Harrods or Selfridge's were to issue notes promising to pay to bearer any goods contained in their stores to the order of, or on, any convenient denomination. Would not these function as good currency among their customers?

September 3rd, 1912.

ARTHUR KITSON.

Dollars and Currency.

MADAM.—Mr. Kitson's absurdities are accumulating: "Coin is not money, but it is "cash," he tells us. "Gold and silver coins of full value are not, scientifically speaking, money; they are not representatives of debts of the worth of gold and silver they contain cancels the debt which, as money, they represent." (2) The "greenbackers" in the U.S. are not yet done telling that the dollar is something out of a state from what the U.S. Government said it was at the outset. In a breath, Mr. Kitson tells us coins cannot be money, and cannot represent debt; also that as money they cancel the debt they represent. Financial trouble, he says, "is the result of attempting to redeem credits in one particular commodity, instead of in all."

(3) A creditor who has been promised dollars, should be compelled to accept corn, hogs, or parsimony, whether he needs them or not. He should be allowed to refuse the capital if the market is as low as 2 or 3 per cent below the price he fixed on it. He might refuse the dollar if the market is four times as high as the price he fixed on it. (4) To avoid panics, a man must be allowed by law to pay his debts in steam rollers, if he has them, and nothing else.

(5) The only U.S. dollar ever made or used is the coin dollar.

(6) The currency reformer should invent a new unit, with a new name, and cease pretending and teaching that the dollar is something it never was.

C. F. HUNT.

[See Mr. Kitson's reply.—Ed.]

"In Vindication of Competition."

MADAM.—A single point among the many raised by Mr. Mylius will suffice as the theme for a letter. It is this: I deny emphatically that the present congested system of swollen trusts and underpaid wage-earners results from unrestricted freedom of contract or free competition; on the contrary, the industrial evil is due to State interference with the free development of that essential mechanism of exchange, the credit system.

Letters, etc., intended for the Editor should be addressed: Mr. J. F. Fysher, 16, King Street, Covent Garden, London, W.C. Telegrams to "Lumenifer, London."
age Marxian is entirely ignorant of the grave restrictions which the State had placed in the way of the possession of machinery and the exchange of commodities—he is entirely ignorant of the part which the State has played by credit. Hence he does not see that when the State prevented the free development of the credit system, it prevented banks from using the wealth of the community to assist those handicraftsmen of ability who might have set up factories in competition with existing owners. Hence he does not see that when the State prevented the commodities, and, by exercising a demand upon the fresh factory would have tended to reduce the price of commodities, and, by exercising a demand upon the labour market, would have increased wages.

The system of exchange, and more particularly the credit system, is the only means by which the mutual confidence among the members of that society. Under freedom, the voluntary loan is the instrument by means of which ability is put in possession of capital where sickness is not actually declared.

To the Rt. Hon. Lloyd George,

September 12, 1912

SIR,—I beg to submit for your earnest con­

Insurance Bill.

Henry Mzzen,

Banking and Currency Reform League,

At the meetings last summer of the "National Associa­

John Burns, President of the Local Government Board,

The Free Woman
they are needful for a time, we should do all in our power to make them unnecessary, rather than multiply them at the expense of that which would do away, in great part, at least with their necessity.

I say "in great part," because there always will be accidents—especially with the present aeroplanes and motors—and some amount of illness too, though disease will be much less than by these true santars—the work at last being rightly used to describe institutions such as will tackle the possibility of illness before illness reaches the outside of the system in symptoms.

Such places will benefit both body and soul, one as a consequence of the other.

They should be erected where possible in the country, and also in the more open parts of towns, but with due consideration to the fact that they have to be near the places where the people work.

There should, by and by, be no other houses built but on the model of such health-giving centres—no others permitted. And then, and then only, will consumption and the majority of diseases be eradicated!

The upper class, which also is not exempt from illness, far from it, will benefit by this too, because of the source from which most of the diseases come, filtering slowly, insidiously, unobserved, unresisted.

It comes from the slums, as well as from all other "disease centres." Revengeful, unrelenting, deadly! The divers unharmful ways of dwelling of all classes make them a likely prey to diseases which, in the shape of microbes, come floating across the land from the unhealthy parts of the country and hospitals.

Will you not, sir, exert your influence to attend to it, on the lines of the prevention which is better than cure?

Some school children have now (some only) an opportunity to breathe the air, but they have it for a short part of the summer only (and not for the whole year, as they should), and then they have to return to unhealthy homes where they are told, they usually soon lose what they had gained.

In such homes parents have to live—and die! This should be their case, for the sake of both parents and children, children and parents, who are one, and live as one, we appeal for all for a better state of things, such as is suggested above.

Were the cost ten times as great its increased cash value of a healthy population would be cheap at the price. It would be cheaper even if it cost more than disease centres; but, on the contrary, as said above, the economy of it will be beyond all calculation.

This is so simple, and a matter of common sense! Shall we be like Naaman, who refused to bathe in the Jordan because it was all too simple, viz., water only . . . and not blood?

My meaning by this last expression is that hospitals are places of disease, groans, suffering, death, as well as of cost and complications—places where man and beast are extirpated and tortured.

Even if this were necessary for a time in the present conditions (and it is not), shall not everyone try to eliminate as speedily as possible conditions which bring about such a state of affairs in their train?

Health is the simplest of all things—it is simple because it is beautiful, and beautiful because it is simple. It will never be attained by introducing poisons into the system, in the shape of drugs, injections, lymphs, sera, etc., or in mutilating unnatural operations the body made by God in His own image. Even though all this may supply a living for doctors, as war provides a living for soldiers, and strong drink one for publicans, etc., etc., we do not believe that the health of nations, and of the world at large, should be sacrificed to such considerations.

There are plenty of good works which must wait to be done because those which should never be touched are allowed.

Again, let doctors be doctors of hygiene, paid, as in China, for preventing disease; all will be well then, and some happiness for all parties at last will be provided, calling down on us the blessings of our God, who wishes us to "help ourselves" as a work by doing our duty to all, with His help.

LUCY THOMASOM, née Rossier de Visme (Madame).

First "Prevention Better than Cure" Centre, Chigwell, Essex, Summer, 1912.

THE ACTION OF MRS. LEIGH.

MADAM,—May I be permitted to continue my protest against the theory that Mrs. Mary Leigh's recent action is, socially considered, wholly moral? I value your testimony that you have "a better thing on" which sets the barrier against similar action in your own case. I, too, have a better thing on. From the day when on entering Holloway Prison for the first time, October, 1906, I left as my prison message—"It is not only the Vote we are fighting for, but everything that is involved in the giving of the Vote to women." I have never swerved a hair's-breadth in belief of and in love for the women's cause, of which I regard women's suffrage and militancy as present important manifestations. And this good thing I have on is no less a desire but that men and women shall understand themselves and other to the extent of full, courageous, reciprocal trust. My theory of individualism is so catholic in its sphere of operation that it embraces the wonderful possibility of reaching the mind of a Mr. Asquith, however weakened in response as such a mind must inevitably be, by too long and acute attacks of prejudices. This theory of individualism recognises that Mrs. Asquith has a soul to be preserved in freedom as well as I myself or the "lowest" criminal or prostitute. Therefore I cannot encourage Mrs. Mary Leigh or anyone else to attempt to terminate the individual free will of Mr. Asquith and others, without, so to speak, their written consent. Free individual I would readily avow myself: individualist in the new reading perhaps I may not be. You see, if you accept your judgment that Mrs. Mary Leigh is absolutely moral in following the dictates of her individual will wherever they may lead, I am bound to admit that there is some justification for many a prevailing theory. There is, for example, the notion of that funny animal, self-labelled Virile Man, who thinks that, by virtue of his virility, he has the right because it is his will to terminate the free will of other people, whether men or women. Your exposition of a morality of individual will is really quite clear; and I understand you, as well and clearly as I understand Mr. C. H. Norman. Now why not try to understand me? Upon what grounds do you infer that I do not wish, as I do with all my heart, the immediate release of Mrs. Mary Leigh? and that therefore I am not a thorough individualist? How can I, according to your own philosophic confessions, speak truthfully for anyone else but myself? I have not actually declared that "I personally would welcome their immediate release? I notice that the copy
of the petition sent to you by Mrs. Sheehy Skeffington does not ask for release at all. In fact, the only people who are asking for release are the members of the W.S.P.U. themselves. This is unquestionably the right thing for the W.S.P.U. to do. No; I do not ask for Mrs. Leigh's transference to the first division in order that her criminal status shall be raised; and I look in vain for any statements in former letters which would necessarily convey this. What I see most clearly, as also do you, is that Mrs. Leigh's methods will not help forward the cause of Votes for Women This Year, however much they may afford to Mrs. Leigh the peculiar joy (whether painful or not is another matter) of having realised her own feelings and views. The question for the W.S.P.U. is—are mystics or practical politicians in training? We have Mrs. Pankhurst's view on record in the second or third issue of the Standard's Woman's Platform. She favoured the practical politician theory. When Charlotte Corday stabbed Marat in his bath she definitely meant to kill him and went to her sure and certain death. Mrs. Skaffington's memorial says that no harm was intended by our comrade Mrs. Mary Leigh and her comrades. I hope I shall be pardoned for reiterating my opposition to Mrs. Mary Leigh's action as socially immoral; but my respect and liking for Mrs. Leigh as an individual are so definite that I wish the governing authorities would recognise her and others' invincible personal courage by discontinuing the ugly practice of feeding heroic prisoners by force. It is difficult to avoid striking the note of self-righteousness or of a Pharisaical self-complacency. I am doing my genuine best to avoid these pits of personal pride. But how short a time ago since you yourself were virtually asking the Government to treat W.S.P.U. rebels as ordinary criminals. It is true your reason for not wanting first-class treatment was the tactical one that injustice to rebels only made the fires of rebellion burn brighter; and you believed that "utter sincerity" would always convince your opponents. By what has been mysteriously inarticulate in the anti-suffrage spirit, to hand in its newest form, in black and white, in large type understood by the commonest man's brain though penned by the hand of man—is it not, all of it, the very thing we wanted? Surely we shall not, like many too-pulpit-minded intellectuallists, be tempted to be hypnotised by phrases like "decent prostitution," though the lettering be twice ten yards high; by words like the good old bogey "hysteria," which was the death of that poor soul Otto Weininger; by the uterine misunderstandings of a New Age contributor; by the various forms of accusation of nervous derangement made by the intellectual adversary, however medical his disguise; by the dreadful engines of law and order and which Mr. C. H. Norman does not, yet before our faces, undertake to meet the intellectual gymnasts on their own ground; and if we are so minded we will smile them hip and thigh. We will choose our own time too! So please do not let us distrust even the subtlety of the New Age, as by many a quasi-judgment I see you do. A subtle truth is a finer truth. The answer to the question: when is subtlety synonymous with deceit? is when subtlety is synonymous with deceit. Let the opponent smother us in respect if he wills it. (I should translate your "excessive respect" to "dispersion," but it is a minor point.) Let us treat our opponents, whoever they are, only be themselves, and no quarter will be asked. The sincerity of the opposition, whether for or against, shall be its greatest virtue. We have no fear of it, for we have no fear of the Truth. Utter absence of fear is its own guarden. We can afford to cherish as our talisman, faith even in man.

When he talks of "hysteria," for instance, directly or obliquely, I beheld me of many of life's little problems which have, within my own mental observation, come my way. I have seen a man who would make two of me in the grip of a Big Fear because his doctor had murmured in his ear the dread word Neurasthenia; and while my heart offered an understanding sympathy, my brain recorded the verdict: Death by Disguise: Death by Disguise. I have seen a man of brilliant intellectual powers with tears of jealousy in his eyes because his superior in office demonstrated a personal happiness which his clever brain could not fathom. (This man's character was about two years old; his brain was quite mature but sadly overworked.) I have seen a man who, in the moment of moral nausea succeeding a painful discovery, begat itself in the final stages of pregnancy, to plead for him with the man whom he had wronged. And she went. (I approve her action; I should have done the same myself.) I have seen certain ugly exponents of muscle-morality, who for long have accompanied Cabinet Ministers in
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their walks abroad, attempt to demonstrate the theory that every bruise on a woman's body represents a blow to the woman's cause. I have seen a man of extraordinary size and physique charging women less than five feet high. In the exuberance of a belief that in the last resort physical force wins the day, I am not going on. I could do. All these things have I seen, and in never a case did the intellectual truth escape such happenings would, in the case of woman, have indicated hysteria. What do they indicate in man? I have asked myself; and something within has definitely and persistently replied—why, if there is anything in the word, order! I prefer the blessed word Mesopotamia; but "hysteria" is, I doubt not, a better word for all forked-radishes and test-tubes masquerading as Man. Believe me it is a misunderstanding—this notion that papers like the New Age are papers for men only. Our Old Adams like that. I remember that one of these writers, only the other day, warned women off from his "Tale for Men Only"; and mightily diverted one woman reader was by the suggestion. What amusing impudence! Apart from the democratic fact that the acceptance of my weekly threepence entitles me to read at least my own copy, just sufficient brains are mine to guarantee real enjoyment in the reading of studies in practical psychology whenever I can get them. The audacious author under examination actually imported into the same chapter in which heaped most desecrately eschewed women readers, a reference to Pythagoras of all people—Pythagoras who understood woman sufficiently to admit her into his ancient sodality. I do not hesitate to allow that Pythagoras instituted a distinct order for women: even the intuitions of a Pythagoras were limited by the intellectual ambit of his time. The world has lived and accumulated unto itself rich experience since then. Two thousand years of Christianity are not to be dismissed with a wave of the pen. The love-sacrifice of Christ has (pace Miss Rebecca West) been accepted. The gifts of the New Adam to us who are wo-Man as well as to men who are MAN, were the aristocratic injunction: Be ye Perfect; and that mighty promise to democracy; I tell you, ye are gods. The New Age asks for a better woman than Eve; and because the New Eve chooses her garment to suit the needs of her times, the New Age does not know her. But what voice more certain than the New Age's that Psyche shall ever transcend Cupid in human worth; and what inconsistency more marked than the New Age's when it willfully proposes to shut down the very foundations which would give Psyche her chance of growth—growth it will be remembered, ever denied to our Cupids? Nor let us worry about Delilah! She is quite out of date. Delilah has slain her thou-sand. But the New Eve shall save her ten thousands. I grant you Delilah wins home every time when Man falls back on man; and right well does he deserve the hair-cutting process!

Mr. John Masefield voiced the feeling of the New Eve when referring, as he once did, to the celebrated passage of John Bull, which is so truly eloquent such national tradition is! This New Eve objects to the elevation of the sub-human elements in man over the human: whether they be turaine, equine, porcine or canine. Her totem is MAN.

You speak my mind's truth when you assert that the woman's cause is man's; but I think you make grave error in not recognising the pull of that particular diversity in unity which accounts for many a man's fundamental antagonism to the practice of full and equal freedom between women and men. There is a distinct feminist issue which had better be met and faced now, this generation, than be allowed to provide fresh misunderstanding, leading to Man's further betrayal of Man. Certain conscious or unconscious turns of phrase in the criticisms already referred to, are brutally but triumphantly importing the idea of a situation in which women, in all walks of life, are facing every day. I should like to suggest, as one of your most interested readers, that this has come (for a time forgetting the original sub-title of THE FREEWOMAN, in addition to, or in place of, the present one. There does not seem to me so pressing a need for the demonstration that the humanist is also feminist, as that the feminist should vindicate her claim to be humanist. W. H. Smith and Sons are not to be congratulated on their decision to exclude THE FREEWOMAN from their bookstalls. They have, it would seem, been dosed with Earl Percy's decoction of fears. Their judgment is both premature and immature; for, in respecting your absolute improvement of a world which allow of men and women realising their individual wills at the possible and probable expense of other people's lives, I know nothing in your general position (sex-reform and all) which is not in close accordance with the spirit of Christian ethics, to which it bears more than a close resemblance. But welcome all challenges to the workings of the courageous spirit! Knowing that the woman movement is a very real thing, I myself should welcome additional emphasis on the whole-world feminist position. Feminism has come to stay until this civilisation breaks through those weakening prejudices of sex-fear which everywhere hinder the free and natural movement towards True Man.

Why—if Mr. Asquith could see, as I have seen, the possibilities of national greatness in the practical establishment of an equality of rights and opportunities and duties between women and men, he would lay aside his rote of prejudice; and his opposition to woman's suffrage would cease to-morrow! If your contributor Mr. C. H. Norman could know, as I know, the sweetness and sanity of woman's aspirations for full and equal freedom with men before the law, he would cease from appealing to the coward-fear which lies latent in woman as well as in man; and himself fight for woman's freedom. If the New Age could realise, as I have realised, the limiting effect on Man's intellectual powers by the inhibition of Wo-Man's full natural powers, it would amend its present position in the very next moment. It is something in the world that you will, perchance, publish such letters as this of mine; but it is infinitely more significant that the New Age won't. That is a very nothing that.
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THE MOUNTJOY PRISONERS.

MADAM,—I enclose herewith a draft of a new petition on behalf of Mary Leigh and Miss Gladys Evans, now being forcibly fed in H.M. prison Mountjoy, which will, I hope, be signed by hundreds of your readers in the course of the next few days. I should be glad if you would reply personally to the writers of a very large number of letters which have reached me since the publication of my recent letter in the press; but it is an impossible task. All correspondents, many of whom enclosed stamped addressed envelopes, shall have petitions forwarded very shortly; and future correspondents will greatly oblige by enclosing stamped and addressed large envelope. If you, Madam, would kindly consent to receive applications for petitions on the same terms (stamped addressed envelopes)
at your office, and receive signed petitions, the present wholly voluntary effort would be greatly assisted.

MARY CANTHORPE.

TO HIS EXCELLENCE THE LORD LIEUTENANT GENERAL AND GENERAL GOVERNOR OF IRELAND AND HIS CHIEF SECRETARY, THE RIGHT HONOURABLE AUGUSTINE BIRKELL, M.P.

The Humble Petition of the Undersigned, on behalf of Miss Gladys Evans and Mrs. Mary Leigh, sheweth —

That Miss Gladys Evans and Mary Leigh were convicted at the Commission of Oyer and Terminer held at Green Street in the City of Dublin on the 6th and 7th August, 1912, of attempting by setting fire to the Theatre Royal, and causing explosions therein, and were sentenced by Mr. Justice Madden, the preceding judge, to five years' penal servitude.

We your petitioners do with the most submission and respect hereunto subscrib —

1. That the purity and honesty of the motives of the said Gladys Evans and Mary Leigh have been questioned by no one, and were recognised by both judge and counsel for the Crown at the said trial.

2. That the sentences are far in excess of those which have been imposed in Great Britain for former political, social, labour, or sectarian outrages, and far in excess of imposed punishments inflicted in the United Kingdom for serious crimes committed for purposes of gain.

The said acts were done for no purpose of gain or selfish desire, but simply and solely in furtherance of a political cause, namely, the enforcement of women. 4. That subsequent to the committal of the said Gladys Evans and Mary Leigh to H.M. Prison Mountjoy feeding by force has been resorted to by the authorities because the aforesaid prisoners will not submit to treatment as ordinary criminals, and have demanded the treatment due to those who commit illegalities in the course of a political agitation.

5. That the practice of forcible feeding has been in continuance for many days, and is now continuing in H.M. Prison Mountjoy.

We your petitioners, while declaring our opposition to the policy of personal physical violence on undefended people, plead on highest human grounds —

1. That the undoubted courage of the protesters requires that they should be treated with kindness rather than the retaliation of forcible feeding.

2. That forcible feeding is not a solution, but only an aggravation to women who feel themselves to be defending a position of high principle.

3. That the forcible feeding of rebellious prisoners of this character does not unpublish the high dignity of the high office of judgeship, inasmuch as resisting prisoners cannot be fed by force without danger to life and health, and prisoners so fed have had to be released in a very large number of cases before the termination of their sentences.

We would therefore beg —

1. That the forcible feeding of the aforesaid Gladys Evans and Mary Leigh shall cease.

2. That they be treated as political offenders and be accorded the same privileges which have been recently given to Irish prisoners in H.M. Prison Mountjoy.

3. That the sentences of the said Gladys Evans and Mary Leigh be greatly reduced.

And your petitioners will ever pray.

NOTE TO CORRESPONDENTS.—While in our opinion the correspondence is the most fruitful part of the paper, and in so way will, or sectarian outrages, and far in excess of imposed punishments inflicted in the United Kingdom for serious crimes committed for purposes of gain. We ask them to be as concise as possible. In will be given to those correspondents who sav much in
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FOODS.

Fox Terriers, smooth or wire-haired. Excellent for lonely house or as companions.—The Thatches, Pangbourne.

Houses, BOARDING HOUSES.

NORTH DEVON.—Seaside Cottage to be let, 4 rooms. L. W., Box 1543, c/o THE FREEWOMAN, 16, King Street, Covent Garden, W.C.

WEST CENTRAL.—Boarding House (Ladies only) has two vacancies—intellectual circle—moderate charges. Write—Box 1563, THE FREEWOMAN, 16, King Street, Covent Garden, W.C.

Two (or Three) Good Furnished Rooms, use kitchen, etc., suitable for studious gentlewomen; Chelsea.

—Box 1543, THE FREEWOMAN, 16, King Street, Covent Garden, W.C.

TWO HOUSES, BOARDING HOUSES.

North Devon.—Seaside Cottage to be let, 4 rooms. L. W., Box 1243, c/o THE FREEWOMAN, 16, King Street, Covent Garden, W.C.

West Central.—Boarding House (Ladies only) has two vacancies—intellectual circle—moderate charges. Write—Box 1563, THE FREEWOMAN, 16, King Street, Covent Garden, W.C.

Two (or Three) Good Furnished Rooms, use kitchen, etc., suitable for studious gentlewomen; Chelsea.

—Box 1543, THE FREEWOMAN, 16, King Street, Covent Garden, W.C.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Turkish Cigarettes. Hand made. Fine quality pure Turkish Tobacco. Medium size, round, 3d per 100. Bargain.

Donations can be given, advertisements will appear in any particular issue if at all possible. Any held over will appear in the following issue. All communications to be addressed to THE ADVERTISING MANAGER, THE FREEWOMAN, 16, King Street, Covent Garden, London, W.C. Telephone: Gerrard 6449.

DOGS.

Poultry Farm. Vacancy for pupil; small premium.—Write Yonkers, c/o THE FREEWOMAN, 16, King Street, Covent Garden, W.C.

Ladies’ Gowns and Costumes bought and sold. Most reliable and satisfactory.—Madame P., c/o THE FREEWOMAN, 16, King Street, Covent Garden, W.C.

Portraits reproduced from old photographs. New process.—Box 1533, c/o THE FREEWOMAN, 16, King Street, Covent Garden, W.C.

A BOOK FOR MARRIED WOMEN.

By DR. ALLISON.

The information contained in this book ought to be known by every married woman, and it will not harm the unmarried to read. The book is conveniently divided into twelve chapters. The first chapter treats of the changes of puberty, or when a girl becomes a woman. The second chapter treats of marriages from a doctor’s standpoint: points put the best ages for marriage, and who should have children and who not, and furnishes useful information that one can ordinarily get only from an intelligent doctor. The third chapter treats of the marriage of blood relations; and condemns such marriages as a rule. Chapter four treats of the signs of pregnancy. The fifth chapter tells how a woman should live during the pregnant state. The sixth chapter tells of mishaps and how to avoid them. The seventh chapter tells of material impressions, and shows that birth marks are not due to longings on the part of the mother, but rather to her poor health. The eighth chapter teaches how to have easy confinements. Certain people believe that women should bring forth in pain and trouble, but the hygienic physician says that confinements can be made comparatively easy if certain rules are observed; that the mother is given. The ninth chapter treats of the proper management of confinements until the baby is born. The tenth chapter tells how to treat the mother until she is up and about again. The eleventh chapter treats of sterility; gives the main causes of it, how to treat it, and how to prevent it. The twelfth chapter tells how to avoid the “change,” a most important article for all women over forty. The book is full of facts and good advice, and cannot be written or printed. It thoroughly into matters relating to married women. Some may think too much is said; others are the reverse. The book can be had to an estate from Dr. T. Y. Allison, 481, Rooms, 4, Scotch Place, Manchester Square, London, W., in return for a Postal Order for 1s. 2d.

"OUGHT Women to be Punished for Having Too Many Children." Post free 4d. MARIE PISHER, 78, Chapel Allerton Terrace, Leeds.
STEPHEN SWIFT'S Latest Announcements

Social and Political Series. 3s. 6d. each.
FROM THEATRE TO MUSIC HALL.
By W. R. TITERTON.

"How admirably he describes and analyses the work of many of the artistic celebrities of the day. The book is certainly quite a brilliant picture of its side of London life, and to say that it does not contain a bad sentence is an extraordinary vivacity."—Observer.

A most vividly written second edition of the book which seems sure to be called "Fall Mall Gazette."—The Athenaeum.

THE DOCTOR AND HIS WORK.
By CHARLES J. WHITBY, M.D.
SECRET DIPLOMACY.
By GEO. ELLER.

TRIPOLI AND YOUNG ITALY.
By CHARLES LAPWORTH in Collaboration with HELEN ZIMMERN. Fully Illustrated. 10s. 6d. net.
The Italian Prime Minister has written officially to the author, expressing his congratulations and thanks for a book which he describes as "a most fitting homage to the truth."—a book which will make all fair-minded people realise the sincerity and righteousness of the new manifestoes of vitality on the part of the Italian Nation.

SOME OLD ENGLISH WORTHIES.
By DOROTHY SENIOR, 10s. 6d. net.
She has written the history of these "old worthies" as Thomas of Reading, George-a-Green, Roger Bacon, and Friar Rus, retaining just as much of their vulgarity and their facility in reading. The result is particularly happy."— Vanity Fair.

VINTAGE; A NEW SYSTEM.
By HENRI BERGSON. Authorised Translation by T. E. HULME. 2s. 6d. net.

"A charming book, well designed and well printed."—The Athenaeum.

THE VOYAGES OF VATHEK.
By CHARLES LEPSTOR, translated by the late Sir FRANK T. MARELLA. With an Introduction by Lewis MAXWELL, and containing the original French, and translation of the author. 21s. net.

VATHEK. Small crown 8vo, cloth extra, is. net.

"A book which seems sure to be called "Fall Mall Gazette."—The Pall Mall Gazette.

By J. M. KENNEDY. Denay 8vo, cloth, 7s. 6d. net.

"A good account of the movement in English literature between 1880 and 1905. A Neglected Factor in Economics.
By RICHARD CURLE. 6s.

"In some respects Mr. Curle's work recalls that of Mr. Joseph Conrad."—Manchester Guardian.

THE CONFESSION OF A FOOL
Written with authority by men who know life, and who recognize the world mind of their given hour. The quintessential spirit of the book with rare felicity and sensitiveness of expression."—The Athenaeum.

A NIGHT IN THE LUXEMBOURG
By RENÉ DE GOURMONT. Translated, with a Preface and Appendix, by ARTHUR RASHDALL. 5s.

"An undying example of fancy placed together with the fertile skill of a consummate artist. ... Mr. Rasmone's translation is one of the best books he has done. He has captured the quintessential spirit of the book with rare felicity and sensiveness of expression."—Manchester Guardian.

"It is a valuable book, full of gaiety and thought, and as dangerous and unpredictable as the kind of book one has been too long subdued in traditional beliefs as a mountain breeze is dangerous and unpleasant to one who has set out too long in a hot room."—Observer.

"By RICHARD CURLE. 6s.


"In some respects Mr. Curle's work recalls that of Mr. Joseph Conrad."—Eye-Witness.

"Exhibits a skill both of writing and invention which is certainly remarkable."—Manchester Guardian.

SHADOWS OUT OF THE CROWD
By RICHARD CURLE. 6s.

"We have seldom read more vivid sketches with so great an economy of words."—Morning Post.

THE RACE OF CIRCUMSTANCE
By H. R. CAMPBELL. 6s.

"Qualities of brilliance."—Speculator.

"Passages of true power."—Manchester Guardian.

A unique list of powerful new fiction to be published this Autumn can only be obtained gratis on application to STEPHEN SWIFT & Co., Ltd., 15, King Street, Covent Garden.