NOTES OF THE WEEK.

Not the least of the evidences that militarism is once more in the ascendant in Germany is the reply of "Vorwärts" to the War-aims of the Allied Labour and Socialist parties. Contrary to common expectation we read the expectation of journals like the "Times" "Vorwärts" has no fault to find with the terms of the Labour Memorandum themselves. They are, it says, reasonable in the main; the subjects of difference are unimportant; and the sincerity of the idealism of the signatories is openly admitted. Nevertheless, the fact is, "Vorwärts" goes on to say, that the moral question, if not irrelevant, is at any rate negligible in comparison with the military factor as represented on the existing war-map. The policy of might has not only had its way in Russia against the moral advice of the German Socialists (who, let us say to their credit, have at least protested against it), but Prussian might, "Vorwärts" implies, is insusceptible to any moral appeal whatever. Being, moreover, invincible, the Allies would therefore be wise to recognise the fact and to accept it as the German Socialists themselves propose to accept it. The attitude, indeed, is one of complete despair and of the complete abdication of morality to Prussian militarism. We cannot help ourselves, the German Socialists say in effect; and, what is more, we do not think that the Allied Socialists will be able to help us. We are the strongest Socialist party in the world; and we are placed nearest the centre of Prussian power; yet we can do nothing. Once more, therefore, we urge our Socialist friends in the Allied countries to cease their well-intentioned efforts on our behalf and on behalf of right against might, and to submit at discretion to the military facts.

This highly important document may be said to put an end to any hope from the proposal to hold an International Conference with the German Socialists on the terms of the Allied Memorandum. For here in advance the German Socialists have indicated their final reply to it. Had their reply taken shape in a Conference for the purpose of discussion and agreement might have been advisable. But the significant fact to observe is that the German Socialists agree in the main with every item of it. In other words, they are at one with their confères in the Allied countries. But what use is it if agree they desert beforehand that nothing practical need be expected of their agreement? A Conference on the Memorandum is, therefore, seen to be superfluous. On the other hand, what now clearly emerges is the fact that it is no longer upon terms that any difference exists, but upon what may be called rather a state of soul than a state of mind; and it is now against this state of soul that the Allied Socialists should direct their efforts. To bring it out in the clearest light before the world, to get it defined as what it is—namely, a psychic condition of disease—this is the next task of the Allied Socialists. To this end it is necessary to reduce our charge to its simplest moral dimensions. Detailed proposals for this or that arrangement, whether territorial or constitutional, are irrelevant. What we need to do is to boldly from all the current controversies the single fact that at a supreme moment in the history of the world the German Socialists, though morally in agreement with Socialists everywhere, have not the moral courage to act up to their convictions. The onus of this terrible abdication must, therefore, be clearly laid upon them; and they must be made to realise the full nature of their offence. This, we believe, can be done if a Conference is held at which the Memorandum is taken as an agreed document, and the simple question is posed what the German Socialists really mean to do about it. Face to face with the Socialists of the rest of the world, they might either then be forced to maintain their present attitude of moral apathy—to their eternal and just disgrace; or, perchance, they might be aroused to the shame of their surrender and recover themselves. In either event, it is obvious, the International Conference would have served a useful purpose; for in the one case the German Socialists would be clearly distinguished from Socialists everywhere else; and, in the other and better case, they would be re-united with the International.

Weeks, if not months, however, must pass before Allied Labour is in a position to take this step. It is no easy matter to get the Socialist parties of the Allied countries to agree upon anything; and it is just as...
difficult, when they have once agreed, to get them to see the need of another kind of agreement altogether. How long will it take, for instance, to convince some of our British Socialists that the reply of "Vorwärts" to the Memorandum is really final, and disposes of the Memorandum itself, leaving nothing more to be said of it? And how long will it take them that an entirely fresh method of approach to the German Socialist problem is necessary; and, still again, to teach them what it is? In the meantime, since it is essential to the satisfaction of our reason, if of nothing else, that diplomacy of one kind or another should be continued, the occasion is open to the Allied Governments to resume their efforts just when it appears that the Allied Socialists have temporarily failed. In other words, it is now the business of the Allied Governments to take the next step. But what shall that step be? Need there be any doubt about it? Surely it is to reinforce the demonstration already begun to be made by our Socialists of the fundamental issue of the war, namely, whether or not the German democracy is prepared to assist the world in putting an end to Prussian militarism. We have indicated more than once the appropriate means to this end. They consist in laying before the German people, on the authority of the Allies jointly, two alternative programmes, one offered to Prussian militarism and upon the assumption of the German people's continued defence of it—a programme, we need not say, of war; and the other addressed to the German people themselves as a promise and inducement to them to throw off their yoke. It may very well be, of course, that these alternative programmes, like the Memorandum of the Allied Socialists, would be received with apathetic agreement by the German democracy. German democracy may reply to them, as it is replied to the Socialist offer, that it is powerless to make a choice. But this very admission, repeated under fresh circumstances, would be an immense moral gain to the Allies; and, in course of time, we do not doubt that its reaction would be felt in Germany.

A reflection of considerable importance to our pacifists arises from this open abdication of moral responsibility on the part of German Socialism. If it is to continue in the face of an explicit Socialist appeal during the war itself, and while Prussian militarism is only counting upon triumph and not actually enjoying triumph, what hope is there that it would be changed after a war in which Prussian militarism had been successful? There can be none whatever. But we ask our pacifists to draw the proper conclusions from this undoubted fact, and not to run away from the inevitable consequences. In the first place, they would thus be leaving German democracy to its fate as the permanent slave of Prussian militarism to be employed alternately and against its moral judgment as cannon-fodder and labour-commodity; and in the second place, they might say farewell to all their dreams of a League of Nations and of international peace. It is not possible for a League of Nations to co-exist with a finally and irrevocably Prussianised militarist State. Internationalism of any kind is necessarily unattainable in a world consisting of pacific nations and a single powerful predatory State. And thus we should have, continued to infinity, the present situation of a world struggling towards democracy and always being dragged back into barbarism by the aggression of a State that refuses to cooperate in the new order. These consequences we do not merely say are probable if we leave German democracy a prisoner to Prussian militarism, they are inescapable. They are not, therefore, friends even of German democracy who would permit this to happen. On the contrary, they are not only German democracy's enemies but the enemies of democracy everywhere.

We cannot insist too strongly on the moral for pacifists to be drawn from the historic reply of "Vorwärts" to the Manifesto of the Allied Socialists. It is that the German Socialists are helpless without the help of their Allied comrades; that they cannot by themselves overcome Prussian militarism, much as they would think it moral to do so; and that, finally, they must continue to depend for their deliverance upon an Allied military victory over Prussia. That is the real meaning of the depressing document before us.

Unfortunately, this simple and pathetic situation is obscured for our pacifists by considerations which are really irrelevant, or, at least, of secondary importance. Mr. Brailsford, for instance, an able man, and a man usually capable of fair discussion, continues to maintain, in spite of all arguments to the contrary, that "between German and Allied Imperialism there is nothing to choose." (See the "Herald" of the current week.) To this we might reply, if we were disposed to be captious, with the question, why, then, Mr. Brailsford should choose the German? If there is nothing to choose between German and Allied Imperialism, the world has nothing to gain by the triumph or anything more to lose by the defeat of Germany. But Mr. Brailsford is really in contradiction with himself; for it is only a week ago that he was announcing that the German annexations in Russia constituted a "disaster for civilization." How can that be? Either, therefore, Mr. Brailsford was merely rhetorical in describing the expansion of Prussian Imperialism in Russia as a disaster; or he meant what he said, in which case we have again to ask him how the substitution of one Imperialism by another indifferent from it can be regarded as a disaster. But the fact is that there is a difference between the two forms of Imperialism; and it is such a difference as makes the spread of German Imperialism a disaster when a similar expansion of Allied Imperialism would be only, at worst, a misfortune. And the difference lies in the fact, which has often been pointed out, that German Imperialism is alone in position to threaten the whole world. Other Imperialisms may occupy this or that area of the world, and become more or less liberal, or more or less reactionary, in course of time. Above all, other Imperialisms may co-exist on the same planet, in spite of mutual competition, relatively independent of each other. But the Imperialism of Germany, by reason of the special circumstances of Germany's geographical and economic situation, must not only aim at becoming unique in the world, but it has the means of becoming unique. This is the fact that differentiates German from Allied Imperialism; not, if you like, a moral fact, but a fact of change.

What is certainly sticking in the throats of men like Mr. Brailsford is the existence of the "secret" treaties. The publication of the secret treaties did not, of course, make pacifists of men who were not disposed to be pacifists before; but they have done a good deal to confirm pacifists in their pacifism and to provoke the question we have just quoted from Mr. Brailsford: in what lies the difference between Allied and German Imperialism that Imperialism alone in position to threaten the world has been one hand, as it were, in Imperialist annexations? We have replied to the question in one form, but now let us reply to it in another. On the supposition, which even our pacifists will allow to be made, that Germany's breach of the neutrality of Belgium threatened to disturb the balance of power in Europe; on the further supposition that, whether Germany was aware
of it or not, the disturbance of the European balance threatened not only England but the world; and, on the still stronger ground of England’s duty as well as necessity, lay in attempting to maintain the existing balance—what could England do, since she was unable by herself to maintain it against Germany, but enlist the support of the other European Powers? That being granted, the question must have arisen what compensations, what promises, what prospects were to be granted to the European Allies in return for their help? No doubt if they had all been like England, only semi-dependent upon Europe and virtually able to be wholly independent, the various Powers with whom England at least had been willing, like England, to engage in war for the sole world-purpose of preserving the balance of power in Europe. But the facts were otherwise. Save in a spiritual sense, such as only one or two of our Allies were able to realise, the war was for the rest not only a just war, but, in addition, a war for power; and it was only natural, therefore, under these circumstances, that Russia, for example, should demand material, as well as moral, prospects, in return for her assistance. Whether, of course, the price demanded was a price that should have been paid, whether that England might not have been wiser for England to have fought Germany with only the help of the wiser nations; whether, in short, the gain in material strength has not been more than balanced by the loss in moral prestige—we are willing to leave it to history to decide. All we are contending is that the more part of the “secret” treaties were part and parcel of the many moral sacrifices made by England on behalf of the war; that they rank with conscription at home and other similar evils deemed to have been necessary to the prosecution of the war; and that, in any case, they cannot be held to invalidate the justice of the war itself. A wiser Government—in other words, a wiser nation—would, we do not doubt, have found a moral means of arriving at a moral end. But in the absence of the will to the end, namely, the maintenance of the balance of power in Europe—it is not our pacifists who are likely to discover the moral means. In the meantime, therefore, they must accept such means as are found to be practically necessary.

A good deal of the substance would be taken out of the criticism of the “secret” treaties if Mr. Asquith’s speech at Cupar could be accepted as the official Allied policy. Addressing his constituents on this very subject last week, Mr. Asquith said that there was not, so far as he knew, any territorial acquisitions which we had made during the war that we should not be ready to submit to the determination of the Peace Conference. He went further, indeed, and suggested that the Peace Conference itself should be the first meeting of the League of Nations; and that it should have within its jurisdiction the practical settlement of all the territorial problems involved in the war. This suggestion throws wide open the gates for a liberal interpretation of the “secret” treaties. If, indeed, they are to be subject to the judgment of the Peace Conference, as Mr. Asquith suggests, their terms, as we have maintained before, are provisional and elastic. They are, in other words, merely precautionary against hypothetical contingencies. On the supposition that the Peace Conference is to be a genuine Peace Conference, a League of Nations and not merely of nations and States, the whole of the provisional arrangements in the treaties are cast into the melting-pot. In short, they lapse when the contingencies against which they were framed are no longer contingencies.

There has now arisen, however, still another problem to vex the minds of our pacifists—and not of our pacifists only—the problem of Japanese intervention in far Eastern Russia. We can well understand the hesitation of the Western Allies before either asseming to or dissenting from so perplexing a proposal. And our pacifists would be well employed in putting themselves in the place of, let us say, our own Foreign Office and in attempting to solve the problem from the British, Allied and world points of view. The dilemma is obvious. Nobody can deny that, if the war is to be continued, it is desirable that the Prussian exploitation of the resources of Eastern Russia should, if possible, be prevented. But, on the other hand, it cannot be denied either, that Japan has her own future to consider and ought not to be impeded (as she certainly will not be) in considering it by reason of her alliance with England. This, of course, is merely to say that, if, and only if, Japan is prepared to act, and if it should be possible to arrange for the cessions of Russian territory in the West should prove to be permanent, Japan will consider herself, in view of Prussia’s well-known aim of world-power, fully justified in making counter-defences for herself in the far East. So much is clear. On the other hand, it has to be remembered and we pray that it may not be forgotten, that Russia, though no longer an active Ally of the Allies, is still an Ally. What is more, Russia, we do not hesitate to say, is an Ally of the most vital importance to us, even more so to-day than when she was our only Ally of the Imperial Powers. In this, England in a particular sense, and the Allies in general, are, so to say, the regents against Russia’s democratic minority, and they are therefore morally no less than politically bound to do their best to secure her inheritance and to have it over into a state which shall become constitutionally of age. To this end, it will be observed (though our pacifists have given the Allies no credit for it), the Allies have already notified the Central Powers that they refuse to recognise their recent annexations of European territories in the West. They mean, in other words, to restore them to Russia when the time comes. Can they, therefore, without stultifying themselves, invite Japan to action which they condemn in Germany; can they permit to an Ally what they deny to the enemy? The solution of the whole problem, we believe, is to be found in the adoption of provisional courses only. Germany’s occupation of the Western provinces is, we say, provisional. Likewise, we must say, if there should be Japanese action in the Eastern provinces, it must be provisional, too. Japan, in short, must be requested to retire from Russia at the same moment that Germany retires from Russia. On the proper issue of the war—namely, the defeat of Prussia—will therefore depend the future of Russia.
difficult, when they have once agreed, to get them to see the need of another kind of agreement altogether. How long will it take, for instance, to convince some of our British Socialists that the reply of "Vorwärts" to the Memorandum is really final, and disposes of the Memorandum itself, leaving nothing more to be done of it? And how long thereafter will it take to persuade them that an entirely fresh method of approach to the German Socialist problem is necessary; and, still again, to teach them what it is? In the meantime, since it is essential to the satisfaction of our reason, if of nothing else, that diplomacy of one kind or another should be continued, the occasion is open to the Allied Governments to resume their efforts just when it appears that the Allied Socialists have temporarily failed. In other words, it is now the business of the Allied Governments to take the next step. But what shall that step be? Need there be any doubt about it? Surely it is to reinforce the demonstration already begun to be made by our Socialists of the fundamental issue of the war, namely, whether or not the German democracy is prepared to assist the world in putting an end to Prussian militarism. We have indicated more than once the appropriate means to this end. They consist in laying before the German people, on the authority of the Allies jointly, two alternative programmes, one offered to Prussian militarism and the other to the German people. If the German people should be continued defence of it—a programme, we need not say, of war; and the other addressed to the German people themselves as a promise and inducement to them to throw off their Prussian yoke. It may very well be the case that these alternative programmes, like the Memorandum of the Allied Socialists, would be received with apathetic agreement by the German democracy. German democracy may reply to them, as it has replied to the Socialist offer, that it is powerless to make a choice. But this very admission, repeated under fresh circumstances, would be an immense moral gain to the Allies; and, in course of time, we do not doubt that its reaction would be felt in Germany.

We cannot insist too strongly on the moral for pacifists to be drawn from the historic reply of "Vorwärts" to the Manifesto of the Allied Socialists. It is that the German Socialists are helpless without the help of their Allied comrades; that they cannot save themselves by overcoming Prussian militarism, as they would think it moral to do so; and that, finally, they must continue to depend for their deliverance upon an Allied military victory over Prussia. That is the real meaning of the depressing document before us.

Unfortunately, this simple and pathetic situation is obscured for our pacifists by considerations which are really irrelevant, or, at least, of secondary importance. Mr. Brailsford, for instance, an able man, and a man usually capable of fair discussion, continues to maintain, in spite of all arguments to the contrary, that "between German and Allied Imperialism there is nothing to choose." (See the "Herald" of the current week.) To this we might reply, if we were disposed to be captious, with the question, why, then, Mr. Brailsford should choose the German? If there is nothing to choose between German and Allied Imperialism, the world has nothing to gain by the triumph or any more to lose by the defeat of Germany. But Mr. Brailsford is really in contradiction with himself; for it is only a week or two ago that he was announcing that the German annexations in Russia constituted a "disaster for civilisation." Has Mr. Brailsford been the developer of the new Imperialism in Russia as a disaster; or he meant what he said, in which case we have again to ask him how the substitution of one Imperialism by another indifferent can be regarded as a disaster. But the fact is that there is a difference between the two Imperialisms; and it is such a difference as makes the spread of German Imperialism a disaster when a similar expansion of Allied Imperialism would be only, at worst, a misfortune. And the difference lies in the fact, which has often been pointed out, that German Imperialism is above all a position to Imperialism in Russia. Either, therefore, Mr. Brailsford was merely rhetorical in describing the expansion of Prussian Imperialism in Russia as a disaster; or he meant what he said, in which case we have again to ask him how the substitution of one Imperialism by another indifferent can be regarded as a disaster. But the fact is that there is a difference between the two Imperialisms; and it is such a difference as makes the spread of German Imperialism a disaster when a similar expansion of Allied Imperialism would be only, at worst, a misfortune. And the difference lies in the fact, which has often been pointed out, that German Imperialism is above all a position to Imperialism in Russia. Either, therefore, Mr. Brailsford was merely rhetorical in describing the expansion of Prussian Imperialism in Russia as a disaster; or he meant what he said, in which case we have again to ask him how the substitution of one Imperialism by another indifferent can be regarded as a disaster.

A reflection of considerable importance to our pacifists arises out of the recognition of the moral responsibility of the part of German Imperialism. If it is to continue in the face of an explicit Socialist appeal during the war itself, and while Prussian militarism is only counting upon triumph and not actually enjoying triumph, it will be that it was changed after a war in which Prussian militarism had been successful? There can be none whatever. But Mr. Brailsford is really in contradiction with himself; for it is only a week or two ago that he was announcing that the German annexations in Russia constituted a "disaster for civilisation." Has Mr. Brailsford been the developer of the new Imperialism in Russia as a disaster; or he meant what he said, in which case we have again to ask him how the substitution of one Imperialism by another indifferent can be regarded as a disaster. But the fact is that there is a difference between the two Imperialisms; and it is such a difference as makes the spread of German Imperialism a disaster when a similar expansion of Allied Imperialism would be only, at worst, a misfortune. And the difference lies in the fact, which has often been pointed out, that German Imperialism is above all a position to Imperialism in Russia. Either, therefore, Mr. Brailsford was merely rhetorical in describing the expansion of Prussian Imperialism in Russia as a disaster; or he meant what he said, in which case we have again to ask him how the substitution of one Imperialism by another indifferent can be regarded as a disaster. But the fact is that there is a difference between the two Imperialisms; and it is such a difference as makes the spread of German Imperialism a disaster when a similar expansion of Allied Imperialism would be only, at worst, a misfortune. And the difference lies in the fact, which has often been pointed out, that German Imperialism is above all a position to Imperialism in Russia. Either, therefore, Mr. Brailsford was merely rhetorical in describing the expansion of Prussian Imperialism in Russia as a disaster; or he meant what he said, in which case we have again to ask him how the substitution of one Imperialism by another indifferent can be regarded as a disaster. But the fact is that there is a difference between the two Imperialisms; and it is such a difference as makes the spread of German Imperialism a disaster when a similar expansion of Allied Imperialism would be only, at worst, a misfortune. And the difference lies in the fact, which has often been pointed out, that German Imperialism is above all a position to Imperialism in Russia. Either, therefore, Mr. Brailsford was merely rhetorical in describing the expansion of Prussian Imperialism in Russia as a disaster; or he meant what he said, in which case we have again to ask him how the substitution of one Imperialism by another indifferent can be regarded as a disaster. But the fact is that there is a difference between the two Imperialisms; and it is such a difference as makes the spread of German Imperialism a disaster when a similar expansion of Allied Imperialism would be only, at worst, a misfortune. And the difference lies in the fact, which has often been pointed out, that German Imperialism is above all a position to Imperialism in Russia. Either, therefore, Mr. Brailsford was merely rhetorical in describing the expansion of Prussian Imperialism in Russia as a disaster; or he meant what he said, in which case we have again to ask him how the substitution of one Imperialism by another indifferent can be regarded as a disaster. But the fact is that there is a difference between the two Imperialisms; and it is such a difference as makes the spread of German Imperialism a disaster when a similar expansion of Allied Imperialism would be only, at worst, a misfortune. And the difference lies in the fact, which has often been pointed out, that German Imperialism is above all a position to Imperialism in Russia. Either, therefore, Mr. Brailsford was merely rhetorical in describing the expansion of Prussian Imperialism in Russia as a disaster; or he meant what he said, in which case we have again to ask him how the substitution of one Imperialism by another indifferent can be regarded as a disaster. But the fact is that there is a difference between the two Imperialisms; and it is such a difference as makes the spread of German Imperialism a disaster when a similar expansion of Allied Imperialism would be only, at worst, a misfortune. And the difference lies in the fact, which has often been pointed out, that German Imperialism is above all a position to Imperialism in Russia. Either, therefore, Mr. Brailsford was merely rhetorical in describing the expansion of Prussian Imperialism in Russia as a disaster; or he meant what he said, in which case we have again to ask him how the substitution of one Imperialism by another indifferent can be regarded as a disaster. But the fact is that there is a difference between the two Imperialisms; and it is such a difference as makes the spread of German Imperialism a disaster when a similar expansion of Allied Imperialism would be only, at worst, a misfortune. And the difference lies in the fact, which has often been pointed out, that German Imperialism is above all a position to Imperialism in Russia. Either, therefore, Mr. Brailsford was merely rhetorical in describing the expansion of Prussian Imperialism in Russia as a disaster; or he meant what he said, in which case we have again to ask him how the substitution of one Imperialism by another indifferent can be regarded as a disaster. But the fact is that there is a difference between the two Imperialisms; and it is such a difference as makes the spread of German Imperialism a disaster when a similar expansion of Allied Imperialism would be only, at worst, a misfortune. And the difference lies in the fact, which has often been pointed out, that German Imperialism is above all a position to Imperialism in Russia. Either, therefore, Mr. Brailsford was merely rhetorical in describing the expansion of Prussian Imperialism in Russia as a disaster; or he meant what he said, in which case we have again to ask him how the substitution of one Imperialism by another indifferent can be regarded as a disaster. But the fact is that there is a difference between the two Imperialisms; and it is such a difference as makes the spread of German Imperialism a disaster when a similar expansion of Allied Imperialism would be only, at worst, a misfortune.

What is certainly sticking in the throats of men like Mr. Brailsford is the existence of the "secret" treaties. The publication of the secret treaties did not, of course, make pacifists of men who were not disposed to be pacifists before; but they have done a good deal to confirm pacifists in their pacifism and to provoke the question we have just quoted from Mr. Brailsford: in what lies the difference between Allied and German Imperialism since the former has been caught red-handed, as it were, in Imperialism? We have replied to the question in one form, but now let us reply to it in another. On the supposition, which even our pacifists will allow to be made, that Germany's breach of the neutrality of Belgium threatened to disturb the balance of power in Europe; on the further supposition that, whether Germany was aware
Dostoyevsky and Certain of his Problems.

By Jaroslav Lavrin.

IX.—THE "RUSSIAN IDEA."

In the last article we pointed out that the nucleus of Dostoyevsky’s belief in a future regeneration of mankind on a religious basis was partly included in his conception of the Russian or Slav idea which formed his cultural and political creed. This Creed (preached especially in his "Diary of an Author") he regarded him as very near to a most interesting ideological current of the Russian cultural life in the past century: to the so-called Slavophilism. Let us examine the general features of this current, as well as Dostoyevsky’s connection with it.

I.

The Russian Slavophilism was not a political movement with the aim of a "Pan-Rusian" or of a Pan-Slavonic political propaganda, as it has been purposely interpreted by the Germans. On the contrary, it was rather, a philosophical and religious current, based partly on Herder’s philosophy of history, and on Hegel, but modified and transmuted by the Russian spirit which endeavoured to amalgamate all the philosophical, scientific and social values with a true Christianity. One of the Slavophile leaders, Sergei Aksakov, defined Slavophilism (in his letter to Dostoevsky in 1863) as the "Christian idea pushed to its furthest limit.

Most of the Slavophiles were endeavouring to write (and sometimes even to act) on these lines. Being conscious of the terrible materialism by which all modern Europe was infected, they saw in the Europeanisation of Russian people—simply—the materialisation of Russia. Hence, they were anxious to prevent that by the so-called “Russian idea,” i.e., they sought in the Russian Spirit for those elements and values which could counterbalance this materialistic civilisation. Many of them believed to have found such elements either in some typical Russian institutions before Peter the Great, or in the orthodoxy of the Russian Church, or in the deep religious instincts of the Russian people, but—unfortunately!—almost all of them (besides Dostoevsky) were too superficial and attached too much importance to purely external, even ethnographical, attributes. In the meantime, the Russian Western idea (again, dramatically for a complete Europeanisation of Russia in all respects. It may be said that almost the entire Russian thought of the nineteenth century developed through the struggle of these two currents, and most of the Russian literary men, scientists and politicians were involved in it. As a characteristic trait of the tactics and tension between these two parties may serve the fact that Dostoevsky did not hesitate to give in his “Possessed” the most morbid caricature of his colleague Turgenev (under the name of the writer Karasnov) as a fellow-traveller and a ridiculous Turgenev’s “Western convictions.” By the way, the “gentle” Christian Dostoevsky always lost his gentleness in his battles with the “Westernisers,” and he seized upon any opportunity to make caricatures of them (Lazhin and Lepezyanich in “Crime and Punishment,” here, on the one hand, and in the revolutionary circle in the “Raw Youth,” Ratkin and Laguas Smerdyakov in “Brothers Karamazov,” etc.).

In general, he was too fervent and fervent in his ideological preaching and, sometimes, too aggressive against those who did not share his opinions. The fervent fanaticism proves more that Dostoevsky had perhaps more will to believe than real belief in his ideas and convictions. It is not the belief—it is unbelief, or, rather, half-belief, which is the father of any fanaticism; and the more Dostoevsky felt his half-belief and his doubts the more anxious he was to hide them from himself—in the dust and heat of his disputes and polemics. His “Diary of an Author” is a precious psychological document in this respect.

On the other hand, Dostoevsky—in spite of all his contradictions—gave the deepest and the most pan-human conception to his Russian idea which was to him identical with the cultural regeneration of all mankind through the Russian Spirit.

"The future Russian idea is not yet born, but the whole Earth is awaiting it in great pain and sickness,” he exclaimed, while endeavouring to find this idea in the mysterious depths and longings of his people. And, in fact, he believed to have found in the Soul of his nation all the necessary elements to counterbalance the materialistic European civilisation and to subdue it to a higher cultural idea. In other terms: in Russia he found less civilisation, but more culture, or, at least, more cultural potency, than in modern Europe.

"I make no attempt to compare Russia with the Western nations in the matter of economic or scientific renown. I say only that the Russian soul, the genius of the Russian people, is perhaps among all nations the most capable of upholding the idea of a universal union of mankind, of brotherly love, of the calm conception which forgets a universal union, for it and excuses the unlike, and softens all contradictions. This is not an economical, but a moral trait; and can any one deny that it is present in the Russian people?”—he writes in his “Diary.”

"Among us has been created by the ages, a type of the highest culture never seen before, and existing nowhere else in the world—the type of world-wide compassion for all,” Dostoevsky states by his version (the hero of the “Raw Youth”). This universal compassion, or rather, universal sympathy, he believed to have found also in Russian history, as well as in Russian art, above all in the great poet Pushkin. And even some months before his death he emphasised (in his speech on Pushkin) that “to a true Russian Europe and the destiny of all the mighty Aryan family is as dear as Russia herself, because our destiny a universality, won not by the sword, but by the strength of brotherhood and our fraternal aspiration to reunite mankind. And, in course of time, I believe that we will all, without exception, understand that to be a true Russian does indeed mean to aspire finally to reconcile the contradictions of Europe, to fuse the European yearning in our Russian soul, omni-human and all-uniting, to incline within our soul by brotherly love all our brethren, and at last, if it may be, to pronounce the final Word of the great general harmony, of the final brotherly communion of all nations in accordance with the law of the gospel of Christ!"

On another occasion he defined his Russian idea as a spiritual union of all true Russian Christians—"with the aim of giving to Russia such a moral authority that she could finally pronounce to all mankind the expected word—for the sake of a universal union, of the idea of which always lived in the Slavonic, and especially in the Russian soul.

In other words, the question: Is there still any possibility of saving the Spirit of mankind from death under the heels of the iron civilisation? Dostoevsky answered: Yes, there exists such a possibility in the consciousness of the young Slavonic race and in the brotherly collaboration of this race with the whole of Europe for the sake of humanity. Or, as his Prince Myshkin exclaims: "Reveal to the yearning and feverish companions of Columbus the New World,”

*Quotations from the “Diary” are partly taken from the translation by Kotlansky and Middleton-Smythe; quotations from the novels are taken from the translation by Mrs. C. Garnett.*
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The New Age
reveal to the Russian the 'world' of Russia, show him the whole of humanity, rising again, and renewed by Russian thought alone, perhaps by the Russian God and Christ, and you will see what a mighty and truthful, what a wise and gentle giant he will rise before the eyes of the world, an educating and amayed, because it expects of us nothing but the sword and violence, because, judging by us, the other peoples cannot picture us free from barbarism.'

II.

Almost in all his greater works Dostoyevsky attempted to 'reveal to the Russian the 'world' of Russia,' i.e., the conception of God and Christ. He saw the highest aim for his nation in the possibility of incarnating such a conception and of being the 'Bearer of God,' i.e., the bearer of that great religious idea which alone could save not only Russia but all mankind from spiritual death.

In this sense to be understood also the following strange words of Shatov (who at the first glance seem to belong to—Nietzsche): 'Everybody is a people as long as it has its own god (i.e., its own leading idea and value), and excludes all other gods on earth irreconcilably, so long as it believes that by its god it can command and drive out of the world all other gods. Such, from the beginning of time, has been the belief of all great nations, all, anyway, who have been leaders of humanity. But there is only one truth, and, therefore, only a single one of the nations can have the true god, only one is 'God-bearing'; that is the Russian people.'

A God-bearing nation means for Dostoyevsky simply a nation which has preserved in its consciousness the highest religious potency and the highest religious Value—the Value and the living image of Christ. He was (or he wished to be) convinced that the Russian people was 'God-bearing,' and in this circumstance he saw the great historic destiny and the immense cultural importance (for the future) of the Russian, as well as of the entire Slavonic race.

That was the reason why he was so anxious to find his conception of Christ in the soul of the Russian people, and why he attempted to include his Christianity within the scope of Russian orthodox which he opposed to the Christianity of Europe.

He saw in the latter, instead of a real image of Christ, only a rationalistic dead formula of His doctrine, while in the religious spirit of the Russian peasants he found Christ as a living reality in man's consciousness. In Russia he found a mystical, and in Europe only a rationalistic, conception of Christ. Hence he stated, and, from his point of view, quite logically, that Europe does not know Christ at all. Especially in Catholicism (symbolised by his Grand-Inquisitor) he saw a 'distorted Christ' and a distorted Christianity, i.e., simply a prolongation of the Roman Empire.

He himself explains that 'after the first Christian communities had arisen, then speedily began to be created a new and hitherto unheard-of nationality, a nationality of universal brotherhood and humanity, in the shape of the catholic ecumenical Church. But the Church was persecuted and the ideal grew beneath the earth; and above it, on the face of the earth, an immense building was also formed, a huge ant-hill, the old Roman Empire, which was the ideal outcome of the moral aspirations of the whole ancient world. But the anti-hill did not fortify itself; it was undermined by the Church. Then occurred the collision of the two most opposite ideas that could exist in the world. The Man-God met the God-Man, the Apollo Belvedere met the Christ. A compromise arose; the empire accepted Christianity, and the Church accepted the Roman State. The Church was destroyed, and finally transformed into the State. The Papacy appeared—the continuation of the ancient Roman Empire in a new incarnation. In the Eastern half the State was subdued and destroyed by the sword of Mahomet, and there remained Christ alone, already separated from the Church. But the State, which had accepted and exalted Christ anew, suffered such terrible and unending sufferings at the hands of its enemies, Tartar and tasked, and the Church, organisation, from serfdom, from Europe and Europeanism, and endures so much until this day, that a real social formula in the sense of spirit of love and Christian self-perfection has not yet been evolved in it.'

Dostoevsky's hopes were, however, founded more on the religious spirit of the Russian people than on the official Orthodox Church, with which he could not quite reconcile his own conception of Christianity. (The elder Zossima, who presents Dostoevsky's perception of 'orthodoxy,' seems to be equally heretical from the official orthodox as well as from the catholic point of view.) In any case, Dostoevsky came to the official Russian religion through the religious spirit of the Russian people and for the sake of this spirit. And he defined that spirit as the hope of fraternity and universal union in the name of Christ; hopes which the Russian people never will abandon. Such a union does not exist so far, but the new Church, a Church which will not be satisfied with prayers, but will command action, such a Church exists already in the hearts of the Russian peasants. The socialism of the Russian people is expressed neither by communist theories, nor by any mechanical formulas, but by its deep longing for a universal union in the name of Christ.'

Thus we come anew to Zossima's conception and prophecy of a universal Church, of a universal inner (religious) union of all mankind. To show the path and to realise such a brotherhood—that should be the true task and aim of the Russian or Slavonic Idea, as it was conceived by Dostoevsky.

III.

This short outline alone suffices to demonstrate the essence of his Russian Idea.

Dostoevsky was a Slavonic Messianist—like many other great Russians, like many Poles (for instance, the great Polish poets Mickiewicz, Slowacki, and Krasiński), like the Czech poet Jan Kollar, like the Southern Slav (Serbo-Croatian) poets Peter Preradovich and Nyegosh.

The idea of Messianism, i.e., of the spiritual regeneration of mankind through the Slavonic race, is more or less peculiar to all Slavs. And it was Dostoevsky who gave it to the deepest expression and significance.

He knew perfectly well all the defects and faults of his race, which is as chaotic, irrational and undisciplined as Dostoevsky himself was. But he was familiar also with all the good traits of its deep, eternally longing, eternally suffering Soul, which really is accessible to the 'world-wide compassion for all.' Therefore, he did not give up hope. He hoped, like his hero Stephan Trofimovich ('Possessed'), who, before his death—after having listened to the parable of the devils driven out by Jesus—said:—

'You see that's exactly like our Russia, those devils that come out of the sick and enter into the swine.' They are all here now, all the soul contaminations, all the impurities, all the devils, great and small, that have multiplied in that great invalid, our beloved Russia, in the course of ages and ages. But a great idea and a great Will will encompass it from on high, as with that lunatic possessed of devils . . . and all those devils will come forth, all impurity, all the rottenness that was putrefying on the surface . . . and they will beg of themselves to enter into swine . . . But the sick man will be healed and will sit at the feet of Jesus, and all will look upon him with astonishment... .

(To be concluded.)
A Teacher to Teachers.

It is probable that from the nature of our profession we are more concerned with the practice of teaching than with the theory of education; with the individual rather than with the social and scientific aspects. This exposes us to the risk of not seeing wood for trees, or, putting it more clearly, of declining into empiricism or the rule of thumb.

A good sound rule of thumb, established as the result of long experience, is, of course, far better in its immediate results than any untried and perhaps fantastic theory. At all events it is much safer. But at the same time this does not alter the fact that a rule of thumb should always be able to give an account of itself, and to justify itself before the bar of criticism.

Unfortunately the practical teacher's tendency to the extreme of mere practice is commonly reflected in the tendency of the theorist to the extreme of mere theory. And these extremes do not meet. If we too often cannot see wood for trees, they too often cannot see trees for wood. We tend to be without theory; they tend to be without practice.

I must point out, however, one advantage we have over them; and it is this: whereas it is comparatively easy for us to acquire the theory of education, it is difficult for them to acquire our practice of teaching. And this difference establishes us in a strong position.

Let us, then, make the most of our advantage. And just because we have this advantage, it appears to me that we have a corresponding responsibility and duty. If, by reason of our practical experience, we are enabled to arrive at better conclusions than are likely to be arrived at by the theoreticians, it is plainly our duty to make our practice a help to our weaker brethren, and to frame and express conclusions based upon our experience.

And if this has always been our duty, much as we may have neglected it, it is more than ever our duty to-day. Nobody can deny that the war has created an interest in education keener and more general than any that has existed in this country since just before the popular Education Act of 1870. Everybody feels that this terrible war should be the close of a secolar epoch in the history of mankind. Everybody feels that we should not allow to recur a state of mind that risks the recurrence of such a catastrophe. And the general mind is undoubtedly turning to teachers and educators with the demand that a new epoch of education after the war and especially to guess at the directions in which public interest will move would be initiated as soon as the last shot in this war has been fired.

This stirring of public interest in education has a particular interest for us. It is one of the most promising signs that the nation is about to renew its youth; and, as it were, to go to school again. Educational reformers are well aware how impossible it is to carry reforms in the absence of public interest. Public interest is the atmosphere in which alone educational reforms can be carried out. It is the very condition of their growth; and not only is it the condition of their growth, but public interest indicates the lines on which or, rather, in which, that growth is alone possible. We ought, therefore, to welcome the revival of interest in education; but, more than that, we ought to watch carefully for the directions that new interest is likely to take, and to be ready to foster, train and develop it. These observations may appear to be applicable only in the sphere of statesmanship or public policy. But I wish to remark that the principle underlying them is both derived from, and, in its turn, throws the theorist to the extreme of mere theory.

Whether in the individual or in education in general, the practical teacher's tendency to the extreme of mere practice is commonly reflected in the tendency of the theorist to the extreme of mere theory. This is the practice of the good teacher, whether he is aware of it or not. This is actually the foundation of his rule of thumb. And, in fact, the only difference between the common practice of good teachers and the common theory of expert psychologists is that the theory of the latter is the practice of the former made aware of itself. The whole theory of education reduces, in short, to a fact established by experience: namely, that interest (as someone has said) is the growing-end of the mind.

Where (and only where) there is interest is there something growing. The state of mind we call interest is the sign that a talent, a power, or an aptitude is sprouting and coming into bud. Without interest there is no real life; but where there is interest there is life.

It surely follows from this that, both as practical teachers and as educational reformers, our supreme interest is in interest. If interest is the only certain evidence of growth; and we are, above all, concerned with the growth of mind, plainly interest for us is everything. It cannot be too strongly insisted upon. Accepting interest as our principle, it will be seen that we have two vast fields of work into both of which the same key admits us.

On the one side, in dealing with our own pupils we must take the interest of the individual as both our material and our guide. And, on the other side, in dealing with education as a whole, and particularly in relation to the present urgent problems of public education, it is our duty as a profession to advance education as far as public interest will allow us, and in the direction indicated by public interest itself.

To speculate on the intensity of the demand for education after the war and especially to guess at the directions in which public interest will move would take me outside the modest limits of my present remarks. I will only say that the opportunities for educational reformers to-day appear to me to be almost unparalleled in history; and that, in general, the direction of men's minds appears to me to be more idealistic than ever before. The reaction of the war, from this aspect, are wholly good. The old world is dead; a new world is struggling to birth. A great opportunity as well as a great responsibility rests on the teachers of the new generation.

It is no man's business, and, least of all, the teachers, to impose interests on others. It cannot, in fact, be done. All we do when we attempt to create an interest not native to the mind is to arouse in it a pseudo-interest, which withers as soon as our stimulus is withdrawn because it has no real roots. This, I am sure, is our common experience. Similarly we cannot impose on the public mind an interest not native to it; nor can we direct an interest from one direction to another.

What in both cases we can do—as teachers and as educationalists—is to take interest as we find it and as it comes, and to make the most and the best of it. Whether in the individual or in education in general, our work is to seek out interest and, when found, to foster, nourish and train it to the best of our ability in order that the talents and aptitudes of which it is the sign may come to blossom and fruit.
DEMOCRACY AND MILITARISM.

BY WILL DYSON.

INTERNATIONAL FINANCE.

"Well, my dear Ludwig, if we could only make those Labour people incur the odium of peace!"
THE MESSAGE.

RUSSIAN AND GERMAN DEMOCRACY: "Be warned by our plight; ask Prussia for justice only when you are strong enough not to need to ask for it."
SPIRITUAL FRIENDS.

SHADE OF PRUSSIA: "Fool to fight me! Do not I ensure the permanent docility of the working classes?"
DEMOCRACY AND THE FALSE PROPHETS.

DEMOCRACY: "They say. What say they? Let them say?"
Journey Round My Room.

X.

I feel a certain kinship to that connoisseur in sensations who used to boast of being kicked by one of the Georges; I cannot forget the Englishman whom Rasputin ever kissed! As kisses go, his was a mere formality in the way of a farewell; indeed, I willingly renounce the kisses as less remarkable than the fact of coming to close quarters with Rasputin at all.

Before I went to Russia, and all the time I was there, I never thought to have any of Rasputin's串联. On the one side were the reports, usually carried to absurd length, of his foul and promiscuous bestiality; at the other extreme, we were told to see in him a mild-eyed, benevolent monk with no small powers of healing by touch and by prayer. It made the enigma more difficult when accounts given by Russians who actually professed to know about him also did not tally. They all explained to me that he was a rogue, but I had been reading a good book and I couldn't help feeling that Rasputin was in sufficiently important positions to be a mere formality.

Was it due to his own personality, or to the general circumstances at the Court? Was there a force in itself, with the potentiality of provoking action on his own initiative, or was he only an unconscious tool in other hands? Nobody knew for certain whether Rasputin was a prophet or a satyr.

Moreover, he was supposed to have a very special claim to the Imperial favour. There is a tradition in Russia, the land of myths, that Alexander I, who died and was buried in 1825 at Tarareq (Chebok's birthplace, and a place where the Sles of the Sea of Azov), did not really die there, but fled from the place in disguise and made his way to Siberia, spreading a false report of his own death in order to escape the plots of revolutionaries. He then spent the rest of his life at a monastery in Tarsam, where his remains, alleged to be his, are still displayed. The Tsar Nicholas II, now deposed, is said to believe in this theory, to have visited the monastery in state, and privately to have acknowledged this same Gregory Rasputin as the grandson of the Imperial refugee, and thus as the rightful claimant to the Throne.

The longer I remained in Russia the more I felt inclined to see this strange man for myself. I made careful inquiries, and at last found a way of reaching him, unapproachable though he was supposed to be. One morning, I procured a copy of Rasputin's book, "My Thoughts," a diary of his journey to the Holy Land, which had just been published in a hole-and-corner way. When I had looked through it, I went to the flat of one of Rasputin's intimate acquaintances and rang up the telephone number he told me. A gruff voice answered, and, by good luck, it was Rasputin himself. I hastened to explain that I had already been reading his book, and, as a foreigner, had been particularly impressed by his plea for the unity of Christendom; could I come to hear more of this from him? He told me to come at once, and, after a certain time, I called at No. 67, in the Gorodnaya Street, where I knew Rasputin lived. When I rang the bell of the flat, the door was opened on a chain, and a slut of about fourteen years old, a peasant, and walked with a clumsy roll. She shut the door on me and went to make inquiries. While she was gone, a man approached me from the stairs, obviously a plain-clothes man. He told me that it was useless to wait; Rasputin never received visitors. Then he rang the bell in a peculiar way, and was at once admitted by the girl. I waited a little while, and then went away. I again telephoned to Rasputin, who promised to admit me. Surely enough, when I called again half an hour later, I was admitted at once and led into a kind of waiting-room. As I sat there, various important-looking men came out from a conference with Rasputin, and one or two ladies in fashionable clothes were admitted to him. After about a quarter of an hour, Rasputin came to me. He wore a not very clean blue blouse, breeches and top-boots, like a peasant, and walked with a clumsy roll. He drew up a chair in front of me and leaned forward on it, so that our eyes were less than a foot apart. I asked one or two questions, and he delivered emphatic answers not much to the point. He spoke the rather archaic Russian of the Church and the monasteries, and illustrated his meaning by waves and passes of his hands. These, combined with the closeness of his very bright and expressive eyes, made him a most uncomfortable person to be in the same room with, and I felt a definite desire to be away from him.

As a souvenir of the occasion, I thought to get some written paper from Rasputin. I asked him to give me formal permission to translate his book. He did so and signed it; and that is the curious scrawl which hangs in a frame there on the wall of my room.

As I said, we kissed when we parted, and I invited him to call again about the letter of introduction that I should do. "Oh! that mine adversary had written a book!" I might have doubted the evidence of my eyes and ears, and have been so much impressed by his certain hypnotic (if not clairvoyant) powers as to believe in his prophetic nature—had not been written, that hopeless book. "And I saw with my own eyes," he wrote, "that the Turks wear the same clothes as Christians and Jews. For the fulfilment of the word of Our Lord is at hand, that there will be one orthodox Church without distinction of dress." I agree that very probably Rasputin did not write all the book, nor half of it, but he certainly claimed to be unanswerable with considerable pride when I was speaking to him. He assured me that it was a good book, but I had already assured myself that it was a very foolish one—and that, therefore, Rasputin was in sufficiently important respects a foolish man. I found him shrewd and probably hypnotic, but neither clairvoyant nor wise. And this, I think, is probably the true estimate of Rasputin.

As you go round my room you will find his book in the top row of the bookshelf by the door. It contains two photographs of Rasputin, one of which is very vague, while the other is either the only authentic portrait of him I know of, or, at least, the only authentic one known in England.
Views and Reviews.

MIND AND BODY.

At this stage, it will be worth while to consider the essay on "The Mind and the Brain," contributed to the volume of Dr. James A. Hadfield, surgeon in the Royal Navy. The argument is developed on lines very familiar to those acquainted with the literature of psychology. The materialistic view that mind is a function of matter is stated; the idealistic view that matter is a function of mind is also stated; the philosophical antitheses are to confront and contradict each other until the end of time, or the real nature of matter or mind is demonstrated. That the antithesis is not real because it is abstract is a possibility never to be forgotten; no one has ever had experience of mind or of matter by itself. We are not aware of reality in analysis, but in synthesis; and as Ribot said: "The analysis here is fatally artificial, because it disjoins groups of phenomena which do not merely stand in juxtaposition, but are really co-ordinate, their relation being not of simple juxtaposition, but of reciprocal dependence." The general Christian theory that we "are members one of another" may be the synthesis of these philosophical antitheses; certainly, the scientific demonstration that matter is force operating under certain conditions, the nature of the matter being determined by the structure of the atom and the velocity of its units, offers an analogous synthesis of apparent antitheses.

But if we were to wait until the philosophers concluded their scienmacy, we should never know anything: "Solvitur ambulando" may not be an answer to abstract argument, but it is a reminder of the nature of reality. If philosophy cannot settle its own difficulties, science can at least find a way round them, because it does not attempt to establish dogma, but truth, it does not propound the problem in the same terms, nor try to solve it by the same methods. Science arrives at provisional conclusions by means of working hypotheses; and while, as Huxley put it, Materialism and Idealism have been "eternally slaying one another and eternally coming to life again in a naphazard process of evolution," science has been getting on with the work. In the case under consideration, the science of psychology, with its working hypotheses of psycho-physical interaction, has come much nearer a solution of the difficulty, and, incidentally, has provided much more interesting occupation than could be hoped for in the old enthusiasms of Materialism and Idealism. We have no reason to believe that "Ultimate Reality" differs from primary reality, and the methods that rob reality of its content obviously cannot instruct us concerning its nature. As Huxley said: "The weight and number of those who refuse to be the prey of verbal mystifications has begun to tell in practical life"; and if we want to get an intelligible idea even of what we mean by immortality, or what we hope of it, we have to turn not to philosophy but to psychology.

We have to begin with the admission that the body, whatever it is, can influence the mind, whatever it is. A lack of thyroid extract, for example, will cause cretinism, and the administration of thyroid extract will frequently cure it; insanity may be caused by various forms of toxemias, and cured by the administration of antiseptics or anti-toxins. I should be inclined to go further than Dr. Hadfield does in his demonstration of the localisation in the brain of various functions; but the question here is one of principle, and not of the extent of its application, and it is sufficient for present purposes to quote Dr. Hadfield's words: "In the usual case the lobe of the brain is injured or removed, we lose our sight: if the area referred to the occipital lobe be injured, we retain our sight; we can see things and copy them, but we fail to understand their meaning. That is to say, a psychical quality is lost with the loss of this piece of brain, which tells us that the sensory centres there are psychical centres in the brain upon the integrality of which our mental condition to some extent depends." The difficulty of proving that the total mind is not destroyed when the total brain is destroyed seems to be insuperable—but I will not anticipate difficulties.

On the other hand, the mind can influence the body. "Let us take a common illustration. A woman receives the news of the sudden death of her husband. This is a 'psychic' cause: we call it psychic because it is not the message as spoken that produces the effect on her (she had often heard the impalpable sound-waves of the word 'death'), but its significance for her. We see the flush—an attempt of the heart to drive sufficient blood to the brain to stand the shock—the subsequent pallor, the sickness, the trembling, and ultimately the loss of consciousness, by which means nature delivers her from the agony of mental pain. These phenomena of the circulation and the nervous system are produced by a cause that is purely psychical in origin, and prove that the mind is able to use the body to express its feelings and emotions." The microscopist, too, learns to produce a psychic blindness in the unanaesthetised eye. The sailor may produce a more or less complete anaesthesia or amnesia in the stress of battle, and psychotherapeutics, particularly that branch of it classified under the name of "hypnotism," provide us with an extraordinary range of similar phenomena. Dr. Hadfield mentions several of his own cases, and demonstrates once again that there is apparently no function of the body that cannot be controlled by the mind—he has even succeeded in performing the experiment of producing blisters by suggestion under hypnosis. It is not to be supposed that these phenomena require a professional hypnotist for their production: the hysterical patient produces most of them himself with apparent spontaneity, or under the influence of some overwhelming shock. Dr. Hadfield is not as searching in his investigation of the mental history of his patients as was Dr. Eder in his recent book on "War-Shock"; but his purpose, of course, is not technical but illustrative, and it is enough for present purposes to know that the mind can influence the body, that the psychical phenomenon of fear, for example, will cause the adrenal gland to pour out an excess of adrenin into the blood, and that the physical phenomena produced are exactly the same as those following an injection of adrenin—"the pupils dilate, hairs stand erect, blood vessels are constricted, the activities of the alimentary canal are inhibited, and sugar is liberated from the liver." The possibility of a practically complete control of bodily functions by the exercise of the mind is obviously not a remote one, and I believe that it is a common experience of psychotherapeutics that it is easier to cure than to cause disease by suggestion. Unfortunately, Dr. Hadfield does not tell us whether it was more or less difficult to cause the blisters than it was to cure the burn; but there is nothing in his essay to suggest that his experience differs from the average experience.

Having demonstrated that "we have real evidence that the mind can dominate the body and all its functions," he proceeds to consider the physiological basis of telepathy to suggest that "the mind can act without using the ordinary channels of bodily sense." I suppose that there are few people in these days (certainly, few readers of The New Age) who need to be told that telepathy is a fact, universally demonstrable, and I think it is of the utmost importance in this connection that it offers, in Dr. Hadfield's opinion, a suggestion of a modus operandi of what we may call the "soul." He as
sums that because the limitations of time and space are apparently overpassed by telepathic phenomena, telepathy itself is a possibility, that the soul may exist apart from the physical conditions of human personality. "These higher powers serve only to point us still further along the road that delivers us from bondage to the flesh, and leads us to anticipate the complete emancipation of the mind from the body. The mind may henceforth become indifferent to the disasters which in the course of nature are bound to overtake the body, and may hope to survive its destruction and decay—and perhaps thereafter to find or create for itself a 'spiritual body' adapted to a different sphere of existence and to other modes of life."

I will devote the next article to the consideration of this hypothesis.

A. E. R.

Reviews.


(The Cinematograph Trade Council.)

It is an unfortunate fact that the stupidity of an accusation is not a guarantee against its general acceptance; so few people understand what the words "causal connection" imply that a myth, particularly if it is malicious, is sure of a long life unless it can be definitely contradicted by facts. The simple fact that what is called "juvenile crime" existed before the cinema was invented, and was more prevalent, that a generation ago it was attributed to the reading of "penny bloods," and a generation before that to the original sin of the children of the working classes, should have warned everybody against accepting the excuse that "the pictures" were responsible for what is the main only an increase in misdemeanours. If a man steals to supply a sick wife with necessaries, as does a boy, we do not hear responsible people suggesting that sweets or cigarettes are the cause of crime—it is only "the pictures" that are anathematised by all the kill-joys of the kingdom. It became necessary, in the interests of the cinematograph trade, to examine and to refute the allegation that the cinema was a cause of juvenile crime; and Mr. Frank Fowell, secretary and publicity director of the Cinematograph Trade Council, communicated with magistrates, chief constables, probation officers, and similar people, examined criminal statistics, collected all the evidence possible to obtain evidence for or against the allegation of the pernicious effect of the cinema. The evidence is, of course, a refutation; and although "crime" is always an absurd description of the irregular behaviour of children, the classification "juvenile crime" is so comprehensive that it is absurd to anyone who understands causal connection to attribute any one cause for such a variety of misdemeanours. The four little boys at Cardiff who were charged with the crime of "riding on step of tramcar" may have been corrupted by the cinema, although there is no evidence of it; but how can we suppose that the fifty-three boys who stole the three shillings and one little crown at the same court with "street-trading" were driven to this criminal practice by the same corruption induced by the same means? If we grant that the fifty-three boys who with criminal intent and malice aforethought "played football, etc., in streets" of Cardiff were driven from the paths of righteous inactivity by the influences to sport so strenuously propagated by the cinema, it is impossible to suppose that the same cause will explain why nine boys and one girl should have ridden "bicycles without lights," why six boys should have "left off firewood," why fifteen boys and one girl should have "trespassed on railways," why twenty-two boys should have "obstructed footway," and five actually "jostled foot-passengers," why ninety-one juvenile criminals actually played "pitch and toss" to the danger of their immortal souls? If we turn to larceny, which is more like "crime," and of which there has been an increase since the beginning of the war, we must remember that "orchard raiding" is "larceny," and the arch-villain who steals a penny pie from an itinerant pieman is a felon, if, indeed, he is not a highway robber and his victim a passer-by. But the very fact that there has been an increase of petty larceny since the war began is coupled with the admission that larceny was deceasing before the war; and as the cinema was not invented on August 4, 1914, those who assert a causal connection between the cinema and the increase of juvenile delinquency are out of the question. This is not to say that the cinema has not influenced the present generation, but it has not begun before the war. There is no need for us to detail the argument any further; but we may conclude with two suggestions both to juvenile delinquents and to those who like obvious explanations of juvenile delinquency. A dairyman, recently charged with putting water in his milk, alleged that his cows were suffering from shell-shock. It is a fact that we do not have air-raid before the war, it is a fact that "shell-shock" is not always due to the actual concussion of an explosion, but may be induced by expectation of it, and it is also a fact that "shell-shock" renders men temporarily irresponsible. Explanation number one: juvenile larceny is due to "shell-shock." A less empirical explanation necessitates the exploitation of the germ theory; various forms of moral aberration are directly traceable to toxemia, and may be caused by germs, ergo, there is a germ that causes juvenile larceny. The only scientific cure would be inoculation; but it would probably be cheaper to instruct policemen to clump the children's heads instead of arresting them for stealing apples, or making public examples, as at Cardiff of the six little boys who "threw stones." Juvenile crime is not "crime," and there is no "cause" of it.

The Co-operative Wholesale Societies, Ltd., Annual, 1918.

The attenuated form of the Annual this year is not indicative of any shrinkage of trade, but of the shortage of paper. The sales of the C.W.S. for the year ended last June amounted to £5,000,000, but we notice that the society is co-operating with the Co-operative Wholesale Bank in forming the C.W.S. Bank with a capital of £18,000,000 worth of goods, so that two-thirds of the C.W.S. business is still distributive of capitalist products. But the Society is certainly extending the range of its productive activities; it has, jointly with the Scottish Agricultural Department at Edinburgh, purchased a thousand acres in Canada for wheat-growing, increased its tea-gardens in Ceylon and Accra for cocoa, and increased its agricultural holding in East Africa to more than 20,000 acres, has gone to Lagos and Accra for cocoa, and increased its agricultural holding in England to 12,430 acres. It has bought an oil-mill in Liverpool, a small timber plantation in Suffolk, a colliery in Northumberland, established a margarine factory at Ilford, and bought a mine for a new flour mill at Birkenhead. For textiles, boots, hardware, and other manufactures, purchases have been made either to provide new factories or extensions; a C.W.S. Agricultural Department has come into being, and there is now a Chemical Research Department and a Solicitor's Department, which, we hope, are more efficient than the Publicity Department, which once sent a letter to this journal and exhausted its controversial ability in the one effort. Even the C.W.S. Banking Department seems to be developing its activities, although it may not appreciate the fact that it is still co-operating with the joint-stock banks in the transaction of business, and competing with them in the appeal for more capital, which they obtain by extensive amalgamation. "Deposits and withdrawals" of £200,000,000; but the amount of new capital is not mentioned (is there any?), and Mr. Percy Redfern
suggests that 'co-operative insurance, which is on the point of greater developments, may prove a means to the end' of creating a capital which can be locked up not for weeks but for years. Wake up, Manchester! The other articles deal with "The Russian Co-operative Movement," "Small Holdings and Co-operation," "National Housing," "The Economics of Reconstruction," and "National Guilds" ("what dost thou here, Elijah?"). The limitation of space probably prevented Mr. H. M. Richardson from developing the antagonism between producers' control of industry, represented by National Guilds, and the consumers' control represented by the co-operators, but his four-page summary of the theory should suffice to acquaint co-operators with the fact that they have no monopoly of social progress either in theory or action.

Towards Industrial Freedom. By Edward Carpenter. (Allen & Unwin. 2s. 6d. net.)

Mr. Edward Carpenter is a born traveller; he is always on the way Towards Democracy or to "The Promised Land," but the one case in which he seems to have arrived anywhere was when he paid "A Visit to a Gnome." Of "Social and Political Life in China," he writes, even in this volume, with a peculiar disregard of the fact that our liberation will not come from China, but from England. Exactly what he means by "Industrial Freedom" can only be deduced from the fact that he accepts the Minority Report of the Poor Law Commission; and his rhapsodies concerning "Industry as an Art," "Beauty in Everyday Life," his glorification of "Small Holdings and Co-operation," his preference for customs instead of statute or common law, have to be read in the light of that acceptance. All that he says of the value of spontaneity becomes unreal in the light of the Minority Report; one might as well accept the Insurance Act as an example of the vis medicatrix naturae. Either Mr. Carpenter believes in the imposition of systems; if he accepts the Minority Report, he accepts the imposition of systems, and his objections to law, property, and the rest are worth nothing.

Wilhelm the Ruthless. Illustrated by David Wilson. (Drawing, Ltd.)

This 'verbal and pictorial satire' is as clumsily done as if it were written by a German. It pretends to trace the development of ruthlessness in a series of imaginary renderings of events in the life of the present German Emperor, in dialogue that is banal when uttered by human beings and bombastic when mouthed by the supernatural personages whom Mr. Wilson usually represents as length without breadth. The caricaturist relies mainly on extension for his comic effect; a thing or person is either very long or very broad, and he plays chiefly with the opposition of short and tall, thin and stout, light and dark. When he becomes imaginative, he does a series of designs in colour, which make a musical impression of the evolution of Ruthlessness, though the relation between music and drawing is not obvious to us. Would it not have been more artistic if Mr. Wilson had tried to convey a pictorial impression, instead of these coloured jigsaw puzzles emptied out of a box? That they are admirably printed is the only satisfaction that we have received from the perusal of this work.

The Pearl. By G. Winifred Taylor. (Blackwell. 6s.)

It is, we suppose, a result of the higher education of women that we are now getting meticulous records of their life at school and college; and if we may judge from this one, the religious problem worries them much more than it does the average male scholar. The difficulty of passing from a literal interpretation of the wrong passages of Scripture to the literal interpretation of the right ones, seems to be insuperable to the young mind; the old, old antithesis of reason and religion has to be posited in every case, as though the intellect were sceptical instead of being simply intellectual, a faculty of apprehension, but not of understanding. What the heroine of this story is not passing examinations, she is talking about her soul to her girl-friends or to innumerable clergymen, and is torn between her desire to believe and her recognition of the fact that she does not believe. Instead of leaving her soul alone, and listening for its affirmations, she is perpetually overhauling her mind to see if she can find any doubts lurking within it, and perpetually succeeding in her search and depopulating her success. What she thought of God, we have not been able to discover from this book; but one thing is certain--she would understand her as well as she did herself, and might be willing to make allowances for her youth. She really felt entitled to the perfect revelation of the Divine, which not even the archangels possess, and, lacking it, felt that she was cut off from the communion of Saints and was outcast from the Divine scheme of things. She was always tiptoeing to the sanctuary to see if a miracle had happened for her, or cycling over to the Cowley Fathers to see if they could either perform a miracle for her or recom- mend one who could. The story ends naturally enough with the suggestion that she should marry another young man of whose religious belief there was no doubt whatever. The doctrine of the Incarnation is sufficient warrant for her finding the God in the man.

A Communion of Sinners. By Evelyn Sharp. (Allen & Unwin. 1s. 6d. net.)

This is a series of short sketches written with the rather acid purpose of the social reformer. Miss Sharp seems always to be jumping down the throat of humanity because it does not recognise the superior wisdom, efficiency and kindness, not of women, but of feminists. In addition to feminism, there is pacifism; and in "Her Boy" what looks like an attempted justification of Pro-Germanism by love. There is a persistent misrepresentation of Christianity as the religion of a pacifist; but Miss Sharp bluntly said that it was because His kingdom was not of this world that His servants did not fight; "if My kingdom were of this world, then would My servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews"; and the irrelevance of quoting Christianity in politics is obvious. But that shallowness of understanding vitiates most of these sketches, and really explains the lack of sympathy with ordinary human nature which makes these sketches deficient in good humour. It was not by a policy of pin-pricks that Christ tried to save the world.

Mephistopheles—Kaiser.

(Goethe's "Faust").

I am the Spirit of negation! And rightly so! For all that is created, its destiny is but again to perish; "there being no reformer, nothing were created. In fact, then, everything which ye call sin, Destruction, all by evil meant—That is indeed my very element. H. A. H.
“Producers by Brain.”

[The New Age has placed this column at the service of Mr. Allen Upward for the purpose of carrying on his Parliamentary candidature as a representative of literature and art.]

L. S. D.

One of the greatest handicaps of mankind, and especially of English mankind, is the disposition to charge public men for the privilege of serving it. At one time, indeed, there was a naked legal condition that no one should enter the House of Commons unless he possessed property to a defined extent. And although the law has been abolished the spirit of it remains.

Mr. Bonar Law, I believe, recognizing that none but the rich need apply, deliberately gave up the first part of his life to making a fortune instead of wasting it in the unprofitable task of trying to serve his country as a poor man. I have watched with interest the career of Mr. Herbert Samuel, who had the advantage of starting with sufficient means. He looked about him, and saw that the shires round London were hopeless seats from a Liberal point of view, and, therefore, neglected in the matter of organisation. He thereupon formed a Home Counties Liberal Federation, and by a judicious system of grants in aid built up Liberal Associations in a score or so of constituencies, thereby naturally earning much influence in the nomination of candidates. In this way he became the political boss of a large area, and no Liberal Government could be formed without his inclusion. It was all perfectly fair and above-board, but it was, nevertheless, a striking illustration of the power of the purse in politics.

I could show the working of the same principle in municipal politics from my own experience. While a citizen of Cardiff, I played an active part in local affairs, and among other services, I was able to save the townspeople £5,000 a year by resisting the imposition of a pier toll for the benefit of Lord Bute. Shortly afterwards, I put up for a seat on the Council, only to be rejected in favour of a brewer, whose friends claimed that he spent money in the ward. A few years later, having taken a house at Torquay, where I confined myself strictly to literary work, I was pressed by the outgoing mayor to succeed him in his office. I asked what it would cost me, and was told £50. Such are the conditions. By doing nothing and paying £500 one may become a mayor; by rendering services worth £5,000 a year one cannot become even a councillor. Cardiff is now to return three members, and if the electors felt any real desire to secure good representatives, if they had the faintest perception of their own interest, I should be one of the three thrown out this him, and shall be interested to see what comes of it.

Now, let us imagine any other business being conducted on similar lines. Take the Army, for instance. Down to fifty years ago regimental officers had to buy their commissions, though even in those days the higher commands were not openly put up to purchase. Gladstone abolished that system in the teeth of higher commands were not openly put up to purchase. There’s a hint round the policeman’s hat, that cart is a thing to wonder at, its wheels are spinning as fast as the world, and it clears the street like a ship unforfeited. The people are laughing toward the sun.

Of youth’s dead days; still stirs within my arid heart the need of tears. I have a subtle need of tears. To quench this fire within my brain, The shivering of the thousand spears Of swift regrets and urgent fears, Sad memories of another’s pain In youth’s cruel days; ah me! to gain For once the solace of soft tears.

I feel the subtle need of tears To purge in part, my soul of pain, A furnace fed thro’ long, lone years By swift remorse and urgent fears, Sad memories of another’s pain In youth’s harsh days; ah me! in vain I crave for God’s great gift of tears.

FRED KAY.

IN SPRING.

Wish you to hear
The song that flowers sing?
Then walk the woods in Spring,
Then flowers sing:
Shy yellow primroses and violets mild
Chant with uncertain voice as a
Wish you to hear

TIMOTHY JAY

WATCHERS IN THE NIGHT.

Across the wide and starless sky
The black bats flicker one by one,
The owls go swooping softly by,
How long to wait ere comes the dawn?

I thought, in this thick night, to hear
The bleating of a hunted fawn—
A fawn that feels the wolves are near;
How long to wait ere comes the dawn?

All round us in the dense are tall
Strange shapes of things that love the night:
We cannot hear their footsteps fall;
How long to wait ere comes the light?

New gods are here—they call us, these—
To our own gods we can but pray:
"Be near us until darkness goes!
How long to wait ere comes the day?"

M. M. M.

Allen Upward.
with these performers would end by ruining the critic's capacities for perception.

The critic is the agent of the public. His praise is equivalent to advising his readers to spend anything from 2s. 6d. to £2. 6s. 6d. on the privilege of hearing a fine performance, and his credit is ruined if he advises them to waste their admission fees. Madame Alvarez' second performance was of a nature to make me regret having praised the first one of her present series.

The critic presumably has, or should have, heard a certain amount of really excellent music, and he should hold up some standards of perfection, in the hope either of assisting or even of forcing some great artist to improve. His fidelity to perfection and to excellence is far more important than any camoufage of flattery, or, as Mr. Schiff calls it, " courtesy, that he might spread over his notices. These drawing-room people have little place in a search for exactitude, and they can very well be left to dilettantes who have no other occupation, and who have never achieved gradations of language in which to convey the quality of a performance, or the gradations of quality between one concert and another.

What I deplore, and what Mr. Schiff apparently cannot understand anyone's deploiring, is that people should labour to please an imbecile public which never does and never can know its own mind, instead of spending an equivalent effort trying to produce excellent art, to which the more intelligent members of the public are always, in the end, gathered.

WILLIAM ATHERTON.

DRAMAT.

Sir,—I am obliged to your three correspondents in the last issue of The New Age for their confirmation of my opinion that they were not, and are not, concerned with the Drama. The drama should not be recruited from the Bar, but should be a career in itself—in short, the judge should be qualified for practice in legalism, and not by practice in litigation.

I do not pretend to any knowledge of the Drama, but I may repeat here the question asked of them by Mr. Lawson in the " Nation " of March 2. How do they propose to set this scheme afoot? So far, they have only asked for enactment—a proposal that savours more of the begging-letter writer than of the artist.

JOHN FRANCIS HOPE.

Memoranda.

(From last week's New Age.)

Whatever Power should succeed in establishing a hegemony in Europe would be compelled by force of circumstances to attempt to establish its hegemony of the world.

The war is being fought not only in the sight of the whole world, but in the mind of the whole world. — "Notes of the Week."

The small shopkeeper is a parasite upon wages, a growth from the soil of economic subjection.

If Joan of Arc had remained in the ministry of her Nativity, it is unlikely that she would have sacrificed herself in that cause, unless we consider her a beast of burden. — J. L. M. Thoms.

All European culture is being more and more engulfed by the desecration. -S. G. H.

A war is not justified merely by being just. There are too many injustices in the world to justify a war for each of them.—RIASUR DEL MATIZ.

Christ has been accepted so far only externally—by our reason, while our consciousness remains as far from Him as 2,000 years ago. —J. W. A. LaMarm.

In all revolutions and reforms hitherto there have been only quantitative improvements.—J. LAVRIN.

The first practical step in any educational reform is to begin it.—W. B. RICHMOND.