

# THE NEW AGE

INCORPORATING "CREDIT POWER"  
A WEEKLY REVIEW OF POLITICS, LITERATURE, AND ART

No. 1767] NEW SERIES Vol. XXXIX. No. 12. THURSDAY, JULY 22, 1926. [Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper.] **SIXPENCE**

## CONTENTS.

	PAGE		PAGE
NOTES OF THE WEEK . . . . .	125	THE TESTAMENT OF WORDSWORTH.—I. By Richard Church. . . . .	133
Captain Peter Wright and the Bath Club. The fall of the Briand Ministry. The <i>Daily Mail's</i> plea for the cancellation of international debts. Mr. Baldwin's jibe at the Churches. (Editorial) . . . . .	126	DRAMA. By Paul Banks <i>The Years Between: Everyman.</i> . . . .	133
WALL STREET AND THE BRITISH EMPIRE. (Editorial) . . . . .	128	MUSIC. By Kaikhosru Sorabji <i>Otello: L'Heure Espagnol: Gianni Schicchi.</i> . . . .	134
THE CHURCH AND THE MINES (Editorial) . . . . .	129	ART. By Ernest Collings <i>Foreign Art at Millbank.</i> . . . .	134
THE CONDITION OF ENGLAND.—II. By Grant Madison Hervey . . . . .	129	REVIEWS <i>The End of Laissez Faire. Parables. The Encyclopædia of Furniture.</i> . . . .	135
THE PRISON PAINT. By Philippe Mairet . . . . .	130	LETTERS TO THE EDITOR <i>From H. B. S. L. and "That Sufferer."</i> . . . .	135
ANTHROPOLOGICAL ECONOMICS.—III. Revolution I. By V. A. Demant . . . . .	131	CARICATURES. By "Cyrano" . . . . .	136
THE TRUE INWARDNESS OF CATHOLIC SOCIOLOGY.—V. By N. E. Egerton Swann . . . . .	132	VERSE <i>Fires. By A. Newberry Choyce (132).</i> . . . .	—

## NOTES OF THE WEEK.

The Jury in the King's Bench Division last Thursday awarded Captain Peter Wright damages against the Bath Club for expelling him without affording him the opportunity of putting his case, apropos of his charge against the late Mr. Gladstone. Mr. Justice Horridge, in his summing up, said:

"While a public man gets the emoluments and the rewards of a great position, he lays himself open to the criticism of the public in a way which such criticism can be properly levelled, whereas a man in private life is not so exposed. This is a case where a man has occupied a great public position and where his family must put up with all proper criticism of him as a public man and upon his private character so far as it reflects upon his public position."

On the larger issues raised by Captain Wright's action, we commented at some length in our Notes of August 6 last year. The true interest of the public is not concerned with what any great statesman does in his private life: but it may be vitally concerned with what he may be obliged to do in his public life to buy the silence of those who know his secret. Captain Wright's assumption that Gladstone's association with Olga Novikoff was the main cause of his anti-Turkish policy may be dismissed; for it was never in Gladstone's power to initiate foreign policy. That is the privilege of the banker, not the politician. The whole point is that if the association was illicit, and the secret was not impenetrable, it could have been used to coerce Gladstone into administering a policy of which he disapproved. Of what use to the public is a statesman who places himself in a position of not being free to exercise his own judgment? How can any reforms be effectively advanced through the instrumentality of administrators who have been bound over for judgment for moral lapses by a secret high financial judiciary which objects to those reforms? Take the now proved necessity for a radical change in the financial policy of this country. Those who have taken the trouble to understand the proof encounter everywhere in high political places what appears to be inability to see it. One really has to ask oneself whether it is that these personages cannot see it—or must not? "Who did sin, this man or his parents, that he was born blind?" There is

no reputation in existence worth a single day's delay in commencing an investigation into the economic effects of existing financial policy. To charge Captain Wright with garbage-raking is beside the point. The only criticism he is open to is for having explored the garbage too late to produce any beneficial result. Moreover, there should not be any garbage to be raked; nor should the raking be left for any private individual to perform. We have a Psychical Research Society, one of whose functions is to rake over the garbage-heap of fraud. We need a similar body to do the same thing with regard to charges whispered about living statesmen. It is not good enough for the Rt. Hon. Mr. So-and-So to say he will not condescend to meet such calumnies. The question whether they are true or not is a public, not a private one; for if they are true, and he is buying the silence of those who can destroy him, it is the public who pay the price. Immediately, therefore, things begin to be gossiped about in London clubs, and Fleet Street public houses it should be the duty of some disinterested body to drag them out into daylight and compel their investigation.

The Ministry of M. Briand fell last Saturday. The Chamber had before it a motion to give M. Caillaux plenary powers to deal with the financial situation. M. Herriot, the President of the Chamber, vacated the chair to take part in the debate as leader of the Radicals. In moving the previous question he claimed to speak not as the leader of any faction, but as the President of the Chamber and the sworn guardian of the Constitution and the rights of Parliaments. He could not vote for the Government's project, as it placed France under the menace of a dictatorship. There could be no other meaning to this Plenary Powers Bill. In a great oratorical outburst he adjured M. Briand not to try to govern France without Parliament so as to deserve its confidence and that of the country. M. Briand immediately replied. France, he declared, stood on the brink of an abyss. The Government must have plenary powers to avert disaster. It was impossible to discuss the Government's plans in detail. It would

take days; and hours were vital. The Chamber must weigh the terrible responsibility it would assume by overthrowing the Government, creating panic, and making disaster irretrievable. Notwithstanding this warning the Chamber rejected the motion by 285 votes to 243; whereupon the Government resigned. On the same day two American eagles took off from the Statue of Liberty. Mr. Mellon, Secretary of the United States Treasury, and Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan set sail on the Majestic for Europe on a "vacation." Meanwhile their colleagues, Mr. Montagu Norman, Governor of the Bank of England; Mr. Benjamin Strong, Governor of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York; M. Moreau, Governor of the Bank of France—newly appointed by M. Caillaux at the instigation of America; and Dr. Schacht, Director of the Reichsbank, are converging on Paris. Great things are afoot. But when these birds eventually gather together, will the French corpse be there? Until last Saturday it looked like it; for we had received information to the effect that we need hope nothing from M. Caillaux. But now? The French governmental system is like the Cheshire cat on the tree. Every time the money monopolists steal up towards it with their bag and brick the animal dissolves into a grin. It is only when they stand off again that the whole cat reappears. The next thing for them to try is to abandon guile and hurl the brick at it in between two of its immaterialisations. But that requires nice judgment; besides which, even if they hit it square and drop it, there is no certainty that it will wait where it falls. Perhaps a little more patience is the best plan. A cat has nine lives; so let the bankers hope for some luck when the ninth French administration comes into being.

The *Daily Mail* of July 19 prominently tabulates a list of "Cold Facts" concerning the American debt. Among them are the following:

"Of the £935,000,000 which Great Britain is now repaying the United States in gold at the rate of over £37,000,000 a year—

Every penny was spent in buying American goods. Prices (which were high) were fixed by the American Government.

Income tax and other taxes were collected on those prices and had to be paid by the British.

Profits on the goods went into American pockets.

A British proposal to repay American goods with British goods was rejected.

The British Government in 1922 proposed to the United States to cancel all the war debts. The United States declined."

In a long leading article entitled "The Crushing Effect of the United States Debt" these facts are elaborated. The fall of the Briand Ministry is cited as one of the consequences of the American debt burden. "It must be something of a shock," says the *Daily Mail*, "to many Americans who cross to this side of the Atlantic to find that the common view of the letters 'U.S.' throughout Europe is that they stand for 'Uncle Shylock.'" It concludes by reflecting that there would have been none of "this miserable, debt-collecting business . . . if the United States had listened to the proposals made in Lord Balfour's Note and agreed to a general cancellation of war debts."

Readers will recognise in this array of facts and arguments an excellent paraphrase of Clause I. of Major Douglas's series of suggestions to Mr. Lloyd George dated September 11, 1922. Four years was a long time to wait for them to be broadcast for the instruction of the British public: but better late than later. Needless to say, we endorse the view put forward by the *Daily Mail*, but wonder on what financial principles it will sustain its plea for cancellation. Already Mr. Mellon, Secretary of the United States Treasury, has countered it by pointing out that the more generosity America shows to Europe the more taxes Americans will have to pay to meet

the Liberty Bonds. He said last Sunday, just as he was leaving for Europe:—

"If these foreign debts are cancelled the United States is not released from the obligation to pay the very bonds which were sold to our citizens to make advances to foreign countries."

We await with extreme interest the *Daily Mail's* reply to this; for its present attitude amounts to a plea that America shall *turn her loan to Great Britain into a subsidy*, and also amounts to an undertaking that Great Britain in her turn will act similarly in regard to the much greater amount which she lent to her Allies. Great Britain is to receive a subsidy of £900,000,000 odd by America, and is to give one of £2,000,000,000 odd to her debtors. If the *Daily Mail* has a scheme whereby this can be done without damage to British taxpayers, it ought to make it known at once. The Coal Commission can't think of one in respect of the coal subsidy, and would no doubt be glad of expert advice. Whatever the *Daily Mail's* idea may turn out to be, our appetite is whetted by one passage in its leading article on the question—"The credit of the cosmopolitan financier is everywhere at a complete discount. No one any longer believes in him and his nostrums."

Mr. Baldwin, at Norwich, was guilty of what the *Daily News* justly calls an "ill-timed jibe" against the Churches. He said that if he saw it announced that the Federation of British Industries was trying to bring about a reunion of Particular Baptists with Anglo-Catholics, he should not be optimistic, but should not despair. Mr. Baldwin's argument amounts to this: that because a Federation of Artists' Colourmen could not hope to bring about a reunion of classical and romanticist painters, therefore a committee of classical and romanticist painters cannot hope to settle a question about pigments. We quote a passage from Major Douglas's address at the Society of Friends' Conference at Swanwick. Speaking of three possible alternative policies for a world economic organisation, he formulated his own in these terms:

"And the third is that economic activity is simply a functional activity of men and women in the world; that the end of man, while unknown, is something towards which most rapid progress is made by the free expansion of individuality; and that, therefore, economic organisation is most efficient when it most easily and rapidly supplies economic wants without encroaching on other functional activities."

In this short formula is contained the whole case for the Church's intervention in industrial problems and against the industrialist's intervention in religious problems.

## Wall Street and the British Empire.

Sir Oswald Stoll contributes an article to the *Referee* of July 11 on the international situation. It begins with a long extract from an article by Mr. Frederick Peabody, an eminent New England lawyer, which appeared in the *United States Press*, exhorting the Government to cancel all debts arising from loans to the Allies. Commenting on this Mr. Stoll imagines American citizens wondering why America should be so grasping towards Great Britain; and proceeds to answer the conundrum thus:

"The reason is Wall Street's plan of World Peace. The plan involves, in an economic sense, the redistribution of the British Empire, largely to the United States in respect of Canada; to Germany in respect of Eastern Africa, from Cairo to the Cape; to Japan in respect of Australia; and to a Germanised Russia in respect of India."

The method of accomplishing this is to destroy the trade of Great Britain, and so deprive her of the

power to defend the Empire; upon which Wall Street could make appropriate economic agreements with all the countries of the world. Sir Oswald thinks that the concept of a United States of Europe, in an economic sense, is a part of this "treacherous objective." Turning to the chief force likely to obstruct this plan, he introduces Mussolini.

"Mr. George Harvey, who not long ago made known his opinion that Great Britain was industrially doomed, recently displayed much chagrin, in the *North American Review* of June-August, at the apparent fact that Mussolini is no mere lath painted to look like iron. . . . Behind the chagrin there is perhaps an uneasy realisation that if Great Britain should not support the rehabilitation of the Roman Empire of the Mediterranean and the unification of the Latin races under the Pope, with peace established by Mussolini between the Vatican and a new Italian Empire; and if Great Britain should not support these aims of Mussolini's with a rapidly developing British Empire more closely united than ever before, the Wall Street plot in the name of World Peace must mean not peace but a war of colossal proportions . . . a war intended in its inception only to destroy the obstructive power of Mussolini, but one which in its progress would shake the world."

Sir Oswald points to Mussolini's speech to Germany on the Brenner Pass as indicating his determination to block the way of Germany through Austria, Greece, and Egypt into Africa. He points to the recent Russo-German agreement as indicating a preparatory step of Russo-German designs upon India; and refers to Russian threats to Japan in Manchuria and Korea as suggesting a tendency to force Japan back on Australia and the Pacific Islands for its areas of national expansion. He speaks of America's intention to dictate a World Peace which would confine Italy to its present boundaries of the Libyan Desert. Resistance to this is implied in Italy's present conversations with France and Spain in regard to Africa, and with Greece and Asia Minor in regard to the Mediterranean shores. He concludes thus:

"In defending his own country's interests thus, the man who is blocking the way to the dismemberment of the British Empire as dictated by Wall Street is not any British Statesman, but Mussolini! Sir Austin Chamberlain has shown some slight tendency toward the cultivation of Mussolini's friendship. That is the only British statesmanship at the moment worthy of the name."

He therefore calls for "a powerful England, a rapidly developing British Empire, supporting Italy in its determination to save the Latin races as the means to save itself." At present "bad industrial finance . . . is making England feeble," and "the whole question turns upon the speedy application of the economic freedom of both industry and finance." Accompanying Mr. Stoll's article is a map of the world showing the projected allotment of Empire territory which he describes. The reader is asked to "note the isolation of Italy without control of the Mediterranean Sea, and without a Holy Alliance between the Vatican, Italy, France, Spain, South America, and the Latin races throughout the world."

This survey has several points of interest. As we have often asserted in these Notes, High Finance is pacifist. During war the political government is armed, and the temper of its citizens is such as to endorse in advance any step it may take to ensure the successful outcome of hostilities. And since an adequate provision of credit is a prime condition of success, the banker has to come to heel along with every other private enterprise. True, that in the past he has been able to secure his own terms for the supply of credit, but that has been because the Government has not chosen to use its temporarily supreme power to dictate terms. The point is that the credit itself has been forthcoming: and this because it has been needed for purposes approved by a whole nation in arms. Nobody would have stopped a moment to listen to warnings against "unsound finance." It is only when peace returns that these warnings are lis-

tened to. And then it is these very warnings which are heeded beyond all other considerations. But High Finance cannot count upon getting back into power at the end of a future war. The next war will finish its pretensions for ever. Public education in finance is sufficiently advanced already to enable us to rely upon that. Moreover, as a matter of fact, even in 1914, long before the New Economic theory was first promulgated, proposals were made privately to the Government from one influential quarter for financing war production on lines involving national price control coupled with a guarantee of remuneration to producers based on quantity of output, and not on the proceeds of privately fixed prices under the "law of supply and demand." Apart from that, it seems impossible that in the event of another war the British people would miss the significance of seeing the credit system tapped to the extent of thousands of millions—a credit system which they are at present asked to believe will not stand a paltry miners' subsidy without collapsing in ruin. It is now a race between credit monopolists and peoples. If High Finance can attain to the position of an armed Government in a disarmed world of nations, it can afford to be found out, for nobody could resist it. In that case it could set the world to work on a workhouse diet and under a prison discipline. What it would do then we need not speculate. It might be that it would begin to wonder what was the use of its dominion. But the question does not matter. There is no possibility of that end being reached. High Finance is in a dilemma. It cannot induce the Great Powers to disarm without first providing them all with room for economic expansion. But to provide the room for some it has to take it from others; and the result will be not less distrust but more—and more armaments. Sir Oswald Stoll's article illustrates the difficulty. Whether his theory is accepted in all its detail, it certainly fits in as a whole with the probabilities of the case. Any attempt by High Finance to set up a world government based on peace must of necessity involve a redistribution of territory. So far as the British Empire is expected to form the chief pool for the purpose, we think Mr. Stoll underestimates the genius of John Bull for eventually blundering into the position of top dog. He may appear transfixed by the signs and passes of schemers all round him, but let any of them offer to smooth his coat for him and they will quickly discover that his pockets are woven of nerves. At present his is the most powerful naval fleet in the Mediterranean. He despatched ships thither when there was a rumpus in Egypt. The rumpus subsided, but the ships did not come back. Not long ago he took a sudden interest in the dead languages, and sent the Prince of Wales to find out from the A.B.C. Alliance how they pronounced Latin words in South America. Since then Brazil and Spain have conceived the idea of leaving the League of Nations. Meanwhile Mr. Austen Chamberlain has made little journeys into Italy and France, presumably for extended etymological researches. And while the hammering of Latin currencies is going on in Europe, hammering of another kind is going on in Singapore. Then there is a gurgling sound in Tokyo—which some gossips say proceeds from where British and Japanese aircraft engineers are tasting whisky and talking about prohibition. What is in the wind no one knows, but one might make the guess that manœuvres are being carried out to ensure that when the next war breaks out, not Britain, but the United States will be first involved. When Britain declared war on Germany Mr. Page marked in a despatch that the Empire has fallen into "our" (America's) hands. On a similar line of reasoning, if America declared war on Japan, our own ambassador at Washington would be able to make the true remark that the power of determining British financial policy had at last fallen again into the hands of the British people.

## The Church and the Mines.

The intervention of the Church leaders in the coal dispute is a matter of great importance. They were first seen by Sir Arthur Steel-Maitland. They afterwards met representatives of the owners for whom Sir Adam Nimmo was the chief spokesman. Then on the 14th inst. they interviewed Mr. Herbert Smith, Mr. Cook, and Mr. Richardson. As a result of this interview the Bishop of Lichfield was able to say in a letter to Mr. Baldwin, dated the 16th, that "it seemed to us that their (the miners' leaders) attitude towards the (Samuel) Report exhibited a distinct advance on any previous proposals which they have shown themselves ready to accept."

And it was. For the Bishop had documentary evidence in the form of a signed statement of the terms on which the Miners' Federation would order immediate resumption of work. The main terms provide for wages and conditions to be the same as those in force in April; a continuance of the subsidy for a period not exceeding four months; a reorganisation scheme to be put into operation at the earliest possible moment; at the end of the defined period, if disagreements still exist, representatives of both parties to form a joint board and appoint an independent chairman whose award shall be binding on them. Not only did the three leaders sign this document, but expressed their readiness "to make every endeavour to assist in the reorganisation of the mining industry to ensure its success." One can imagine the satisfaction with which the Church leaders' committee received this tangible and hopeful response to their overtures. They had at last induced the Miners' Federation to renounce what has continuously been called their barren negative attitude. Immediately the Bishop of Lichfield asked Mr. Baldwin to receive a deputation comprising himself and "other representatives of the Anglican and Free Churches who are acting with me," to discuss the new situation. Mr. Baldwin promptly replied according to the request, but declaring definitely that as regards the subsidy—

"This is a suggestion to which the Government could not possibly assent, and it would, therefore, be useless for me to communicate the present proposals to the owners."

He commits himself to one specific reason.

"Apart from any other consideration, the disastrous effect of this prolonged stoppage on the national finances has made any further subsidy in aid of wages out of the question."

He adds a debating point, scoring it off a remark made by the Bishop's committee, to the effect that they believed the solution was in the adoption of the Royal Commission's Report *in its entirety*.

"One of the most emphatic recommendations of the Commission was that there should be no more subsidy." He proceeds to quote the Commission's reason for that recommendation as follows:

"It is indefensible," they say, "that the people engaged in other industries should be taxed in order to provide profits for the employers or to maintain the wages of the workers in the particular industry affected."

Then he concludes:

"With no less emphasis the Commissioners stated that if the disaster impending over the industry was to be averted an immediate reduction of labour costs either in wages or hours was indispensable."

One point will be clearly appreciated. The "barren negative" indictment now lies against Mr. Baldwin in the first instance, and ultimately against the Coal Commission. Mr. Baldwin may be dismissed from the case. We have been told on authority which we respect that privately he has all along been opposed to the cessation of the subsidy. Whether this is so or not, he is only a mouthpiece of the financiers. It must be emphasised that the Coal Commission was a

bankers' commission. Let us repeat the names of the members:

Sir Herbert Samuel, once a member of the bullion house Samuel Montagu and Co.  
General Lawrence, of Glyn, Mills and Co.  
Mr. Kenneth Lee, of Tootal Broadhurst and Co. and a financial expert.  
Sir William Beveridge, director of the London School of Economics.

For an extended reference to these gentlemen's activities and affiliations we refer readers to our issue of September 10, 1925. It is sufficient here to categorise three of them as representing high finance and banking, while the fourth is merely an expounder and defender of the principles on which they do business. And what is their business? Partly subsidy-creation and partly subsidy-brokering. In other words they are credit manufacturers and dealers. We are not going to repeat our analysis of the process by which credit is created. It was set out in our issue of May 13.\* The point we make here and would be prepared to make good before these gentlemen is that whenever bank credit is created and lent for any purpose whatever, the whole community is invisibly taxed to the amount in question. Therefore the Commission's argument against the continued coal subsidy applies to every other phase of loan finance as well.

A disinterested expert analysis of our national credit and price system will reveal the fact that the coal subsidy was being repaid by the general body of consumers in their day to day expenditure on goods and services during the period over which it was issued. There is therefore no justification for it still to persist as a debit entry against these same people in their role as taxpayers.

It is not to be expected of the Churches that they shall conduct such an analysis, but we hope they will use all their influence to bring about a thorough examination of the existing system of creating credit and recording debt. Let them for the moment remind Mr. Baldwin that the question of the subsidy was a *chose jugée* before the opening of the Coal Commission's sittings, and that the Commissioners, having called no evidence on the subject, were not entitled to embody any finding on it in their Report.

## Finance Enquiry Petition Committee

### PRELIMINARY LIST OF SUPPORTERS.

Rev. F. Lewis Donaldson, Canon of Westminster.  
Prof. Frederick Soddy, F.R.S.  
Sir Henry Slesser, K.C., M.P.  
G. K. Chesterton, Esq.  
Rev. R. F. Horton, D.D.  
Dr. Jane Walker.  
A. W. F. Alexander, Chairman } Society of Friends Committee  
Mary E. Thorne, Secretary } on War and Social Order.  
J. St. Loe Strachey, Esq.  
Richard Wallhead, Esq., M.P. (Merthyr Tydfil).  
Sydney Pascall (James Pascall Ltd.)  
Montague Fordham (Rural Reconstruction Association.)

This Committee has been formed to organise the collection of signatures to a Petition for an Enquiry into Finance.

It is not connected with any particular scheme of financial reform, and its object can therefore be consistently supported by everyone who believes that the fundamental cause of the economic deadlock is financial. Copies of the Petition, together with leaflets and sets of instructions, are immediately available.

Write to THE SECRETARY, Finance Enquiry Petition Committee, 324, Abbey House, Westminster, S.W.1

\* This was our (emergency) strike issue of 4 pp. Copies are still available at 6d. per dozen and readers will find them invaluable for distribution at this juncture.

## The Condition of England.

By Grant Madison Hervey.

### II.—ECONOMIC SMALLPOX.

The matter with A. R. Orage, as I understand it, is that, at the psychological instant, when England was virtually at his feet, he lost his nerve. This was the direct result of running his mind in two compartments. On one side of his intellectual bulkhead he was a first-class West European, Aristotelian to the last rivet; on the other side of the bulkhead he was a second-class imitation Hindoo, everlastingly trafficking with *Upanishads*. Now, no West European can ever make a success of life—of his own life, or of his nation's life—as an imitation Hindoo. And so, accordingly, A. R. Orage lost his nerve. His will to wrestle with England gave out. The lazy and sensuous Hindoo-ascetic side of him said, "What's the use?" And the other, or West European side of him, said, "All right. I repudiate the English herd. Henceforth, no more economics. The *Mahabharata* and the *Jnana Bodhini* for me!"

Now the ruling Dravidian practices of the English Press, in relation to the diseased industrial and economic condition of England, bear about as much relation to the necessities of the case as Tamil medicine does to the exigencies of smallpox in India. Orage knows this. It was his duty, in England, to stick to his guns, and—like a true West European scientific journalist—blow that Davidian herd of *Kanji-fakirs* clean out of the water. Englishmen love fighters who stick to their guns. And *Kanji*, I might with benefit explain, is that kind of rice-and-water which is distributed in India to the Sudra people in honour of a visit to the village by Mari Ammam, the Smallpox Goddess. In other words, it is the direct equivalent of Baldwin's British subsidy for coal. One expected a man like Orage, full of Indian lore, to point out that fact. One expected him to say to England, "Attention! The age of Economic Smallpox is here. The nation, if it wills, can be cured by the Douglas prophylaxis. If not, if it sticks to the Dravidian cold rice and the Devil-dances of the British Press, the nation will surely die."

Orage, with all his knowledge of India, has failed to challenge England to a definite act of choice in regard to this issue of life and death. His articles in the *American Commonwealth*, however good—and anything that Mr. Orage writes is always good—smell too much of *Archana* and *Pujari*. One expects of an Orage that he shall engage himself in something better than so much mere Sudra dancing under the *pandal*. After all, he holds Brahminical rank. And I, for one, object to the sight of one of our greatest Brahminical leaders dancing for the amusement of mere low-caste Americans, beyond the seas. If England were well, the thing might be forgiven. But England is sick unto death. It is a sheer case of economic Maha-Mayi with England. The *Daily Mail*, Dravidian to the core, believes that this economic smallpox of Britain's can be cured by putting up a bruised and battered big brass pot: to wit, the Baldwin wage-reduction policy. *The Times*, another true Tamil organ, suggests that the mouth of the pot should be plugged with a bunch of margosa leaves. And the rest of the British Press, so far as I can decipher here in Australia, insists with genuine Sudra wisdom that the bunch of margosa must be not torn off. And where is Orage? Dancing, himself, beneath the *pandal*; instead of exposing these low-caste Hindoo fakirs who call themselves the responsible conductors of the British Press.

He says, in one of his articles reprinted from the *American Commonwealth*, that only the extremely able few who own nothing and control everything, know

better than to mislead the world by phrases. If that be so, then why is it left to me—a mere ex-convict upon the furthest margin of the British Empire—to call the English coal-subsidy by its proper name? The *Kanji*-policy of Baldwin; abandoned, re-adopted—how long is that Tamil sort of treatment for the economic smallpox of England likely to last? Until a MAN speaks. Only until somebody, quite certain of his aim, says boldly to the massed manhood and womanhood of England: "Have done with this Gospel of Big Brass Pots! Have done with the futile margosa leaves of Fleet-street! Carry the sick Nation overseas, into the sunshine of Australia, and the Nation will not die but live."

That is my policy. That is my plan for the saving of England. But I would not give five *markals* of rice, mixed with *dhal*, for England's chance of recovery unless England herself take hold of Australia and rule it with imperative hands. I repudiate the Australian herd of writers, politicians, preachers and others because they have husks instead of hearts. Their skulls contain dried peas. Alone—a man utterly solitary in my nation—I at least perceive the nature of England's disease. She is pitted with an economic smallpox whose pustules burst out in the shape of strikes. Not by the costly dispensing of rice-gruel subsidies to the Sudra industry of England can these vesicles be delayed in their development, or the patient's agonies be brought to an end. In India, I know, when there is smallpox abroad, big shallow-bottomed *chatties* filled with oil are fixed on tall posts. Thick wicks are placed in this oil and lighted. By the light of these primitive lamps a Prime Minister and a clown appear. Similarly, in the latter role, a Church appears at the bedside of stricken England. Of his particular role, offering betel-nut and frankincense to himself, there can be no doubt.

Men do not often dare to avow, even to themselves, the slow progress reason has made in their minds. But they are ready to follow it if it be presented to them in a lively and striking manner, that forces them to recognise it. One does not have to be a Condorcet in order to know that. I submit, then, that it is unreasonable to attempt any longer to physic a sick England upon Dravidian lines. I urge, with respect, that the Tamil medicinal methods of Mr. Baldwin and the *Daily Mail* are out of date. I would even suggest that Major Astor, of the *London Times*, or thereabouts, is not the best European economic dermatologist available to-day. The printers of England did well to shut the mouths, even for a day, of all those quacks. As a Nihilist of the British Empire, sworn to bring in the New Age, and to annihilate the whole Dravidian gang of *Kanji-fakirs*, I demand a return to constructive reason. I demand Orage.

### PRESS EXTRACTS.

"The revival of the Iron Railway Manufacturers' Association for the control of export trade throughout the world was accomplished on March 11, and negotiations are already going forward to apportion the various export markets of the world among the six member countries. These are said to be the United States, Great Britain, France, Germany, Belgium and Luxembourg. A denial of American membership is said to have been made by Judge Gary, but it was also reported that American industry would work through Great Britain, as membership might be considered a violation of the trust laws of the United States. . . . England would not be entitled to the 45 per cent. of the world's export market which the others are said to be ready to accord her, and as a result half of this quota is said to be for the American interests. France and Germany are to receive about 20 per cent. each, it is said. . . . There is to be no limitation of production in the member countries, it is indicated, but this may come in future negotiations. Previously it had been reported that the combination had been defeated by the fear of over-production."—*New York Herald*, March 27.

## The Prison Paint.

By Philippe Mairet.

"We have changed the colour," said the Governor, "it's cheerful, don't you think?"

Only one of his hearers knew the full meaning of his words: a man who stood a little apart, in a tremor that no one detected. That particular prison was new to him, indeed; but the machine of punishment is standardised in type. The lofty hall, with tiers of iron galleries guarding the little doors of cells, was what he knew of old; but startlingly transfigured with the hues of snow and sky: for the walls were white with distemper, the iron rails all smiling with cerulean paint, and the tops of the walls, where sun from the skylight touched them, dazzled like snow-capped Alps above a cool ravine. While the others were still daunted by the grimness of the forms, he was awakened into happiness by the colour. Those forbidding shapes were bitten into his memory with indelible darkness; they had haunted him like a croprophilous nightmare, in their former colours of dung and death. But now, that sombre yellow with its dado of dirty brown, divided by a wide band of mourning black, sank suddenly into a far remoter cavern of unquiet memory. He knew a quick release of joy, like that which comes when some old evil of the world is overpowered, some ancient wrong finally relegated to the past.

He heard himself talking to the others, gravely, sensibly enough: none could guess the strong emotion in him: it was like a quiet rain of happy weeping. . . . "I hope to get meals in common in the hall," said the Governor: the ladies cooing assent. To the one who remembered the dreary silence it seemed too good to be true.

One of the exercise grounds was being changed. The rings of flagstones were no more to trammel the feet of the wretched for their set three miles a day. Instead, there was a smooth and gravelled drill-ground. Yes, this, too, was an improvement. It would depend upon the kind of drill, of course . . . and the instructor.

"We hope ultimately to get the lock off the cell door," the Governor was saying—

By that time they were in the Governor's house, sitting and standing round with cups of tea. To the fears expressed by two of the gentlemen, that prisons so humane might cease to deter from crime, the Governor replied thoughtfully. No, he thought not. Prison was still a severe punishment. A man felt the loss of his liberty, suffered from the discipline and the breaking of his habits. What we were trying to do was to minimise the degradation of prison. He spoke of convicts who could be trusted to work without supervision.

He was a humane man, with a gentle eye: his keenest listener had never imagined the possibility of such a prison officer. Almost a visionary. He seemed to foresee with confidence a day when prisons would cure crime by the pure gentleness of the punishment.

"At present I could not give these concerns without such voluntary help. Truly grateful to all of you. . . . Goodbye. Goodbye." "Thank you for showing us over. . . . All very interesting." So the concert party rolled off in a special bus. All but one, they were notably gayer. That one had his reaction from the emotion of the paint and whitewash. To him the prison stones were grey and bleak again, the force behind all this humanity and gentleness seemed still grim, implacable as ever. Why, after all, so *suaviter in modo*? There is something only differently detestable in a velvet glove, when it masks the iron hand. Better to have a human hand, even in a gauntlet of steel!

Why are all our consciences scared when a man is hanged, and why have we this deep disgust for

our punishments, that makes us want to whitewash the cell and warm the steel—almost to weave the gallows-rope of silk? Is it not the knowledge that by inflicting dire circumstances on the social sinner we are simply offering human sacrifice to the comfort of the State? Since Dostoevsky has come, we know what a criminal is: that his crime is exactly his only possible true punishment, that our mechanical retributions are worse than mistaken—they are *irrelevant* to the victim's own problem. And now a new school of jurists is developing, who, perceiving that irrelevance, desire to take the moral stigma altogether out of legal punishment—to found all criminal law upon the cold necessity of social convenience, divorced from any other valuation. They would have us recognise that what we do to the offender has not a fragment of Divine authority. So it is merely an effective oblation to that "coldest of cold monsters"—the State! But, they urge, it is necessity.

That is the lie against which our spirits contend, despite its comfort. That is what gives us wretched consciences not curable at all by Hagerström's amoral view of law. It is just the sense of that necessity which gives us Galsworthy, our own groaning conscience dismally hypnotised by a sense of hopeless destiny. And at the other end of the social scale it gives the criminal himself, who, as Weininger perceived with piercing truth, is the man necessity has got a grip of, the one whose sense of freedom is extinguished. State punishment only increases crime, by a force inherent in the logic of it.

That necessity of State is the iron hand which men detest, wrapped in however many gloves of velvet. For a man carries the consciousness of the moral law within him. However he may betray it—

. . . "There's not any law  
Exceeds his knowledge, neither is it lawful  
That he should stoop to any other law."

Every man's social creed, if he could make it clear, is rooted in a notion of pure theocracy. In their hearts all men could understand a system of duties, or even of self-imposed punishment and penance. The proof of this is in the fact that a coherent system of values, established by men of value, can create a moral consciousness: that through the Brahminical code of Manu, or the Church of Christendom, a civilisation could spring out of chaos. A religion can give birth to a State. But a State cannot engender its own morale, it can but maintain its form through force, which sacrifices individuals and slowly disintegrates autonomous virtue. From this dilemma there is no escape. The more men act from fear of the State the less they fear God—that is, the less they trust in the intuition of conscience to dictate the norm of their behaviour. It is quite true that, when the fear of God is instilled into a people, they suffer the cruelties of an inner repressive force according to the measure of their ignorance and misunderstanding. But to feel the difficulty of social conduct inside one's own being is to grapple with it: to have it imposed from without is nothing but an incentive to evade it. And State punishment is not expiation. An eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth, confers upon the sinner the mystic dignity of fair payment.

Yes, by all means let us soften these rigours of repression. But for us, links as we are between animal and Superman, this problem is not soluble by sympathy alone. Its message is—hope nothing from the State. Hope only in those strong souls who will weave anew a superhuman spell of yet unheard-of values. In the magic of it we shall be heroes enough to expiate our own errors: we will even be able to dare to pardon others.

Thanks, all the same, and thanks again to him who changed the paint.

## Anthropological Economics.

By V. A. Demant, B.Litt., B.Sc.

(Fellow of the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland.)

### III.—REVOLUTION—ITS CAUSE AND CURE. I.

One of the phrases most frequently heard on the lips of those who hold revolutionary opinions is the expression: "The Present Social System." It is used to describe the complicated social structure of Society which the revolutionary considers bad and impossible of reformation and for him, therefore, a thing to be destroyed. Its use in this sense can be seen in the habit, common among revolutionary agitators, of describing those who have managed to do well out of Industrial Society as "Typical products of the Present Social System." Behind this kind of language lies a peculiar view of human history. It assumes that our present-day type of social and economic life is the result of an impersonal process or "law" by which all the elements of civilised society have developed until now. This so-called "law" is superior to and independent of personal wills and intelligence. On this view, when men find that there are many evil things in social life, such as poverty, economic insecurity, constant danger of war, they tend to believe that these are all inseparably bound up with other features of industrial civilisation such as capitalism, private enterprise, private property, etc. Because these things are found side by side in contemporary life, revolutionary thinkers regard them as essentially connected, so that to remove the evil features it is necessary to destroy the whole social structure *en bloc*. It is also significant that the opposite attitude, that of unconditional Conservatism, takes the same attitude towards historical processes. It says, in effect, that though there may be many bad and dangerous elements in industrial civilisation, they had better be endured because tampering with their causes might well result in upsetting factors which are undoubted benefits to mankind. Both agree that modern society cannot be *mended*. The revolutionary says therefore it must be *ended* in its present form; the "die-hard" says it must be *retained* as it is, for any change would end it. This common mentality is responsible for the fact that some of the strongest personalities in conservative causes have begun life as social revolutionaries. Mussolini and, to some extent, Samuel Gompers are typical examples.

The modern study of Anthropology again comes to our aid in showing the falsity of this view of History. The school of students associated with the names of the late Dr. Rivers, of Cambridge, Professor Elliott Smith and Mr. W. J. Perry, of London, has demonstrated that Civilisation is a highly artificial product due to a complicated series of circumstances, the elements of which are, except in the place or period of their common origin, merely historically connected. We are here presented with a view of human achievement which regards the actual state of society as the accumulated result of the impact of the human will upon its environment. Features of present-day social structure which have grown up together are not therefore vitally connected with one another; so we are free from the necessity of either destroying the whole thing because of existing evils, or of retaining the whole thing in spite of them lest the good things disappear.

The inability to track down the source of social evils is due largely to the fact that every chance is taken by publicists to divert attention from the region of Finance, where the fundamental fallacy lies. We see this in the widespread tendency to blame somebody for our miseries. The capitalist blames the

laziness or selfishness of the workers; the workers blame the greed of the masters or the indifference of the middle and professional classes. The intellectuals lament the reckless multiplication of the poor and lay the responsibility on what they call over-population, and so forth.

The pernicious effects of repressing the knowledge of evil causes in the individual have been the discovery of modern psychology, and the connection between individual and social repression is described in a passage which I quote at length from *Psychology and Politics*, by the late Dr. Rivers, one of the foremost psychologists and anthropologists of our generation:—

"Similarly few can doubt that by the process of social repression the evils whose manifest expression is prevented do not thereby cease to exist, but smoulder on beneath the surface to break out into renewed activity when it is no longer possible to bear them in silence. In the individual it is now generally recognised that one of the most frequent ways in which repressed or suppressed experience manifests itself is in the nightmare, in which the emotional state natural to the experience which has been repressed bursts out with an intensity far greater than that which would have accompanied its unrestricted expression in waking life. Elsewhere (*Dreams and Primitive Culture*) I have shown that the social counterpart of the nightmare is the revolution; that if the effort natural to the experience of social wrongs is not allowed to find expression in such a way as will lead to the recognition of the wrongs and to the measures which follow upon this recognition, there will sooner or later be violent and unregulated, all-or-none manifestations comparable with those of the nightmare. The resemblances between the effects of individual and social repression are definitely reinforced when we turn to the nature of the treatment by which the morbid states may be removed. The evidence is now conclusive that the occurrence of nightmares and other morbid states which follow upon repression in the individual disappear when the sufferer no longer attempts to put his troubles out of sight, but faces them and succeeds in dealing with them as if they had a less painful character. Especially important is it that he should come to understand the nature of his troubles and shall appreciate the real reason, often very different from the apparent reason, why the experience which he has been repressing has gained its highly painful character. In other words, the two requisites for the proper treatment of the states produced in the individual by repression are courage and knowledge; individual by repression are courage and knowledge; courage to face experience from which there is a natural tendency to flee, as well as the still greater courage to look closely into the nature of the painful experience, and thus gain the knowledge which forms the other requisite for successful treatment. There can be little doubt that a similar process is necessary in the treatment of social evils produced by repression or for which repressive measures have been employed by unwise rulers. Few who are capable of regarding social situations dispassionately can doubt the value of knowledge of the social evils in connection with which a crude policy of repression has been adopted. Here, again, the two things needed are courage and knowledge. Not only is the courage needed to face the social evils for which repression is usually employed of the same order as that needed by the individual when he is advised to face and understand the troubles he has been repressing. The knowledge needed is also of the same order, for in the social as in the individual case nothing is more valuable than the study of the process, the historical process, by which the evils have come into existence. In each case the most important factor in the treatment is the discovery, and still more difficult, the acknowledgment, of the faults by which the disorder has been produced or accentuated."

This pronouncement by an independent scientist gives us a clue to understanding the cause of that unintelligent reaction to social evils which we call revolutionary propaganda, and also in finding the cure. The "knowledge of the process, the historic process by which the evils have come into existence" is the one thing that revolutionary thinkers and their anti-revolutionary opponents do not attempt to acquire. For if this were public knowledge, the sphere of conflict would be changed to that of Reason from that of Emotion, which is the psychological *milieu* of revolutionary activity.

## The True Inwardness of Catholic Sociology.

V.

Certainly the Catholic Church regarded the status of a freeman as the *normal* condition for humanity; and in regard to recognised freemen, it was much concerned to uphold their full human dignity and consideration. The state of society which the medieval Church thoroughly identified itself, and to which alone it gave real approval, did not involve anything like the modern wage system. In Flanders and some of the Italian cities, it is true, there existed from an early period in the Middle Ages a large industrial proletariat. But these were exceptions. It was not this kind of thing that the Church was assuming as the field in which its moral economies were to operate. Until late in the Middle Ages, in the greater part of Europe there was no permanent wage-earning population on any large scale, though a minority of such proletarians were to be met with sporadically. The ordinary man was normally a smallholder (even though often a serf) in the country, or a worker in the small-scale Guild industry in the towns. In the latter case, the journeyman could ordinarily look forward to becoming a master himself, and meanwhile was practically a member of the same social class as the master. That was the kind of social order with which practical Catholicism easily and heartily amalgamated. As the Middle Ages advanced, it is true, a *permanent* wage-earning class began to grow up much more widely. But this was part of a complex drift of the whole economic system—a drift watched by the Church with the utmost jealousy and suspicion. Indeed, Church authority fought against it, to the last, an inevitably losing battle, since it wielded (as Mr. Tawney has illuminatingly shown in his "Religion and the Rise of Capitalism") only most inadequate weapons—principally its law of usury.

The inherent grains, as we have seen, of Catholicism are undoubtedly antagonistic to the wage-system. If they were completely true to the deepest principles to which they are confessedly pledged, and if they insisted on carrying these out with a boldness and consistency which the Church as a whole, when brought into collision with the established order of society, has never yet shown, Catholics would be compelled to condemn this system fundamentally. It is clearly open to the charge of being, in effect, wage-slavery. It is tainted at least with very considerable servile elements; it does not afford the wage-earner a fully free or a really honourable status. It has been justly characterised, once for all, by Wordsworth:—

Our life is turned  
Out of her course, wherever man is made  
An offering, or a sacrifice, a tool  
Or implement, a passive thing employed  
As a brute means, without acknowledgment  
Of common right or interest in the end.

Wordsworth's phrases are precisely equivalent to the term, "instruments of production," as applied to the wage-earners—a term explicitly defended by that doughty champion of the existing industrial order, the Bishop of Durham.

"The abolition of the wage-system," then, may fairly be described as a Catholic demand. And the universalising of that system cannot, as the typical Socialist seems to think, be accepted as synonymous with its abolition. It would, of course, be abolished by pure Communism. But that would not abolish, but actually (by turning the whole nation into a glorified workhouse) intensify the servitude, which is the true ground of objection to wavery. We may set aside as quite out of the question, at the present stage of economic development, the universal private ownership of a sufficient concrete share of the means of production for each individual

or family to live on (desirable as is an enormous extension of this kind of ownership). There remains as the only possible means of realising that emancipation of the people which is properly connoted by "the abolition of the wage-system," a scheme of dividends for all. As a step towards the transition from the wage-system to a dividend-system, we should welcome any means by which the organised workers (preferably including the "salaried") in an industry may become collectively shareholders in it on an effective scale. The "Producers' Bank," in the precise form adumbrated in the original "Douglas Scheme," may be impracticable. But it would seem worth while to try what could be done by Labour Banks conducted on the lines which seem to be proving fairly successful in America. The suggestion, too, made a few years ago by Mr. Thoresby, as editor of the now defunct *New Commonwealth*, is possibly worth inquiring into further. He advocated that the aggregate amount of annual wages and salaries should be assumed to be paid-up-capital standing to the credit of the employees.\* At any rate, in the general diffusion, not in the abolition, of dividends lies the hope of the masses. There is no greater guarantee of freedom than the possession of an unearned income.

Against the legitimacy of unearned income, as such, there is nothing whatever to be found in Catholic tradition. This point needs some enforcing as there has been an enormous amount of (sometimes very wilful) misunderstanding with regard to it. Utterly arbitrary meanings have been affixed by modern propagandists to the term "usury," as used historically in Catholic tradition. The condemnation of this was a totally different thing from the modern denunciations of unearned income. It was far more limited in its scope, and rested on much more specific grounds. The idea never occurred to orthodox Catholic teachers that it was wrong for a man to receive the fruits of any property which he owned. It obviously could not do so, unless they questioned at the roots the very right of private property—at least in any kind of means of production; and this, as we have seen, they never thought of doing. Thus, if a man owned a farm, he might either let it at a rent, or put in a bailiff to work it at a stipulated salary, himself receiving the whole proceeds. Similarly might he deal with a mill or a ship that he owned. So, too, if he possessed accumulated money, he might put this into the hands of a merchant to trade with, and receive a share of the profits, if there were any. In doing so, of course, he had to take the risk of the loss of the original sum itself. This point constituted the essence of a genuine "contract of partnership," which was strictly parallel to the procedure of an "ordinary shareholder" at the present day. The money so put into a business had to remain, for good or ill, the investor's own property. Provided it was his own, he was entitled to the fruits of it, apart from the question of whether he personally laboured to produce those fruits. This principle was the very basis of the objection to usury.

N. E. EGERTON SWANN.

### FIRES.

(TRANS-ATLANTIC.)

By A. Newberry Choyce.

Now hollies stand with berries on:  
Bright cowans beacon hill to hill:  
The gorse's golden blaze is gone:  
Roped belladonnas scorch and spill:  
Now lichens smoulder grey. . . .

So Autumn flames through every wood  
To shrivel Summer, tree by tree.  
And I remember two who stood  
A cold . . . beyond a week of sea  
When sumacs burned away.

\* The "New Commonwealth," January, 1922.

## The Testament of Wordsworth.

I.

By Richard Church.

Professor Ernest de Selincourt has published with the Oxford Press a scholarly edition of the two texts of Wordsworth's "Prelude." Of the excellent qualities of this edition I have spoken elsewhere; but more can be said of the poet and his masterpiece.

There is something almost Brahminical in the way in which Wordsworth concentrates his attention on the senses, determining to find out what is their exact relationship to the personality which they feed, and how far they minister direct to the Consciousness without depending upon the Reason. It is not sentimental idealism which prompts him to half-deify the child. His attitude rather is experiential. He takes the child—a being unadulterated by the simulations of Reason—as the perfect type of that receptive organism which can register the infinitely various vibrations pulsing from the centre of Life. His conception of the child is, therefore, something in the nature of a Platonic Idea. He is a great theorist upon the relationship of Man to the Universe.

That is really the central motive of the "Prelude." The main purpose and passion of Wordsworth's poetic life was to discover the machinery by which man maintains and develops that relationship. He could not believe that it consisted solely in Reason, for, if so, why did *joie de vivre* and enthusiasm—that essence of Godhead—diminish as the individual grew older and more rational. Why did a moment of acute sensuous experience put a mark upon the soul such as a lifetime of ratiocination could not do? Fighting his way back to memories of childhood, he found these recollections of a sensibility and insight, fierce, savage, and prophetic, and now no more. He said of the child,

"No outcast he, bewildered and depressed;  
Along his infant veins are interfused  
The gravitation and the filial bond  
Of nature, that connect him with the world."

Throughout the bulk of his work this glorification of childhood is to be found. In the "Ode on the Intimations of Immortality" he trembles with awe before the apparition of infancy; and in the poem "We are Seven" puts off his adult powers and humiliates himself before the superior asseverative genius of the child, which pierces through the barriers raised by a materialistic science between life and death.

It will be seen, then, how deep-seated was his break away from the eighteenth century. He was denying the efficacy of the whole moral process of that age. He was affirming that Nature could not be approached in the moral and rationalist way; that it stood for and was the physical being of a vitality that existed above and beyond the urbane territory in which the eighteenth century man had endeavoured to confine himself and his beliefs. Wordsworth's revolt against the existing poetic technique which so outraged his contemporaries was only a very tentative symptom of this spiritual emancipation.

Like most genuine revolutionaries, he was also prophetic. He foresaw the disastrous effects of the nineteenth century worship of Science. He believed that the capacity of Science was executive, never administrative; and that a society that believed, and practised, the reverse was doomed to become incoherent and mechanistic. That mistake has happened, and to-day we are suffering from the consequences. The transcendental power of soul, which for him—he was not original in this—was typified in the child-mind, could not work with the restricted technique of a purely analytical instrument such as Science. To him, as to Milton, it was a "blind mouth," a mere accumulator of evidence. It was

"that false secondary power  
By which we multiply distinctions, then  
Deem that our puny boundaries are things  
That we perceive, and not that we have made."

This seems such a common-sense and natural attitude that one wonders, with Mr. Shaw, why it has been so slavishly dropped. Perhaps mankind has been bewildered and thrown off its balance by the whirr of its own machinery and the mass of its statistics. One has only to look inside an electric power house, or into a blue book, to be able to feel that sense of smallness which makes such a surrender of faith possible. These things, again, are so domestic and close, and, like manual labour, they can give immediate comfort and confidence during the normal conditions of life. Wordsworth, however, foresaw the danger of this *laissez-faire* and materialistic course. To him, the scientific attitude was infantile, because it was not synthetic: the attitude of his ideal "child" was adult because it was direct and relevant to first causes.

"The child is father of the man."

Only by realising how much this phrase meant to Wordsworth can we rightly appreciate the strange self-confidence that could prompt a young man of twenty-eight to write a history of his own mind. Here was no ego-centric impulse of a self-pampered recluse, but the inevitable action of a religious genius aware of the necessity to turn historian. And the nature of his belief made that necessity urgent. He must tell of those trailing clouds of glory before they fade. He must explore the conditions by which they exist, and endeavour to find a means of keeping them fresh to the hearts and minds of people who, getting and spending in the currency of time, have laid waste their power. He found poetry the mystery-pregnant word, the logos whose riches Merlin could not rifle; this art, vague yet vital as the childhood vision it was to enshrine, he found to be that means.

## Drama.

The Years Between: Everyman.

M. Jean-Jacques Bernard first entered the English theatre by way of the *Everyman* on June 14, 1926; which is one way of saying that the performance of "The Years Between" constitutes an event. The English version used, the work of Mr. John Leslie Frith, was as sympathetic a rendering as could be wished for, with that freedom from cliché and partiality for idiom which distinguish good translation. The title, "Le Printemps des Autres," as titles are wont to do with translators, gave Mr. Frith a lot of trouble, and he ought to create a better than "The Years Between." A mother, forty-two, widowed, disillusioned, and weary of life, is approached shyly and awkwardly in the fashionable Italian hotel by a young lawyer, French, like herself. Perceiving that some motive he is hiding must have taken him there, she guesses half a dozen possible ones, warm, but never hot, for the reason that she ignores her daughter, whom she regards as a child. Unconsciously she yields to the wish that the young man's object is herself. When the real situation reveals itself, and she recognises with a shock that her daughter is no longer a child, but a lovely woman, she is unable to adjust herself to the fact that the coronation of the child means the abdication of the parent. Although she does not stand immediately in her daughter's way, and gives both the child and her young husband kindly maternal advice as required, her envy and jealousy of the possessor of youth and beauty unconsciously dominate her conduct at every crisis.

Not a ripple disturbs the surface of the waters while they are mixing. Yet while the pace is andante for nearly two acts the interest of the movement, in the minds of the players rather than in their actions, does not fail for a moment. The progress of atmospheric tension can be felt as the quiet of a gathering storm, which breaks in the third act so naturally that the audience feels entitled to arrogate to itself the magic of the rain-prophet. This restrained, tranquil movement to the crisis is characteristic of the new French style. That M. Bernard has achieved it in the new convention of the psychological drama ranks him among the masters.

The mother's utterances are appropriate to the most traditional loving parent. But her trifles of omission and commission gradually disclose to the youngsters, who are unwilling to believe the mother's sin of looking backward. The amount of suggestion called for in the part of Clarisse, the mother, would test any actress, and Beatrice Wilson has not yet quite overcome the difficulties. She was not as unaware of her crime against generation as she should have been, not as free from conveying the idea of deliberate malice. She communicated her unconscious motives too consciously. She communicated her unconscious motives of Gilberte, the daughter, in a fashion that made M. Bernard's absence from the theatre a matter for regret; he ought to have seen her. She acted with the natural harmony of emotion, gestures, and speech that stamp complete realisation.

Already in this early stage of the psychological epoch it has been perceived that intellectual truth is prone to mask emotional untruth, while in the past emotional truth has appeared so unconscious and uncomplex that its utterer, unless he were a dead poet, seemed too simple to interest us. M. Bernard has forged ahead of those nineteenth-century dramatic conventions according to which mankind's problems were merely questions of action, thoroughly understood, to be solved by logic and repression. The problem he states here is simply the old conflict between generations, but he solves it by self-knowledge, and does not shrink from the most terrible actualities. Without either horror or striving after "situations" motives reveal themselves, naturally and without surprise. Men's actions can be tried now, but their motives must be left for trial until the Judgment, said Cardinal Mercier in his famous encyclical. He reckoned without modern psychology. PAUL BANKS.



# Caricatures by "Cyrano."



V.—SIR BASIL ZAHAROFF.