

# THE NEW AGE

INCORPORATING "CREDIT POWER"

A WEEKLY REVIEW OF POLITICS, LITERATURE, AND ART

No. 1735] NEW SERIES Vol. XXXVIII. No. 6. THURSDAY, DECEMBER 10, 1925. [Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper.] **SIXPENCE**

## CONTENTS.

	PAGE		PAGE
NOTES OF THE WEEK	61	THE SHAPING OF THE IMAGE. By Richard Montgomery	65
Commentary upon Mr. Strachey's "Revolution by Reason"—a general or a selective increase in purchasing power?—the revenge complex—Thyros and Delias—the satiety of the rich the opportunity of the poor. The demonstration of the Civil Service at the Albert Hall—points from the speeches—the "stay-in" strike—challenging the Debt service—the Press boycott. The Civil Service Defence Committee's purchase of <i>The Civilian</i> .		SOCIOLOGY AND SPECIALISATION. By John Purvey	67
WHAT IS EUROPE?—II. By Henri Hauser	64	METHOD.—III. By Allen Upward	68
VERSE	—	IS EVOLUTION TRUE? By Frank Granger	69
Elemental. By W. E. Walker (65).		"Is Evolution True?"	
		SOLE AU VIN BLANC. By "Old and Crusted"	69
		"A FEW PER CENT." An Aspect of the "A + B" Theorem. By A. B.	70
		REVIEW	71
		"The Borderlands of Economics."	

## NOTES OF THE WEEK.

"We do not desire a general expansion of purchasing power all over the community. . . . Our method, i.e., accommodation to industry coupled with minimum wage legislation, provides for an expansion of working-class purchasing power exclusively. Further, these proposals provide for the transference of money as well as its increase. Hence, when some of the money paid in increased wages percolates back to the property-owning classes, it will be skimmed off again by increased direct taxation and redirected to the workers." (Our italics.)

The above passage occurs in Mr. John Strachey's recent book, "Revolution by Reason."\* Revolution by reason is an alluring concept, but without a revolution in reasoning it is likely to remain a concept. As a contribution to economic thought the only value of Mr. Strachey's book lies in the fact that it will help to set Socialists analysing the money system. Many of his *obiter dicta* are sound. That "increased capacity to produce is not the same thing as increased purchasing power," for instance, cannot be emphasised too often. Nor can his reminder that there is a "snag" in the nationalisation programme; that Inflation must be measured by reference to price rather than to the volume of money circulating; and that the remedy for poverty is to be looked for in the employment of our unused productive resources. The more people who digest these truths the better. But since the same loaf of bread can energise a man just as powerfully to do a day's fighting as to do a day's work, the act of disseminating truths of this kind is not necessarily a useful service. The problem is how you apply them. And it is as to the "how" that the revolution in reasoning must take place. That poverty is an anachronism may be taken as an axiom. That the spectacle of its persistence to-day should make Communists see red, and Socialists see pink, is a proof that the heart of

\* "Revolution by Reason." By John Strachey. (Leonard Parsons. Price 7s. 6d. net.)

man is desperately good. But the prevalence of the idea that the only cause of one's poverty is another's prosperity is proof that the brain of man is desperately stupid. Moreover, even if the idea were true, what then? Prosperity is not only a privilege, it is also the power to protect that privilege. How, then, can the poor hope to force the rich to yield up their riches or any portion thereof? They outnumber the rich vastly—they have all the weight—but, because of that, they have no mobility. They can only get stuck in the pass, and be sniped at from the hills. The escape lies only in the possibility of a peace pact between rich and poor, not of any proletarian plan of campaign. "We do not desire a general expansion of purchasing power all over the community," says Mr. Strachey. The answer is that this is precisely what ought to be desired; for it is the one pre-requisite of permanent and fruitful peace. In the old fable it was the sun and not the wind which succeeded in getting the cloak off the traveller. Now a *general* increase of purchasing power is the sun, whereas a *selective* increase is the wind; and the pressing into service of economic truths for Party purposes, which in their very nature are discriminatory, is like summoning the storm to assist the sunshine.

In the new economic dispensation there can be no "chosen people." The origin and aim of economic activity are the needs and desires of all people. Man, as worker, is subordinate to man, as consumer. This was true even under primitive conditions of production; and how much more so now, when man, as inventor and discoverer, is turning himself out of the industrial process by substituting mechanical for human energy. If any people at all had to be chosen as inheritors of wealth it is rather those (and their descendants) who conceived of labour-saving instruments and devices than those who now merely use them. But to apply that principle would only create a different set of "chosen people": it would not abolish disparities in the distribution of privilege. The idea of replacing the Jew by the Gentile is itself

Jewish. Now there is neither Jew nor Gentile—capitalist nor worker—but there is Man—the Consumer. His is the inheritance.

To bring this conclusion to bear upon current economic problems we must define what this inheritance is. Mr. Strachey says, and rightly, that it is the unused capacity of the nation's productive resources. It is energy held in leash. The inheritance is potential: therefore the first step is to unleash the energy and actualise the inheritance. It certainly matters a great deal how the inheritance shall be distributed, but there is no use in quarrelling over a formula until that which is to be distributed is in a distributable form or at least is in process of transmutation into such form. But this transmutation depends upon the will of the rich as well as that of the poor. The two must co-operate. How? By the coercion of the rich by the poor? Or by inducing both rich and poor? The answer depends upon which system works more quickly; for the existing situation is commonly agreed to be desperate. So there is no uncertainty about it. The "first step" is obviously the step which can be taken first. Inducement is as superior to coercion as light is quicker than sound. Is, then, inducement possible? Can Labour and Capital agree on a common inducement? There is no reason why not, so long as the method of applying it does not rule out the participation of Labour in the results of their common co-operation.

Now Mr. Strachey appears to think that a general expansion of purchasing power all over the community will rule out the poorer classes from participation. At least, we hope he thinks so; for if his real objection is not that the poorest will not benefit, but that the richest will benefit as well, he would be deliberately prolonging the actual miseries of destitution in order to indulge a revenge complex. In Daniel Riche's "Le Coeur de Thellys" he tells the story of Thyros and Delias.

Thyros was of that disposition that he could not see Delias gain any joy, but that he himself must gain the same joy by the same means. Thus, Delias loves a maid, and is loved by her. He comes to tell Thyros of her, of her beauty, of his happiness.

"You haven't said anything about this before," grumbles Thyros.

"No, old man, I wanted to give you a surprise," is Delias's laughing answer.

"By God," is the other's outburst, "that means that you wanted to humiliate me, thinking I would die of rage at the idea that you had found a companion while I remained alone."

"But not at all —" protests Delias.

"Yes, yes. I know what's the matter. You are never happy except when you can unsettle me . . ."

So Thyros rages off to the stream-side, where young maidens are wont to sit during their leisure, and asks the first one he meets to marry him—which it happens she is content to do. The two friends marry. In course of time there are quarrels in Thyros's house, during the intervals of which he can hear sounds of laughter floating over from the other. Here is a worse humiliation for him. Delias has all the good fortune and he all the bad. And so the story proceeds until Thyros, in the ultimate throes of angry desperation steals one night to the temple of his God. Knocking his forehead three times on the ground he invokes the deity to look on his misfortunes and to take pity on him.

"Thyros," speaks a loud voice, "the gods have never abandoned thee. The one cause of thy trouble is that thou hast not known how to benefit by their favours. Thou hast allowed the evil flower of envy to blossom in thy heart . . ."

"Oh great and pitiful God, I swear that I do not know what envy is: it is misfortune alone that I sink under," Thyros replies.

"Well, as a sign that I have taken pity on thy distress, express one wish, and I promise to fulfil it," speaks the God.

Thyros feels an immense joy flow through his being, and tries to think what magnificent and unheard-of gift he can ask for—when the God speaks again.

"Choose; but know that, whatever thy desire, immediately thy friend Delias will enjoy the same favour."

The hands of Thyros are suddenly clenched, his eyes injected with blood. Delias, again Delias, always Delias. In soliciting happiness for himself he will condemn himself to witness also that of his friend. . .

Bending down again, very humbly, he speaks his wish. "Seigneur, crève-moi un oeil."

"Destroy one of my eyes." Happily Thyros brought evil only on two individuals. But supposing he had been entrusted with the responsibility of wishing by proxy for all the unfortunates who dwelt in his country. If he had led Labour.

"Production is indefinitely expansible: consumption is not." This saying of Major Douglas's is the solvent of all apprehensions as to what may happen should there be a general increase of purchasing power. Remember that purchasing power means the power to buy goods out of the whole industrial system for personal consumption and use. For that reason the exercise of purchasing power is limited by the consuming power of its possessor, quite irrespective of how much purchasing power he possesses. It follows that in estimating the consequences of a general increase in purchasing power, an increase in which the rich will share, one must estimate to what degree the rich can increase their consumption, how far they can exercise their new purchasing power. Now Mr. Strachey argues that the rich are already exercising it, and are doing so to such a degree as to make it the duty of a Socialist Government to refuse credit to "luxury firms" (p. 167) and to impose "heavy taxes on large incomes so as to lift from industry the burden of providing for the wants of the rich" (p. 172). In this connection we submit that since the rich are consuming so much more closely to the limit of possible consumption than the poor, a general increase in purchasing power, if large enough, will cause an "overspill" of consuming power among the former which will have the same effect on the consumption ratio between the two classes as Mr. Strachey wants to produce by denying loan-credit and taxing incomes. Which is the better policy, to let the buying power of the rich man's income increase up to five, ten, twenty, or fifty per cent. above the consuming power of the rich man himself—in which case he will voluntarily stop still while the poor man is "catching up"—or to say "Nothing more for the poor man if the rich man gets some as well"? The question remaining is: Can there be a sufficient expansion of purchasing power to achieve that result? On the money side, yes—Mr. Strachey needs no telling that money is only a method of measurement. Then on the goods side? Here it is where he falters. He seems to fear that there will not be enough to go round. He underestimates the stupendous possibilities of supply when once demand shall be certain and continuous. They are so near to getting all they want that to give them the rest would hardly lower the new stream-level of general supply a hair's-breadth. The satiety of the rich is the opportunity of the poor. Here is the real revolution in reasoning: here is the complete inversion of old concepts.

There is one objection. "If you satiate the rich you deprive them of the inducement to go on producing after their own personal wants are satisfied." But that would only be a practical problem where production or its financing depended on the rich. But it need not. The potential power to produce is resident in all, rich and poor alike; it can be actualised by money not belonging to the rich, as Mr. Strachey himself proves at some length. The emission of new credit by the State and banks in co-operation for new production frees industry from exclusive dependence on old credit, "the rich man's investment surplus." This Mr. Strachey understands.

Now we have said enough in criticism of Mr. Strachey's general outlook. Our main quarrel is with the unseen controllers of economic policy who cause that outlook to be so popular, and with the so-called statesmen of Capitalism who refrain from thinking themselves free from obsolete financial postulates. For Mr. Strachey's crusade against the Capitalists and the antagonisms and embarrassments which may ensue from it the Capitalists must thank themselves. They need bumping out of their mental lethargy, and if the shocks must come through revolts against existing conditions of scarcity, then we should be inconsistent were we to oppose them merely because the leaders had not thought out their strategy to the end, nor quite knew what they were revolting against. Where financial air-raids are prevalent Socialists will preach the building of shelters, and Communists the making of anti-aircraft guns. If Capitalists miss the old goodwill and security, it is because they allow the financiers to recruit them as pilots. The latest shelter-builders are the Civil Servants. Ten thousand of them were assembled inside, and another five thousand outside the Albert Hall on the night of November 17. The proceedings are fully reported in *The Post*, which remarks in its "Notes and Comments" on the attitude of the Press towards the event.

"The one disappointing result . . . was the almost complete boycott of the Press. What was even worse was the misrepresentations contained in the brief reports that did occur. Most of the newspapers—the *Westminster Gazette* was the exception—reported Mr. W. J. Brown as having referred to the lowest paid of Civil servants as receiving 66s. a week; and, what was worse, they omitted the words 'or less' which followed the reference to the 60s., which a wage of 35s., plus full bonus, produces. We were particularly disappointed to find a very scanty report in the *Daily Herald*. To treat a demonstration of 15,000 Civil Servants as an everyday occurrence connotes an amazing lack of editorial prescience on the part of the workers' newspaper."

We agree. We should, however, substitute the word "prudence" for "prescience" in giving the concluding reflection general application to the Press boycott. Our reason will become clear shortly. The meeting was organised by the Civil Service Defence Committee. It was to begin at 6.30. By 6 o'clock the hall was full and the doors locked. Three mass meetings had to be held outside. They were addressed by relays of speakers from inside, and lasted just as long as did the main meeting. One of the most significant features was the association of First Division officers with the minor grades in this demonstration. Representatives of the following Executives were on the platform:—

- First Division Association.
- Civil Service Legal Society.
- Association of H.M. Inspectors of Taxes.
- Society of Civil Servants.
- Institution of Professional Civil Servants.
- Civil Service Clerical Association.
- Association of Executive and Other Officers.
- Association of Officers of Taxes.
- Customs and Excise Federation.
- Government Minor Grades Association.
- Ministry of Labour Staff Association.
- Union of Post-Office Workers.
- P.O. Controlling Officers' Association.
- Federation of Sub-Postmasters.
- P.O. Engineering Confederation.
- P.O. Engineering Inspectors.
- Federation of Post-Office Supervising Officers.
- ("And many other staff organisations.")

Mr. George Middleton, chairman of the National Staff Side and Editor of *The Post*, presided. Now he had before him what may be called the Permanent Technical Government, an irreplaceable body with the same power on the side of service as the banks hold on the side of finance of maintaining or destroying the whole system of governmental administration. We have no space for a connected account of all the speeches. We reproduce the most significant passages, and leave our readers to appreciate

their importance in view of the character of the audience. Mr. Middleton said:

"I desire to make it quite clear to the Government and to the public that while Civil Servants may differ on politics, to touch the economic interests of the staff is to defile the ark of the covenant."

"We are not going to submit to the outrage of 1920, when the super-cut which cost the higher reaches of the Service £450,000 a year was imposed by the Government of the day. (Loud cheers.)"

This set the note for the introduction and discussion of the Resolution which was moved by Mr. J. W. Bowen in these terms,

"This mass meeting of all grades of Civil Servants condemns the ill-informed and prejudiced attacks in certain sections of the Press and elsewhere directed against Civil Service staffs and their conditions of employment; draws public attention to the fact that less than 50 per cent. of the Service receive full compensation for the rise in the cost of living, and that gross underpayment exists among large sections of the Service; and pledges the Civil Service not only to resist to the uttermost any attempt further to depreciate Civil Service standards of remuneration, but to prosecute by all available means the claim for reasonable standards of life for all those who serve the State."

Among Mr. Bowen's remarks were these:—

"Not long ago a prominent newspaper, in expressing the fear of the consequence of the advent of a certain Government, said: 'We can rely on the sanity of the Civil Service.' If, therefore, the Service is so necessary and so dependable, it surely is necessary to preserve it as a contented and efficient body."

"Is it not a fact that many Ministers would have been in a bad way if it were not for Civil Servants who covered their shortcomings?"

"Increased prices are not covered by bonus. With the current index number of 76, the bonus ranges from 22 per cent. on £1,000 to 75 per cent. on 35s. Only those with 35s. or less get bonus roughly equal to the cost of living."

"There are now tens of thousands of Civil Servants below poverty level."

Mr. W. J. Brown who followed, "received a great ovation." He quoted this passage from the *Daily Mail*:—

"Our Civil Service managed to conduct the business of administration in 1913 for £54 millions. In the present year it is costing £227 millions."

In reply he asserted that, excluding the Post Office (which made a profit) and the Revenue Departments, "where the expenditure on wages represented only 1 1/2 per cent. of the moneys raised, the total cost of administration in the form of wages, allowances and bonus was—not £227 millions—but £11 millions. So that the blotting out of every Civil Servant in the country would not affect the Budget to the extent of 2d. off the income tax. He added further facts:—

"There are 300,000 Civil servants. . . . 150,000 of that number receive a basic salary of 35s. a week or under—or, taking bonus into account, a total remuneration of 60s. 6d. a week. . . . Something like 230,000 are in receipt of a total remuneration of less than £4 a week."

A little later Mr. Brown hints at a bite behind the barking. "This ought to be a meeting to deliver an ultimatum to the Government that we want more money for our people to enable them to live." (Loud cheers and prolonged applause.) Then he proceeded to elaborate:

"I want to put this question: If the Government has it in its mind to pursue the idea of wages cuts, I want to ask them if they have counted the cost. Believe me, there will be a cost—there will be a cost. Why? Because we shall ask you to strike? No; we know you too well. Because we shall ask you to go slow? No. (A voice, 'We don't want asking.') All we shall do, ladies and gentlemen, is just to stand on one side. It will be quite enough! Just look at the figures for a minute. Suppose

an average cut of 10 per cent. were enforced. Everybody would admit that the effect of such a cut would be to reduce the enthusiasm and the interest of the Service (hear, hear). Very well, then. **THE INLAND REVENUE LAST YEAR RAISED 459 MILLIONS. SUPPOSE WE ASSUME A 10 PER CENT. DROP IN THE INTEREST AND EFFICIENCY OF THE OFFICIALS OF THE INLAND REVENUE.** ('Ah!') That is 45 millions! The Customs last year raised 235 millions, and it is much easier for a Customs Officer to be nice than to be nasty (laughter). A 10 per cent. drop there—23 millions. Unemployment Insurance administered by Civil Servants last year, 36 millions. 10 per cent. drop in interest—That cut is the kind of thing which only people in their first childhood, or well on their way to their second—(laughter)—childhood would ever embark."

It is clear by now what caused the "disappointing" quantity of Press comment that *The Post* deplures. Was it to be expected that Fleet Street would find it "public policy" to whet the appetites of the general body of taxpayers by disseminating this idea of possible laxity on the part of the Government's salaried inquisitors? Neglect to collect £45 millions of income tax and £23 millions of customs dues—that would be jam for the upper and middle classes; overpayment of £4 millions of doles through similar neglect—bread for the working class. A virtual distribution of £72 millions of money among the community. Why, this kind of "labour unrest" would start a trade boom. Nobody would want the stay-in strike to stop. Taxpayers would have every incentive to remit voluntarily to the Defence Committee not only the £11 millions the Civil Servants now require but even £20 millions if only the latter would promise not to recapture their lost "interest and enthusiasm." There are, of course, flies in the ointment. What the Government could not collect it could not spend with the industrial system. But the flies are by no means so large as some people think, as we could easily demonstrate by an analysis showing what proportion of Government revenue does actually get back into the taxpayers' pockets as personal income. That, however, is a matter for the consideration of the "Statesmen" who, we hope, will emerge out of the unification of the whole Service. If all the people in the country were asked to pay out week by week in prices and taxes combined only just so much as they were corporately drawing as personal incomes in those same weeks, and no more, they would find themselves saving millions and millions without anybody's living at a pennyworth's lower standard. The resolution of this apparent mystery is locked up in the word "Overheads"—and not a few Civil Servants know where the key is. Shall we suggest that Mr. Brown has an idea? Listen.

"If we cannot save there," he imagines the economists to ask in respect of the Civil Service, 'how are we to solve the financial problems which confront this country?' I have just two comments to make on that. The first is, not by attacking Civil Servants in newspapers who charge 100 per cent. on their pre-war prices. (Applause.)

"The second is that no nation which really has a financial problem to face can afford to spend five-eighths of its total expenditure either on paying for the war that has gone by or preparing for the one that is not far off. (Cheers.) £350 millions a year for the debt on the last war—a debt which, if our war-time Governments had had courage enough to deal with money as they dealt with life, would never have existed at all. ('Hear, hear' and loud applause.)"

A Press boycott! We should think so. When fifteen thousand collectors and dispensers of the taxpayers' money are invited to scrutinise the credentials of Debt Service (really Credit Destruction Service) as an alternative to searching persons' pockets, the currents of national finance are dangerously near short-circuiting. Silence is the only safe insulator when the "Labour" and "Consumer" cables come so near each other. We must conclude with one extract from Mr. N. Curtis-Bennett, "whose Oxford

accents" said Mr. Clauson in a following speech, "afford such an inexhaustible source of merriment to the lighter columns of the Service Press." Referring to economy of administration, he instanced the Savings Bank Department with its total of £500 millions of deposits, and compared these with those of the five leading banks: Midland, £356 millions; Lloyds, £339 millions; Barclays £301 millions; Westminster, £272 millions; National Provincial, £255 millions.

"The salary of the Controller of this large enterprise is £1,000-£1,200—(shame)—and the total establishment charges, including salaries, is under £1,000,000 per annum. I leave you to guess what the salary of the chairman of directors of any of these banks is, but their corresponding establishment charges are at least four times as large.

We see in *The Post* of December 5 that the Civil Service Defence Committee has just decided to acquire *The Civilian* (170 Fleet Street, E.C.4), an old-established paper which it is going to transform into the organ of the whole Service. Hitherto it has not had one. Among the provisional directors are Mr. Middleton, Mr. Bowen, and Mr. Brown. We hope that all our readers who are Civil Servants will support this venture. The more quickly it can consolidate its position and make sure the protection of the interests for which it stands, the sooner it will be free to use its influence—as we hope it will—to bring about a serious official investigation of the true principles of a general economic settlement.

## What is Europe?

By Henri Hauser.

II.

Europe is not a geographical, but a cultural entity. Europe: that is the European, *i.e.*, the Latin-Germanic, Christian culture, especially Western Christendom under its double Catholic and Protestant aspect. Comte spoke quite correctly of a culture of the West—*i.e.*, of the West of the ancient world. This was a common culture, whose universality itself possessed again as symbol and instrument the universality of the French language as the European language. There is, besides, the predominance of English ideas. Between this world and all which is not it there exists in the seventeenth and also in the eighteenth century a very clear contrast.

The French Revolution is from two points of view European; immediately through its expansive tendencies; mediately through the reactions it caused. Sybel and Sorel were able to bring together the two wings of the diptych: Europe and the Revolution. In the year 1815 there was in Vienna in fact a Europe, an European system, the system of Talleyrand and Metternich, which lasted in the main to the year 1848.

Two phenomena, however, gradually brought about the breaking up of this system.

On the one hand European expansion, the first beginnings for which go back to the sixteenth century, and which in the nineteenth took on the dimensions of a migration of peoples. This is the great event of recent history. Millions and millions of Europeans migrate to distant lands and obliterate the differences between Europe and that which is not Europe. On the other side of the ocean they set up social systems of the same type as those which they leave behind; European social systems outside Europe. Now not only the eastern, but also the western boundary of Europe is movable; no longer does the sea, which presents no obstacle, form the boundary, but it is formed by the prairies, the mountains and valleys of the Far West. English and French colonies, dominions, scattered in all corners and ends of the world—these sister nations are European in the spiritual sense of the word, *aye*, and more European than many a State which is shown

## The Shaping of the Image.

Flatterers credit us with the qualities of character we covet. We are thus encouraged to see ourselves as superhuman persons, whose very wishes are fountains of power. When this delusion, by some pathetic adventure, is dissipated, the cost is heavy in self-esteem, if in nothing less easily replaceable. Accordingly, we harden ourselves against flattery as against an intoxicant we like too much. Nevertheless, we do not then invite the truth about ourselves, but merely such praise as can be given sincerely, and for the rest, silence. "A German thinks it a deadly insult," wrote Schopenhauer, "to be called stupid, a Frenchman to be called a coward, and an Englishman to be told he is no gentleman, or, what is worse, a liar." Schopenhauer traced the source of these aversions to training, to the national systems of education which had raised, in Germany culture, in France courage, and in England chivalry, to the rank of supreme heroic virtue. Schopenhauer's observation was just. The motive, however, which led to the development of these systems of education, focussed upon the particular aversions mentioned, must be sought deeper in the national souls. Call a German witty, he will at once become as nearly every hair alive against deception as for him is possible. If you compliment a Frenchman on his bravery, although he smile with his lips, you may, through his eyes, watch his wits cleared for action. Inform an Englishman that he is a thorough gentleman; promptly, exploiting his native genius for invention to the full, he will fashion a lie as to the whereabouts of his cheque-book. In all cases your compliment would amount to flattery. You would have touched a weak place in the characters of the nations about whose existence they are more or less aware. Their national systems of training have been designed, wittingly or unwittingly, with the purpose of strengthening the qualities of character which by nature these nations lack. If this is true, and many interesting correspondences confirm that it is not a mere superficial irony, we may suspect further that the keenness of the various nations' efforts to acquire the respective characters furnishes a measure of the extent to which they are naturally lacking, while the intense animosity excited by the charge of dullard, coward, or blackguard, testifies less to righteous indignation than to repugnance towards disillusionment, especially by one who brands himself unfriendly by imputing that illusion exists.

That particular line of conduct which, according to the observations of Dr. Adler, is so often adopted by persons afflicted by a sense of inferiority in self-comparison with their fellows is of interest in connexion with these national aversions. The sufferer, Dr. Adler notes, quite unaware of what he is doing, persuades himself of inner, and therefore hidden superiority; for self-justification he strives to make his real rank doubly manifest by selecting as the field for competition with his fellows his weakest faculties, and in some cases concentrates on them to the limit of genius. Beethoven, who was for much of his life deaf to the music of this world, and whose ears were never of the best, stole music from Heaven, to bestow it, Prometheus-like, on the earth-bound. Demosthenes began with a stutter, and Mr. Bernard Shaw with the handicap of exaggerated modesty and timidity. Nietzsche, frail and suffering, perplexed by problems which thousands of meaner men overcome with scarcely a thought, conceived and taught the vision of the cultured superman. It is as though the spirit within us urges us to strive after roundness by exercising and strengthening precisely those qualities in which we happen by nature to be deficient.

Rather than win fortune by the successful performance of what he is fitted for, the genius appears

on the old map of Europe. Europe is dying of its own victory; she is losing herself in the world she has Europeanised.

Difficult is the distinction between one Europeanism and that overseas. Do we not confuse in talking of the decline of Europe two very different things: the decrease in the relative importance of the West-European family of nations which is a necessary consequence of the expansion, and the antagonism between culture of the European type, wherever its geographic location may be, and the non-European cultures? Australia or the United States against Japan—that is a dispute between Europe and non-Europe.

And on the other hand, on the mainland which we call Europe, is everything uniformly "European?" The coming into being of the national States has complicated the cultural map of Europe. The aspirations of the West-Slavs, of the Czechs, are all turned towards the West. Is it the same with the Balkan peoples? Among the Southern Slavs, despite the Jugo-Slavian unity, is there not a contrast between European Agram and oriental Belgrade?

We speak of European solidarity. I see more real vital solidarity between London and New York, between London and Toronto, Sydney, or Capetown, than between London and Sofia, or indeed (much as I regret it) between London and Warsaw, to say nothing at all of Moscow. British solidarity, the "Commonwealth of Nations," extends over three or four continents without troubling itself about school-geography, Anglo-Saxon solidarity, though less cogent, is yet also a reality, "blood is thicker than water."

But what is to be said of Latin, or rather of neo-Roman solidarity? Though South America is connected by narrow strips of land with North America, though Mexico may have ever so long a common boundary with her mighty neighbour, a fact of real geography is stronger than the apparent unity of the American continents: Pernambuco is nearer to Dakar than to New York. The marble palace of the American Republics may be built on the flower-decked lawns of Washington, Pan-American conferences may with varying success be held *ad lib.*, the Monroe doctrine may be extended to a Draconian doctrine—yet Spanish America (which has become in part an Italian America) cannot be prevented from distrusting the hegemony of the Yankees or of the English and from turning to the Mother States Spain and Portugal or France and Italy; before our eyes a neo-Roman unit is being formed.

Whence comes the position of the South and Central Americans in the League of Nations? From the kinship of their ideas of morals and law with those of the Europeans of the Latin cultural circle, who, in varying degrees, have received Roman law. Between those jurists and the French, for example, there is no single essential difference. They speak in fact one and the same language. The same forces which make Pan-Americanism illusory are at work against a Pan-Europe. Mankind does not organise itself lengthwise into a system of strips. Often the unions are effected rather diagonally as between Bordeaux and Buenos Ayres or between Melbourne and Vancouver. Human freedom with all its supple possibilities laughs at crude geographical determinism.

### ELEMENTAL.

Small, nameless flower, bright with Earth's joyous yellow,  
I doubt not that myself and thou are one:  
What though I go a too self-conscious fellow,  
With will, should I desire, to tread upon  
Thy strengthless form? So should I Beauty spurn,  
Hence my mind's promise damn to lampless night  
And feel thy trampled root about me turn—  
A vengeful cataract forbidding sight!

W. E. WALKER.

sometimes to win immortality by failing nobly at what for him is impossible. How often, as in Nietzsche's case, is the work which immortalises not so much an achievement in itself as the record of a struggle, a glorious forlorn effort, against the combined fates, towards the divine, spherical spirit. All this is hardly a digression; the same striving for "wholeness" observable in the individual takes place in that more elusive, though not less corporeal entity, a nation. It is not necessary to enter into controversy on the question whether nations have characters, souls, and spirits. They have what they create. Citizens of one country, to a great extent racially related, conforming to the same laws, practising the same customs, dependent on the same natural surroundings, and competing for the same honours, tend, in a broad sense, to become alike. Nations, like families, may have gods, and, although it may not follow, may be presumed to have souls, or at least the desire for souls, which may not be much different.

The "will-to-wholeness," in the practical attempt at realisation, is liable to be submerged in the "will-to-power." The momentum towards redressing the deficiency may not be exhausted when the work is, on that side, complete. We long for tangible proof of our success, and aim at justifying ourselves not by beauty of character, but by dominion. Sandow so heartily disliked the weaknesses and afflictions of his youth, that he was not satisfied until he became the strongest man in the world. Many a backward boy, depressed by his failure to secure the same praise from his teachers as his brighter class-mates, has proceeded to the length, to prove his worth, of burdening himself with several diplomas for, to him, useless learning. Something of the sort seems to have happened in the mind of Germany. In a spirit so cultured as that of Nietzsche, the artistic, religious, imaginative Nietzsche, who flung himself at philology for "discipline's sake," war without quarter raged between the values of beauty and power, and in the end, alas, power carried the day.

Buckhardt noted "as in every Greek a touch of Edipus, so in every German a taint of Faust." The German, disturbed by a suspicion that the world's use of him as a symbol for stupidity was not wholly unjust, dressed himself in the pomp and regalia of learning. While fearing Schopenhauer's epithet as children at make-believe fear the comment of the sceptical adult, he became the learned prodigy of the world. In his intense desire to justify himself he longed for the conversion of knowledge into dominion, a bartering of the soul with the devil. Happiness was to be realised through the transmutation of omniscience into omnipotence. Having eaten all the fruit of the tree of knowledge within his reach, the German developed pride in proportion, and fell correspondingly, with the consequence that his struggle for the wholeness of spirit in which the knowledge that is power commands by serving has had to begin afresh.

The war in the German spirit, as in Nietzsche and Goethe then, was to settle whether knowledge should serve beauty or power. In the French courage competed for allegiance against comfort. In every Frenchman, perhaps, there is a touch of Tartarin. The scalps that tell of fine deeds and perilous adventures are passionately desired, but the counter-attractions of society, of civilisation, are too strong. Flatterers of the French eulogise their courage, but candid enemies treat it as a joke. "They tell you daily in London," according to Emerson, "the story of an Englishman and a Frenchman who quarrelled. Both were unwilling to fight. At last, however, it was agreed that they should do so, alone, in the dark, and with pistols. The Englishman, to make certain of not hurting anyone, fired up the chimney and brought down the Frenchman." That the story has not been repeated of recent years, says a good

deal for the sincerity of the wish of the two nations to be friends. The French have a reputation for foolhardiness in their displays of courage. Bravery depends on wanting something so madly, as Shaw said, that one loses the sense to perceive the risk. For this the French are too clear-minded. They seem to resemble schoolboys who force themselves to acts of foolish recklessness to hide their fluttering hearts from the girls. In a colloquialism they have "to egg themselves on." So repellent is this hypocrisy to this logical people that they cannot help, to satisfy their own consciences, supporting their Tarasconnaisian fantasies by practice, at any hazard.

The wealth of English expressions such as chivalry, courage, honour, dignity, imported from France, has been remarked often. These words exhibit the same properties as the noise of bagpipes. They are a sort of drug for stimulating us, like the mouse of modern fable, to seek and face the enemy we fear. The seriousness of the latter years of the war rendered most of these fine-sounding words base coin of the spirit. Many of the French in those terrible years felt an acute disgust for their past braggart "panache,"—sword-play for the gallery—cultivated to raise them from the depression engendered by 1870; they realised the vital need to dispense with the last tatters of romantic nonsense, and to work, soul as well as body, naked.

It is hardly strange, indeed, that as Germany has made so great a contribution to the "power" aspect of the human psyche, it is to France that we are chiefly indebted for research into hypnotism and double personality. In this country of extremes, as Goethe called it, that swings from the proudest monarchy to bloody revolution, between monarchy and republicanism, from Roman Catholicism to Free-thought, and from exhibitions of rash courage to plain fear, there is something closely akin to double personality. For the spectacle of her aristocracy walking serenely to the guillotine in spite of its fluttering heart, the acts of setting Napoleon on the throne of Heaven, and vowing France to conquer Europe, were the national pathological exhibition. If a speculation on the future of France is permissible, it seems that she must compensate her heart or suffer a further attack of Napoleonic mania, the outcome of a hypochondriac's desire for safety. France must place her faith not in arms but in culture, of which she is the pre-destined mistress.

In this trial and error quest for wholeness each several man among us is Faust, Don Quixote, Tartarin, and the rest, by turns. His spirit expresses something of every type in nature, since wholeness, by conception, embraces all things. When a vortex of universal energy performs as a giraffe, an eagle or a Napoleon, its capacity to act as anything else is not destroyed, but merely asleep. We are all convolutions of the same stuff, aiming by diverse routes, at perfection, at maximum accommodation of partially known means to a dimly visualised end. Not only are we prone, as the Germans with their learning, to develop the deficiencies into excesses, or, as the French with their courage, to tap more than we can spare for the sake of showing ourselves richer than men believe, but we may, like the English, while gathering means to an end, forget the end, overcome by the lust for accumulating means. Schopenhauer gathered his experience when the English were allowing the last vestiges of gentlemanly traditions to filter through their fingers as they grasped at limitless commercial and monetary power. He touched the sensitive place in their consciousness. They coveted gentlemanliness; it would have pleased them to be mistaken for gentlemen; but they would not make the necessary sacrifice.

The gentleman is of the same lineage as the knight. Schopenhauer referred to him as one who

holds nothing sacred but his word of honour. By others he has been described as manifesting that spirit of truthfulness and forbearance which wins respect in any age or city, the expression of the spirit of Christ in social relations. For a gentleman, alas for England's claim, there is no such thing as the main chance. His values, though possibly unconscious and unspoken, like his religion, are instinctively known, and he would rather die than delete a letter. He bows to the Eternal, not as a miserable sinner, but as one unchanging reality greeting another. Manhood to him is a privilege to be redeemed by responsibility. Taking himself for granted as the summit of creation he acts accordingly. The perfectly spherical gentleman may be impossible of entire practical realisation. Like the sphere and the circle in the Heavens he may be, apparently, an unattainable, though worthy, ideal. Part of the means to the ideal consists in that sufficiency of wealth which Aristotle perceived indispensable to independent and active citizenship. So dear was the gentleman to the English that, realising the immediate impracticability of all becoming gentlemen they effected a division of labour. The French, with their duels and revolutions, their excesses "for a woman's sake," strove to manufacture courage; the Germans, building schools and colleges like prisons, writing uncountable volumes to prove what men of wit see at a flash, pursued the light of culture; and the English, dreaming the gentleman, wanting to play life fairly and let the best team win, utilised their public schools, including those endowed for the tuition of poor orphans, for converting the sons of the wealthy classes into vicarious gentlemen, who should redeem the whole nation.

These children of the wealthy paid for their privileges by esteeming fortune above honour, and the main chance above the truth. At the fulness of their maturity they changed a nation of shopkeepers into a nation of shopwalkers. They turned themselves, in some instances, into absent and irresponsible proprietors; in others, into shopwindow gentlemen good only for shows and processions. The more they acquired of the wealth vital to gentlemanly responsibility and independence the greater their appetite, until those who had not forgotten their destiny were as rare as purity in their wares. Honours of state, intended for the public recognition of high service or character—to mark the aristocrat or the gentleman, in short—had to be offered for purchase to the merely rich. A Spanish writer remarked recently that the world now looks to England alone for the creation of the type known as gentleman. What did he mean? What Cervantian subtlety lurked between the lines of his naive praise? Possibly, that the world no longer possesses the type, yet cannot look elsewhere.

It is well for England that the ideal still breathes. While it has not preserved her politics from corruption, nor the economic man from running amok, it has secured her strikes from sabotage, or nearly so. Though Cabinet Ministers may boast of their achievement before the ill-nourished pupils at the schools of their childhood, and peers write vulgarly of success, a few roughly rounded spirits still remain to be wounded. In the war between career and character which every Englishman wages within, Matthew Arnold, and Christ, still have a fellowship, small though it be in hope and in numbers. Whether Waterloo was won by the sportsmen of Eton, as Wellington said, or by the infantry as Napoleon believed, no longer matters. Suffice that the world still looks to England for something that America, except on a very small scale, does not yet supply.

RICHARD MONTGOMERY.

## Sociology and Specialisation.

"The process of evolving laws cannot be easy, or else we should not need written laws. It is not a science in itself. A long and wearisome apprenticeship is obligatory on the judge. Whence arise guilds and States?—from want of time and power in the individual. Every human being cannot learn and practise every science and art. Labour and arts are divided. Is not government on the same footing? If all are capable of achieving all, why is not every man a doctor, a poet, and so on? The impossibility of this is conceded in all other branches except philosophy and statesmanship—every one believes himself capable of criticising these, and assumes the right to lay down the law like a virtuoso."—Novalis.

"It is the business of bishops, nobles, and the great officers of the State to be the depositaries and the guardians of the conservative virtues, to teach nations what is good and what is evil, what is true and what is false in the moral and spiritual world. Others have no right to reason on these matters. They may amuse themselves with the natural sciences. What have they to complain of?"—De Maistre.

"The corrupted ruling classes have brought ruling into evil odour."—Nietzsche.

### I.

There are those among us, gentle and plaintive souls, who wag their heads distressfully to see life so specialised. And let them wag, poor people. They are doing no harm. It is true enough that the well-known American workman who does nothing all day but pick up screws as they come from the lathe, and hand them to another workman—one, two, three, movements by number, the rhythm approved by the society for investigating industrial fatigue—oh, beyond doubt he feels little of the joy of honest labour. It is true again that the detail of science has grown so huge that scientists have lost sight of one another. Their work is never properly co-ordinated. Few of them have any conception of the purpose and value of science, of its metaphysical implications, of its place in the morphology of human society. The physicist sees the world in terms of physics, and physics is his only world. The biologist cannot correct him, for he knows too little of other branches of science. There is no one to whom they will both grant authority to show them their functions, their virtues and their limitations.

Small wonder that there are men who feel uncomfortable in this age, and denounce our specialisation. They look for a Simpler Life and urge that we should be Jacks of all trades. They remind us that man is not a machine, and that unity is more important than multiplicity. They point out that men cannot express their souls in work which involves endless repetition. We must allow them some portion of honour; for these are the poor in spirit, who have inherited heaven, and are puzzled to know what on earth they can do with it. They see a problem somewhere around them, but the solution they propose is dreadful.

### II.

The fault is not in the specialisation of tasks. It is rather in the haphazardness and insignificance of tasks. No one feels hurt, I suppose, because the cells of his body have separate functions. No one pities those cells, or imagines that they would have a better time if they cut loose from the body and lived like amœbas, each performing every function by itself. No; it appears that their contract to do for one another the work they are most fitted to perform is advantageous for them all. It is the order that gives freedom.

Another folly is to conceive that we make too many demands from life, and that if we lived with fewer complications, more primitively, or more

Spartanly, we should all be happier, and the bad old days of machinery would depart. The truth is the opposite; we make too few demands of life, we are not sufficiently hungry with new and various wants. It isn't natural for men to be satisfied with baked beans and standard motor cars. Each man should have a chariot to his own taste, and feed upon delicacies that no one else has ever heard of. In brief, we need an increase in the number of tasks that society sets itself.

III.

Particularly, as it happens, we need an increase of specialisation in the realms of value. We are moderately fed with beans, but we are miserably fed with philosophy, and religion, and art. Every man appears to think that he can philosophise well enough for himself; at any rate that philosophy calls for no great practice and dexterity. And as for religion, we observe in the newspapers that men who have never given a month's hard thought to the business are held to be qualified exponents—no, more than exponents, critics and judges. It is right that all men should consume philosophy and religion; it is permissible that they should have their own tastes and submissions; but it is disastrous and appalling that they should pretend that the science of sciences, which is philosophy, and the valuation of values, which is religion, are things that any amateur can play about with, or that the opinions of the uninformed are at all worth hearing.

JOHN PURVEY.

Method.

By Allen Upward.

III.

THE SYMMETRICAL METHOD.

The difference between the Symmetrical Method and the Comparative may be illustrated by the difference between a coroner's inquest and a trial in a criminal court. The coroner's jury is asked to find the best explanation it can of a certain event; almost always a death. The criminal jury is asked to say whether it is satisfied beyond reasonable doubt that the prisoner before it is guilty of murder, or manslaughter, or whatever crime he may be charged with. And every lawyer with practical experience in the courts knows that nothing is more common than for a coroner's jury to bring in a verdict of murder or manslaughter against a man who is found not guilty by the jury which tries him afterwards.

The reason is not far to seek. The common jury is asked to condemn a man to imprisonment or death, and it will not, and ought not, to condemn him without evidence which, although not amounting to positive proof, is strong enough to convince the minds of twelve men who have no personal interest in the matter. The coroner's jury has no such responsibility. Its verdict is not a condemnation, but at most an accusation. It merely puts a man upon his trial. And it is given in answer to a quite different question. Given these and those facts, how are they to be best accounted for? Did the deceased die by disease, or by accident, or by his own hand, or by another's; and in the last case, who is most likely to have killed him? The coroner's jury is not bound by its answer. Important new evidence may be forthcoming later on, which may wholly change the aspect of the case. All that it can do, and does do, is to say: With the evidence before us, we think that this is the most reasonable view to take.

It will be readily seen that the historian is in much the same position. He can rarely offer positive proof. Were the registers of the Privy Council to be burned by accident, there would be no strictly legal proof that such a personage as Queen Victoria was ever born. The historian would have to fall back on circumstantial evidence, which in the nature of things is diminishing day by day, as her coins are

withdrawn from circulation, her statues decay, and her portraits vanish from view. And even when legal proof, in the shape of official proof, is forthcoming, it does not always amount to positive demonstration. There are few pedigrees in the world not liable to some doubt, due to the uncertainty that a child's legal father is its actual one. As I have remarked in the preface to a volume dealing with historical mysteries, when Catharine de Medici, one of the most astute women of whom history makes mention, wished to know the truth about the death of her daughter, who was Queen of Spain, she did not ask to see the certificate of the court physician; she wrote to the French Ambassador asking him to let her have the gossip of the backstairs. The contemporary document is the idol of our contemporary historians; but who in his right mind would undertake to write the life of Napoleon in sole reliance on the pages of the *Moniteur*?

The further back the historian goes the more he must be content to trust to the Symmetrical Method, if his work is to be anything more than a catalogue of monuments and coins. His task must be to examine all the material available, to distinguish what in his judgment is most reliable, to reject what he cannot fit in with that, and from the evidence that does agree to frame the best account he can of the events he is dealing with, as the coroner's jury frames the best verdict it can on the cause of a death. And although such a method can rarely claim the infallibility of the Identical one, it may sometimes approach it in the certainty of its conclusions. There is only one right way of putting together the pieces of the puzzle; the historian's trouble is that so many pieces are missing.

The Symmetrical Method, properly applied, is as truly scientific as any other; and no one has made greater use of it than Darwin in the *Origin of Species* and the *Descent of Man*. It is illustrated in every good detective story, beginning with the ancient one of the dervish who described a lost camel from his observations of its footprints, of the herbage on which it had browsed, and the morsels dropped from its panners; and described it so accurately that he was charged with having stolen it.

An example of it was given some years ago to the Royal Anthropological Institute of London by its long time President, Sir Arthur Keith, F.R.S., our greatest living expert in the reconstruction of prehistoric skulls from the scantiest remains. Two friends of his made a plaster cast of such a skull, broke off two small fragments, and challenged him to reproduce the skull from them. He succeeded in doing so with only one important error, in the shape of the forehead. I may allow myself to mention that in a paper read before the same institute on a prehistoric maze, I inferred from its pattern and situation that primitive man must have caught fish in a trap with complicated windings. Two of the Fellows present testified that they had seen such traps still in use, one on the coast of Essex, and another at the outlet of a Macedonian Lake; and I have since read a description of one constructed by the Australian aborigines, in a novel by Rolf Boldrewood.

Such is the method on which Kant does not seem to have formulated with sufficient clearness to impress his readers. It is a method liable to abuse, and liable to error. Its conclusions must always be subject to correction by the Identical Method, within its own province. But that province is so narrow that the Symmetrical Method is the one on which we have to depend for almost all real advance in knowledge. The Symmetrical Method alone is constructive and creative. It alone can piece together the facts accumulated by research and out of them produce a working philosophy of life. A Cinderella in the eyes of the jealous pedant, the wise man hails her as queen.

Is Evolution True?\*

It is generally held that the American and British publics are entitled to have this question answered. Speaking for myself I was somewhat disappointed with the Dayton trial. The atmosphere of emotion in which, according to the Press the trial proceeded, seemed as much out of place as if one were to sob and laugh over a long addition sum. If, in any controversy, we examine the issues, we find that the public takes for granted much that really is in question, in order to give free expression to its fighting instincts.

The Dayton trial is not the last word. In our unpoetic British way, without the glamour of advertisement which casts such varied tints over the enterprising West, we have tried the case again. Professor Price, who has held the chair of Geology in Union College, Nebraska, U.S.A., has debated the matter in public with Mr. McCabe, who, on this occasion, represented the Rationalist Press Association. The official report of the debate has been revised by both disputants. The resolution proposed by Mr. McCabe ran: "That the plants and animals of our world, including man, have developed from some form or forms of primitive life by natural processes." If we take the man in the street as an instance of an animal, and the red rose, dear to a certain gracious woman, as an instance of a plant, we are to understand that the remotest ancestor or ancestors of both were probably—the statement is exceedingly probable in the present state of our knowledge—Protozoa. "mere unit specks of living matter," as Professor J. A. Thomson describes them. Now in comparison with the complexity of the Metazoa, of which two instances have just been given, the Protozoa are negligible. And we may say, employing the method of the differential calculus, that they are as good as nothing. Aristotle, therefore, when he described generation as the change from what was not to what was, applied the thorough-going formalism of the Greek mind in a characteristic way. In the transition from the relatively formless Protozoon to the relatively formed Metazoon, the new forms were as something coming out of nothing. If we understood God to mean the formative element in the universe working up from the dust, we could subscribe to the statement of certain Jewish thinkers that God wrought man in his own image. These editors of Genesis probably prepared the Jewish law for publication in Babylon about the same time as Xenophon led the march of the Ten Thousand, say 400 B.C. We know they were acquainted with Babylonian literature: it is not improbable that they came into contact with the Greeks. The brilliant fashion in which Jewish traditions of many sources were worked up by them into a systematic form was something new. And it is no mere fancy to suggest that the Priestly school contained scholars who had learnt something from the comprehensiveness of a Herodotus or a Democritus. The speculations of Genesis are not less profound than those of Empedocles, who in the west had also attempted to reconstruct the beginnings of things by blending the legendary with the ascertained knowledge of the time. To the historian of thought, Genesis itself appears as an evolutionary reconstruction of the past. If the dust of the earth appears as the material employed by the First Artificer, we are reminded that creation for these Jews did not mean creation out of nothing in the Aristotelian sense.

What was original in the Jewish presentation of the facts was that man came into being as such when first he was susceptible to intellectual motives apart from mere impulse. The opening words of the Fourth Gospel explained the phrase "in the beginning" by the term "reason," and so came into line with the Jerusalem Targum on Genesis i., 1, "in wisdom the Lord created." The theory of evolution has only taken its earliest and still dynamic form as yet. The criticisms of Samuel Butler upon Darwin were those of an amateur, but they were prophetic of the need there is to enrich the first and tentative formula of a complete theory of the cosmos.

Professor Price did not attempt to make a direct reply to Mr. McCabe's exposition of Darwinism, but tantalised the audience by references to a work by Professor O'Toole, which I gather is devoted to overthrowing the science of Palaeontology. I could imagine a more effective criticism on the lines of Samuel Butler, in which the notion of mechanism replaces the blind play of forces. But I am not going to leave the matter there. Evolution is represented by the school to which Mr. McCabe belongs as a theory of the cosmos. "From one end of the universe to the other . . . there is the same great law of gradual progress" (p. 26). This is begging the question with a vengeance. The argument from dynamics, the survival in the struggle for existence, supplies an explanation of change. But it

\*"Is Evolution True?" (London: Watts and Co. 1925.)

is exemplified in degeneration no less than in the rise of species. Evolution is true in the dynamic sense. But there is no adequate proof on dynamic principles that the course of evolution is any less blind than the forces by which, according to Darwin, its successive stages are brought about.

Now the beauty of the cosmos and of many of its parts, is a fact not less real than the other facts of which Darwin takes account. Evolution, then, so far from being a complete theory of the cosmos, taken in its strict sense, is simply an attempt to explain the transition from the Protozoa to the Metazoa. In the wider sense, it has up to the present no more claim to respect than the binomial theorem. Evolution has led not only to the beauty of nature, but to the tragic ugliness of human life "barricaded evermore within the walls of cities." So far as "beauty is truth, truth beauty," the evolution which Mr. McCabe explains in his antiquated way is false. And I should object with the authorities of the State of Tennessee to the teaching of the evolutionary dogma on the lines laid down by Mr. McCabe.

FRANK GRANGER.

"Sole au Vin Blanc."

By "Old and Crusted."

FISHERMEN'S ORDEAL IN WILD SEAS.

FEARED LOSS OF TEN LIVES.

TERRIFIC GALES.

—Daily Paper.

'Tis the hard, grey weather  
Breeds hard English men.  
What's the soft South-wester?  
'Tis the ladies' breeze,  
Bringing home their true loves  
Out of all the seas:  
But the black North-easter,  
Through the snow-storm hurled,  
Drives our English hearts of oak  
Seaward round the world

—C. Kingsley.

Then fly our greetings, fly our speech and smiles!  
—As some grave Tyrian trader, from the sea,  
Saw the merry Grecian coaster come,  
Freighted with amber grapes, and Chian wine,  
Green bursting figs, and tunnies steep'd in brine.

—M. Arnold.

After a night of tempest the dawn broke livid and lowering over a shallow sea churned into a yeasty foam. Through a gap in the sand dunes one caught a glimpse of the North Sea tearing at the buck-thorn and bent, whose tough, wiry roots bind these drifting sands into a strong—but not always sure—defence against the deadly alliance of high tide and hurricane. For this is the coast where the sea has broken through, time and again, and notably in 1571, the year of a memorable disaster, one of whose tragic incidents inspired Jean Ingelow's familiar poem—the year when "Boston belles" played "uppe" *The Brides of Enderby*, when, "my sonne's wife Elizabeth (a sweeter woman ne'er drew breath) and her "pretty bairns," as if in obedience to her man's bitter cry,

"O come in life, or come in death!  
O lost! my love, Elizabeth,"  
was washed up dead at his "doore," with "her pretty bairns in fast embrace,"  
"ere yet the early dawn was clear."

Tragedy is always knocking at the door of sea-folk. Through the winter months those pitiful headlines recur with painful iteration—they record the bitter price paid for the Dover sole which you crave for breakfast, O Midas, and son of Midas!

Now there is no denying that fish and fishermen have always played an important part in our national economy—a fact which has just been impressed upon me by the irruption of the lady of the house with the query, "Can you eat fish for lunch?" Knowing her skill in the cooking of all manner of fish the reply is a prompt "Yes," accompanied by the not irrelevant reflection that we as a nation might make much better use than we do of the wholesome food provided by our fisherfolk at so much risk and discomfort to themselves.

Nowhere is waste and folly more rampant than in the distribution, preparation, and consumption of fish. Who has not heard of whole cargoes destroyed or converted into fertiliser to avoid a glut on the market? Who has not experienced the difficulty of getting a fresh whiting at a



## Credit Research Library.

The following books, issued by the Pollak Foundation for Economic Research in America, are being added to the stock of this Library.

They have not been written with the intention of supporting the Douglas Credit Theorem, but they bring into most lucid review facts and figures which will be invaluable to those who desire to see that Theorem related in detail to existing business motivation and practice.

The books are complementary to the literature sponsored by the Social Credit Movement, because of the fact that, whereas Douglas has isolated and synthesized the fundamental principles of Accrediting and Accounting production and distribution, these writers have assembled and presented just the kind of statistical information and practical every-day argument that will impel business men to seek for a constructive economic policy such as Major Douglas has propounded.

**COSTS AND PROFITS.** By H. B. Hastings, of Yale University. Price, 10s. 6d. Postage, 6d. This book offers a new analysis of the causes of business depressions. It attempts, by a process of accounting, to show precisely how deficiencies in consumer purchasing power arise in the course of business.

**MONEY.** By W. T. Foster and W. Catchings. Price, 15s. Postage, 8d. Mr. Foster, formerly President of the Reed College, is now Director of the Pollak Foundation for Economic Research. Mr. Catchings, formerly President of the Central Foundry Company and of the Sloss Sheffield Steel and Iron Company, is now a member of Goldman, Sachs and Company, and a director of numerous industrial corporations. This book attempts to show the fundamental difference between a barter economy and a money economy; to show how business depressions and unemployment arise out of that difference. It traces the circuit flow of money from consumer back to consumer, and the obstruction in the flow. It is a foundation for the work entitled "Profits," next quoted.

**PROFITS.** By W. T. Foster and W. Catchings. Price 17s. Postage, 9d. This book, in the authors' words, "is the only considerable attempt to present the statistical proof that industry does not disburse to consumers enough money to buy the goods that are produced." The following is a summary of their conclusions:—

"Progress toward greater production is retarded because consumer buying does not keep pace with production. Consumer buying lags for two reasons: first, because industry does not disburse to consumers enough money to buy the goods produced; second, because consumers, under the necessity of saving, cannot spend even as much money as they receive. There is not an even flow of money from producer to consumer, and from consumer back to producer. The expansion of the volume of money does not fully make up the deficit, for money is expanded mainly to facilitate the production of goods, and the goods must be sold to consumers for more money than the expansion has provided. Furthermore, the savings of corporations and individuals are not used to purchase the goods already in the markets, but to bring about the production of more goods. Under the established system, therefore, we make progress only while we are filling the shelves with goods which must either remain on the shelves as stock in trade or be sold at a loss, and while we are building more industrial equipment than we can use. Inadequacy of consumer income is therefore, the main reason why we do not long continue to produce the wealth which natural resources, capital facilities, improvements in the arts, and the self-interest of employers and employees would otherwise enable us to produce. Chiefly because of shortage of consumer demand, both capital and labour restrict output, and nations engage in those struggles for outside markets and spheres of commercial influence which are the chief causes of war."

The Pollak Foundation offers a prize of five thousand dollars for the best adverse criticism of this book.

THE CREDIT RESEARCH LIBRARY, 70, HIGH HOLBORN, LONDON, W.C.1. Telephone: Chancery 8470.

### FORTHCOMING MEETINGS.

December 11 to 14, Friday to Monday.—Lecture School on "The Economic Causes of Antagonisms To-day" at High Leigh, Hoddesdon, under the auspices of the Friends' Peace Committee. Study Outlines from Bertram Picard. Applications for enrolment (fee 2s. 6d.) from Mary E. Thorne: both at 136, Bishopsgate, E.C.2.

Wednesday, December 16.—The Central London Group at THE NEW AGE Office, 70 High Holborn. Address: "The Advertising Fallacy," by G. S. Reinganum. Discussion. Open to the public. Time, 7 p.m.

## The Social Credit Movement.

Supporters of the Social Credit Movement contend that under present conditions the purchasing power in the hands of the community is chronically insufficient to buy the whole product of industry. This is because the money required to finance capital production, and created by the banks for that purpose, is regarded as borrowed from them, and, therefore, in order that it may be repaid, is charged into the price of consumers' goods. It is a vital fallacy to treat new money thus created by the banks as a repayable loan, without crediting the community, on the strength of whose resources the money was created, with the value of the resulting new capital resources. This has given rise to a defective system of national loan accountancy, resulting in the reduction of the community to a condition of perpetual scarcity, and bringing them face to face with the alternatives of widespread unemployment of men and machines, as at present, or of international complications arising from the struggle for foreign markets.

The Douglas Social Credit Proposals would remedy this defect by increasing the purchasing power in the hands of the community to an amount sufficient to provide effective demand for the whole product of industry. This, of course, cannot be done by the orthodox method of creating new money, prevalent during the war, which necessarily gives rise to the "vicious spiral" of increased currency, higher prices, higher wages, higher costs, still higher prices, and so on. The essentials of the scheme are the simultaneous creation of new money and the regulation of the price of consumers' goods at their real cost of production (as distinct from their apparent financial cost under the present system). The technique for effecting this is fully described in Major Douglas's books mentioned below.

The adoption of this scheme would result in an unprecedented improvement in the standard of living of the population by the absorption at home of the present unsaleable output, and would, therefore, eliminate the dangerous struggle for foreign markets. Unlike other suggested remedies, these proposals do not call for financial sacrifice on the part of any section of the community, while, on the other hand, they widen the scope for individual enterprise.

Attention is directed particularly to the following amongst the considerable literature on the subject:—

- "Through Consumption to Prosperity," by Arthur Brenton, 2d.
- "The Community's Credit," by C. Marshall Hattersley, 5s.
- "Social Credit," by C. H. Douglas, 7s. 6d.
- "Real Wealth and Financial Poverty," by Capt. W. Adams, 7s. 6d.
- "Cartesian Economics," by Professor F. Soddy, 6d.
- "The Flaw in the Price System," by P. W. Martin, 4s. 6d.
- "The Deadlock in Finance," by A. E. Powell, 5s.
- "Economic Democracy," by C. H. Douglas, 6s.
- "Credit Power and Democracy," by C. H. Douglas, 7s. 6d.
- "These Present Discontents: The Labour Party and Social Credit," by C. H. Douglas, 1s.
- "The Solution of Unemployment," by W. H. Wakinshaw, 10s.

A preliminary set of five pamphlets, together with a complete catalogue of the literature, will be sent post free for 6d. on application to the Credit Research Library, 70, High Holborn, W.C.1, from whom the above-mentioned books may be obtained.

The undermentioned are willing to correspond with persons interested:—

- Bournemouth: W. V. Cornish, 77, Maxwell Road.
- Dublin: T. Kennedy, 43, Dawson Street.
- London: H. Cousens, 1 Holly Hill, Hampstead, N.W.3; Major C. H. Douglas, 8, Fig Tree Court, Temple, E.C.4; E. A. Dowson, 14, Dulwich Road, S.E.24; D. Wemyss Lewis, 176, Camden Road, N.W.1; E. Wright, 38, Bromar Road, S.E.5.
- Manchester: F. Gardner, 24, Mansfield Avenue, near Blackley.
- Middlesbrough: Mrs. E. M. Dunn, Linden Grove, Linthorpe.
- Newcastle-on-Tyne: W. H. Wakinshaw, 12, Lovaine Crescent.
- Rotherham: R. J. Dalkin, Wickersley.
- Hon. Secretary, W. A. Willox, 70, High Holborn, London, W.C.1.

Published by the Proprietor (ARTHUR BRENTON), 70 High Holborn, London, W.C.1, and printed for him by THE ARBUS PRESS, LIMITED, Temple-avenue and Tudor-street, London E.C.4.