

**TEXT FLY WITHIN
THE BOOK ONLY**

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OU 152987

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OSMANIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Call No. 320/R120 Accession No. 6505

Author Radford, George

Title Our Daily Bread

This book should be returned on or before the date
last marked below.

OUR DAILY BREAD

BY

GEORGE RADFORD, M.A.

EDITOR OF OUR LAND

PUBLISHED FOR

OUR LAND PRESS

BY

CONSTABLE & CO. LTD. LONDON

1918

*This little book is published as Supplement IV. to
Our Land, the serial issue of which has
been suspended during the War.*

*Our Land Annual will be published
(D.V.) on 1st January, 1919.*

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
i. National Safety and Health -	- 5
ii. English Wheat - - - - -	- 11
iii. The Producer and the Consumer -	- 19
iv. Our Natural Wealth - - - - -	- 50
v. Education and Management - - -	- 60
vi. Finance - - - - -	- 71
vii. Publicity - - - - -	- 90
viii. Free Trade - - - - -	- 103
ix. Socialism so-called - - - - -	- 112
x. The Real Peace - - - - -	- 123

Our Daily Bread

National Safety and Health

THE inhabitants of the various States which are at war will not all be satisfied if the belligerent of which they nominally form part should win. Some of these peoples may win more by the loss of the war than by its gain; and we must never forget that the emancipation of certain subject races has come to be, whatever it was at first, one of our ultimate war aims. Russia has shown us very clearly that even in an apparently orderly state the interests of its people do not always coincide with the policy of its rulers; we are once more taught that the first requirement of freedom is the custom and development of, not the mere momentary seizure of, self-government. We have been governing ourselves for a long period, and yet we have not overcome all the difficulties of nationality; and it is something of a shock to find, in the fierce light which war casts upon social conditions—the student had seen the danger long ago by his dimmer

taper light—that we have our own problems of land tenure and social justice, just as our enemies have them in an extreme form, and such as Russia is trying to solve by civil war. It is for the sober-minded among us to address themselves to the land problem in a spirit the reverse of revolutionary. We are members one of another, and must attack the question, not from the point of view of envy and strife, but in the light of self-preservation as a state and with an eye to the best interests of all.

I have already tried to urge these things upon thinking citizens with two chief objects before me. The first is the common need of national safety in face of the risks of war which are now familiar to us all. The second is the desirability of health and comfort everywhere, and this largely depends upon making such fundamental arrangements at home that free trade may be able to flourish as before but under healthier conditions. Free trade has had a disastrous effect upon farming, upon the scientific development of our resources, and in some directions upon our characters. Our very life as a nation might depend upon securing from our own acres here—not our imperial

NATIONAL SAFETY — HEALTH 7

ones across the seas—an adequate amount of food; upon keeping upon the land and its auxiliary services a sufficient number of citizens to defend our shores, or supply those defences; and upon a national training in scientific subjects so that ignorance may not cause us to lose what strength alone cannot preserve.

With England fundamentally prepared in certain directions Free Trade is needed to add comfort to mere existence. In order, however, to make a safe opening for an even more thorough use of Free Trade than we have hitherto made it is essential that we should undertake certain industries as a people just as we undertake the arduous duties of civil government and police, of that dreadful thing war, of education, sanitation, communications of all kinds, and postal facilities. I have sketched these State services already, but there are so many details connected with them all that I beg for a patient hearing once more upon this all-important subject.

I have advocated the public ownership of those things which are essentially and fundamentally national, land, and minerals, and the public management of others which, like the

Navy, Army, education, and the post office, ought unquestionably to serve and be controlled by the State as a whole. These latter undertakings are farming, railways, mining, banks, and the public-house. The question of insurance, though not so obvious or so easy, ought to afford the citizen relief from much of that black care which sits upon the shoulders of multitudes of worthy, honest men. I have endeavoured to draw public attention to these matters, and believe that the time has arrived for attempting to call together those who are willing to unite for the elaboration of a definite programme for publicity and work. Inertia in public life is very great; private interests appear to conflict with public ones; there is a dread of the so-called *proletariat* on the part of some; it seems to others rank blasphemy to try to make it possible to have the poor no longer with us. - What pathetic sadness there will be on some faces when we bid poverty a long farewell!

Worse, perhaps, than any other obstacle is that barbed-wire fence round individualism which hints that energy, and the success which attends it, will be eliminated if we eliminate squalor, sweating, and the vices which appear in their

train. But the war is to be thanked for telling us explicitly at last that no one can work efficiently upon an empty stomach. Yet the empty stomach must be risked if we do not see to our food and its distribution for ourselves. The old economy seemed to hint that whoever else we parted with we must preserve at all hazards the profiteer. Let us experiment upon him for a time; let us give our own good selves a chance! It seems necessary, therefore, to pursue the economic ghoul, if possible, to its lair, and to consider some of those interesting questions which are connected with State management.

If we divide our counties into farming units, arranged purely according to the convenience of collection and distribution, it will be seen that in these major items of food and clothing the home country will be its own master, and can contrive that, of the produce, nothing be lost, and, of the consumer, that no one be overlooked. I am compelled to emphasize this matter in the first instance because we have learnt that, merely as fighters, it is a great convenience not to have a mass of worry and anxiety—a sea of difficulty as Mr. Prothero puts it—concerning supplies. And as wheat is the chief item which causes

anxiety, I will speak of it separately, and in the first place. But I cannot press upon the dear people of this land too often or too strongly the fact that the food problem has two sides, which must never be lost sight of. There is the scientific interest, including the economic one, which is concerned with the obtaining of a vastly increased output of the best foods. And there is the purely political aspect of the case which the economic social question raises. Let us try to make the picture of a smiling countryside so attractive that feudalism itself may give up the effort to found families and be content to become really patriotic at last.

English Wheat

I DO not wish to hint that the U boat would be negligible if we grew plenty of wheat; but the threat of starvation is to a large extent based upon our vast imports of the cereal. The Corn Production Act has been passed by a large majority, and is to continue in force for a few years. At the end of that time, unless we study our safety and our interests more thoroughly than is apparent in this emergency measure we shall be worse off than before. I am presuming that we are to continue to be an island and that some at least of the benefits and inconveniences will remain with us in spite of channel tunnels, aeroplanes, wireless, and the rest. And I therefore desire to see my fellow-countrymen seriously setting their hands to the task of self-support in food. And a true estimate of the problems which surround wheat is the essence of success.

Let me say at once that our English farmers can grow heavier crops per acre than others; that our quality is being improved in a remarkable way; and that wheat can be grown on the

same land year after year. But these interesting facts have no bearing upon the national problem except to obscure it. To obtain success, and a vast increase in our output of good wheat, not merely now but always, we must approach the question in an altogether different way. We may send out orders from a small body of dictators to plough this field or the other for wheat. We are only spoiling farming as a fine art, and will find before long that we shall have to guarantee prices which are double those of free trade; and the whole school of free-traders will take us back to all the old miseries connected with the land.

Wheat is the natural centre of all good farming; but the artificial arrangements, and the lack of business ones, of an old feudal State make it impossible to grow it at a profit. It must be made the centre of a multitude of other products. If the State allows the present system to continue we shall never rise above that constant strife between dairy and arable, free trade and tariff reform. For if one of our great corn-growers has a poor crop when other countries have record ones, he loses not only in the free trade price but in the total yield. The story

of the heart-breaking results of really good farming upon the finances of agriculture is such that no one can wonder that the bulk of the land has got into the hands of the pessimist, who farms in such a method that he cannot lose; the State only can suffer both in population and produce.

It is useless to beat about the bush in this matter. To give the wheat farmer an adequate return under the present feudal system is to rob the urban dweller and the dairy farmer at the same time. For the wheat crop should be one of the items in the rotation of nearly every farm in England, not the craze of a few clever growers and the laughing-stock of world harvests. If this is the case, and some lands are more suitable than others for emphasizing wheat, it must surely be evident that justice in agriculture is only obtainable when the whole of a large area is treated as one in the interest of the State. The personal interests of the farmer and his assistants are not bound up with national prices but with the annual and weekly income obtainable from skill and work. And, as Sir Matthew Wallace pointed out, the risk of parliamentary guarantee is that the drone on old corn land

may easily make out of it more than the energetic breaker up of new acres.

We used to grow wheat in places where there is now no single ear of it within thirty or forty miles. I may go further and say that in some of such districts there is no sign of a rotation of any kind. It is all grazing land used for the mere running on of young stock. The usages of real farming are unknown except in the same sense as a shepherd on the hills may be called a farmer because he deals with sheep. The activities consist in manuring and cutting hay on those fields which are used to carry the stock over the winter. But where are the turnips and straw? Where are the oats, barley, and beans, not to speak of wheat? We can live upon oats if wheat fails us; barley and rye are useful substitutes in some of the more difficult places.

But, as Sir A. D. Hall has so often urged, we can get more milk and its products by a carefully regulated system of arable farming than from grass alone. But here again the inequalities are so great that no private venture can be safe, especially where skill varies so much and inviolable trade marks are our only safeguard in the market. How will you differentiate by such trade marks

between various gallons of milk? Distance from this market is of such importance that nothing but a national—that is, a county—system can establish equity among the workers on the land. But as soon as this transport and collecting system is set on foot, the value of the distant is as great as, possibly greater than, the near farm. The intrinsic chemical properties of the soil and the lie of the surface are of much greater importance than a few miles of haulage.

Into this large national system of treatment, then, wheat comes and takes up at once its honoured place. If you eliminate the game preserver you have not done everything to encourage the growth of wheat, for no one can, even with the powers of a Newton, calculate the risks to avoid in our present system and still grow wheat. But in a national system this great cereal takes the leading place, and its particular value in the free trade market is of small moment when the whole produce of the State is added up. In my own opinion, if Parliament would give me a free hand, I could afford to give the State all the present output at free trade prices and still do very well with the rest of the yields. Times change, but we change still more quickly than the elements do,

and if we grew wheat and ground it in the upper reaches of our remoter valleys once, we can do so again now that the German is at our doors. But we shall not merely save our souls alive by this, and by the new land tenure which should be instituted forthwith. We shall have established a new precedent, and shall have laid it down once for all that the people's food should be the State's first care, not the sport of the gambler and the decadent. When we have got to this first condition we can proceed by rapid stages to all those improvements in agriculture which our experts are longing to bring about.

Sir William Crookes wants us to take nitrogen from the air—*see* the reprint of his Address of 1898 which Messrs. Longmans publish—and give it to the wheat. Dear simple soul! like so many of our scientific men who live upon the ideal that science gives itself freely to all! As free as air! Let the great scientist try to take his nitrogen from the atmosphere and send it to Professor Biffen for his wheat; and then let him report at the next British Association Festival what luck he has had. Let him tell us what permission he has been compelled to secure besides that of Mr. Prothero; to what trust agencies he

has been obliged to promise the profits and on what scale—founders' shares, I presume; and what boundaries, patrolled by legal airships, he has been driven to accept between the sweet airs of the shires! I am not referring to the needs of munitions, but to the permanent requirements of wheat. And yet if one reads "The Nitrogen Problem," and the names upon the majestic "Nitrogen Products Committee," there is scarcely needed any further evidence in favour of the contentions in this little book. Are these men satisfied to be the mere tools of Capitalism, and will they revert to the old policy; or will they become henceforth the honoured servants of the State working for the common good?

I appeal, then, to the urban citizen who is nervous about the U boat and wheat. I ask him to put an end by his vote to this travesty of citizenship, the feudal ownership of land by private people to the country's loss. Wheat we may grow in abundance if we make up our minds to do it; and with it we may have meat and milk, cheese and butter, potatoes, and green food of every kind. The great cereals and the leguminous crops are part of every true rotation, and wheat may be

said to involve abundance of these prime necessities of life. When we have the land once ploughed for wheat for rotation in every possible field, we have set the higher scientific command in motion, and can found upon our farming not only a better and fuller home-grown bill of fare, but a set of valuable industries which will add to the prosperity of the countryside. We are then free to improve yield and quality year by year.

The Producer and the Consumer

IN text books on economic questions the chief burden of explanation lies in the direction of pointing out the trouble and the cost of trouble in bringing the consumer into touch with the producer. I do not think that the starving denizen of the mean street gives nearly sufficient consideration to the anxiety he causes to the millionaire in this matter! There is the trust to carry supply over bad times, the great commercial fleet to bring wheat almost for nothing just to keep the hulls moving; there is cold storage to save goods that have been brought in too soon, and expresses to hurry up eggs that came too late; then there are vast newspaper organisations to tell us which of the pro-butters we ought to use, and saintly shopkeepers who exist just to save us from one another's wiles!

But in addition to all this expenditure, risk, and final inefficiency—compassing sea and land to make one breakfast and that a worse meal than we might have had ready at home to our hand—there has been for many years now the disastrous method of our own home production. The same

army of individualists looking for a stray fresh egg, a pound of really pleasant butter, a good beef steak or chop (bread has been impossible for a long, long time), and the result such as we all know.

But if the counties take the farming in hand they can have no need for any expense in bringing consumer and producer into intimate touch. In the first instance, and in the average of production, the county goods will be on sale in every corner of the county, and the higher scientific management will be continually watching the comparative values or qualities of the various units with a view to the correction or isolation according to the causes of difference. I do not aver with absolute conviction that Yorkshire can itself fill every mouth in Yorkshire, at least for the moment ; or that industrial Lancashire can be fed from its very prolific acres till the average of yield is raised. But I am convinced that free trade need be used for the larger towns only, and that all the rest can be amply supplied without any selling costs or advertisements beyond the open doors of the shops and stores. I may go further and point out that Yorkshire and Lancashire will regulate the prices and mark them on the goods, so that no higgling

will be needed or permitted. The salesmen will be allowed a uniform rate of remuneration on the sales. For nine-tenths of the produce, that is all. The "suction of demand" and the coaxing of the seller are both eliminated for one simple reason—we have scarcely enough to go round; and, when we have developed farming sufficiently to feed everyone it is not the potato alone which will be able to "pull snooks" at the U boat, as Mr. Raven Hill so aptly put it in his drawing.

But the potato is a very good example of the benefit of the co-operative working of a county unit. At present all sorts of efforts are being made to fix prices, to reserve seed, to put on the market the stock that should be used first, to do justice to buyers of all classes irrespective of rank or pocket, and much chaos has naturally supervened. But, when all potatoes are taken to the dépôt, these questions will be dealt with in the ordinary course of business, and one other supremely important point will be carefully studied. The waste will have a considerable value for chemical purposes if collected and perhaps treated in a preliminary way.

I am obliged to commence by a simple sketch of the primary machinery in this matter, but I

must say at once that the problem is not finally solved in quite so simple a fashion. At present every farm that yields cheese at all yields a different one from its neighbour, so that if variety and uncertainty were our ideals we should have nothing to wish for at present except bulk. And over and above all these varieties there are large salient differences or qualities such as Cheddar and Cheshire, Stilton, Wensleydale and the rest. But it simplifies matters considerably to know that a district like Lancashire, *e.g.*, prefers its own make of cheese to those of a technically higher grade; and no doubt local taste will largely sympathize with, and thus assist, local talent in getting the best it can out of local soil.

As I wish at present to consider the economic aspect of state farming, I will look with some detail at the problem. I have asked for public ownership of land, not because I want to upset a single household in the counties, whether it be that of Earl or cottager—let everyone remain under his present roof-tree unless we can give to some a more attractive home—but because the problem cannot be solved unless the State itself becomes the landlord and spends some good

round sums upon its property, and the adequate working of it.

Let me speak of one of the first difficulties which complete farming will have to face. Personally I am desirous of leaving the farmer to work the land as a tenant of, rather than as a paid manager for, the county. If he is to be a tenant, the county cannot fairly, in my humble opinion, dictate to him, as the Government is doing now, concerning his expenditure on the land, the deep ploughing, the manuring, draining, and the like. There are many such operations which are in some districts in an intermediate condition or phase: the larger necessities of ploughing and cleaning, reaping and threshing, dairying and so forth, are being worked out by co-operative movements. If, therefore, the State were in charge, and elaborated everywhere what is being done here and there, it would be quite possible, and perhaps necessary under the circumstances, to let a man a farm upon which the major portion of the mechanical work is done for him—the collecting and marketing is of course a fundamental provision of state farming—and his attention is freed and given to the more personal and anxious labours of stock rearing, feeding, milking,

and scientific improvement. The scientific men and women at headquarters know best by a study of the whole unit, and by consultation with the various tenants, what treatment the acres of each farm require; and it will be not only possible but desirable that the headquarters staff should set out to let the farms in the unit at a rent which is reasonable after the needs of fertility have been examined and met.

By a scientific system such as this, which will include adequate transport for all purposes, the elements of variety in soils and distance from a market will be met; and the farmer will be able to devote himself to securing from his acres heavy crops well cleaned and tended, fine stock of all kinds, kept in health and improved by all the methods of records, thus giving full yields of milk and quantities of eggs, prime beef and mutton and bacon.

May I interpose here to make a short statement concerning one of the reasons for keeping the farmer as a tenant rather than a manager? When I recount with some enthusiasm the yields of all kinds of produce the idea must be present to every one that the first charge upon such produce should be the farmer himself. But if this be allowed for,

there must also be allowed for the varieties in such charges, the large number of members in many households and the natural claims of cousins and aunts who may be visiting and the pleasant opportunities presented of hospitality to friends and gifts to neighbours and workmen. The simplest safeguard against differences in generosity and conscience is the cash account. An egg is a small thing to save from a rat and give to a child, but every egg so saved and sent to the depôt adds to the total cash payable to the farmer in his weekly or monthly statement. But, as I have urged before, there is room for every type of tenure in the county unit. The large poultry expert will have his place there; the labourer's chicken will find a ready market also. The great estate dairy may be made a useful centre if the present owner so desires. But the small holder will have equal attention paid to the needs of his little farm. On the other hand, certain areas may have done well under an agent or bailiff, and changes need not be made merely for the sake of change.

I am not attempting to lay down fixed rules which may need some careful trial and experiment before being decided on, but I want to suggest, before referring to the general economic position,

two great principles. First, the farmer does not need for his operations land only, but well-tilled and well-drained land, which will be treated from time to time by scientific managers to fertilisers and lime as may be required by the case—the expense being borne by the landlord, *i.e.*, the county—the land being rented at a “good heart” rent just as buildings would be rented as sound and sanitary. But I may here express my own personal opinion that for the general purpose of the State farmyard manure should be the main application, lime and the other fertilisers being brought in sparingly upon very special expert advice. And in this connection I express my own opinion that in the feeding, where cake is often urged on account of its manurial properties, the main feeding materials ought to be the hay and leguminous crops which are grown on the farm, or at least in the district. Cake should have a purely medicinal use. We shall then have areas economically cultivated and carrying stock of a thoroughly healthy desirable kind. The flavour and qualities of the produce will then be equally good and appetising.

Second, the farmer in his contract agrees to deliver all produce to the depôt at the price of the day subject to his right to use (not to sell to any

one) such portion of it as he may need at home. Any secret evasions of such agreement would thus detract from his deliveries to the depôt and from his own cash. As an incentive to vigour and care there will no doubt be instituted prizes of some kind to reward those who can show the best results per acre in the various kinds of produce. Due acknowledgments by the county of these results in milk and laying records will undoubtedly be made.

I have explained, as earlier opportunities of doing so arose, that the last few weeks of feeding stock, cattle, sheep, and pigs should be carried through at the depôt itself. It will readily appear, therefore, that perfect conditions here arise for testing the values of both foods and manures in a steady persistent manner which can be provided in no other way.

But this final feeding problem has a very much more important bearing upon our food than may appear at first to the uninitiated. Mr. Prothero and Lord Rhondda addressed a meeting of the representatives of farming organisations, and these are the points they made :—

“ *Mr. Prothero* : During the next eight months we are going through the most critical period of our history.

We are crossing the rapids, and unless all pull together we shall be swept to disaster.

“ There is a very great shortage of feeding stuffs, and disaster is in front of us unless we make drastic changes in the methods of feeding live stock.

“ There are only enough oats to allow a reduced ration for working horses. Carriage and pleasure horses must go on the grass or be killed.

“ There is not enough concentrated food for fattening cattle.

“ Instead of fat pork and fat bacon we must have lean pork and lean bacon.

“ The shortage will last over this time next year.

“ Grow all the potatoes you can without fear of a glut. We cannot have too many.

“ It is our duty, whatever the cost, to hold the food line firm at home. The man who loafs on the farm is stabbing in the back his comrades in the trenches.”

“ *Lord Rhondda* : Our position is infinitely better than that of the enemy, but it causes us continued anxiety.

“ The stocks of wheat coming into the country are far less than we expected, and in two or three months the position may cause us very great concern.

“ On and after 1st November I will take over the whole of the surplus stock of potatoes at a minimum price ranging from £5 to £6 per ton.

“ If we get a million acres of potatoes this year there will be no fear of starvation in the sense that it will lead to privation followed by disease and death. At the very

worst we shall be able to give rations of food 50 per cent. above that which Germany has pretended but does not give to its people.

“ It rests with those at home quite as much as with Sir D. Haig and his men to say who is going to win the war.”

From the technical point of view the whole system of feeding and rationing here sketched is wrong. Joseph, quite a long time ago in Egypt, put his finger on the difficulty, and the lapse of time has made no difference in mathematical facts. But it may not be generally known that feeding and fattening are fine arts. You may keep a bullock eating hard at your scanty stock all winter and in the spring have no more beef than you had in the fall. The economic method is to pass up to the depôt all the best of every kind of produce, including the mature stock, and leave headquarters to finish the feeding and fattening while distributing all the marketable commodities with regularity and despatch. A little faster here and a little slower there, according to demand, is of no importance when the whole unit is concerned. But for the separate farms and their managers the difference in anxiety and responsibility is untold. All the imperfect in grain, in potato, in

straws and hay, can be used with great effect in bringing on the immature stock of all kinds, and in providing for such independent feeders as poultry, young pigs, and cattle. You cannot get an improvement in market value by taking any kind of live stock from a richer to a poorer bill of fare, from a full diet to a spare one. It is, therefore, of national concern that slipshod methods in this matter, impassioned appeals from the Board to the farmer not to be a fool, should cease, and that regularity, order, and scientific accuracy should be established once for all.

I need not add that Lord Rhondda's intended control of all our potatoes is a very inefficient method of arriving at the best use of the whole stock.

The management is thus placed in possession of all the produce of the unit except such as is retained for the farmer's own use. The next call upon such produce is the village where not only the labourers on the farms but many other citizens dwell. At such village there will of necessity be some collecting and milk cooling station, and here will be elaborated the distribution of the produce which may be needed in the village itself. There will be no difficulty here : the village requisition,

instead of the goods, reaches the depôt, and those who produce such goods have thus an early charge upon them. I do not wish any longer to see Siberian eggs distributed in our home valleys whatever may be their price.

But much of the produce cannot thus be tapped at the first village where the collecting motor calls. You cannot cut off a rasher from the pig in transit, or order a topside from a living beast. These things can only be distributed, after due collection, from the depôt, but there the little orders from the village station must have the first, not merely an honoured place. Do not let the kind reader forget that we are on our way to meet free trade at the seaports and that we are determined to leave well-fed peasantry behind. The prime cuts, however, will in all probability still gravitate to the towns unless some of our dukes and squires happen to live near. These will, for the first time in their lives, taste "at their places in the country" food which will be in every way as good as they can get at the clubs. In them we shall have at once the critics and tests of depôt success, and one of my chief hopes has always been to see a real active participation by "the landed gentry" in these rural economic doings. We

shall be getting back to realities when a good mutton chop becomes again its country's pride.

If I may leave these few suggestions as to the future to germinate in the minds of those who love the country, I will proceed to the black science itself. There has been a perfect epidemic lately of efforts to show that "selling costs" are much heavier than are those of production. But I have drawn a picture of a county in which all the produce reaches stations or depôts without any selling costs at all, for transport and grading and storing are not selling costs. Hodge does nothing but get his goods ready, and we can keep him busy enough in doing that. If I am told next that it will require a whirlwind of publicity to make known where the county eggs and butter, milk and cheese, bacon, mutton and beef are to be found, I simply do not believe it. The old goddess Fame is not dead yet; and who ever knew a Yorkshire or Lancashire housewife fail to find the best goods? But here it is further to be noted that no choice will be given: the county or starvation will be the test. If Yorkshire is not good enough, and you have not time to help to improve the quality, you must trek for Lancashire, or Cheshire, or Somerset till you are satisfied, or get to a coast

town and Scotland Road in Liverpool if you insist upon American or Canadian Cheddar or Australian meat.

In the rough, then, each county supplies its citizens with the main food products, and some of the nicer problems will not appear at first. The secret of success in English State farming lies in the fact that we have not yet grown enough for all to eat. There cannot for some time yet be that surplus which the economists are begging us so lustily to press upon the world by advertising and commercial travelling. We need not yet in Yorkshire give a pound of tea with our butter, or call the Press to our aid to clear Wensleydale of cheese. We have a long way to go before every baby has enough real milk, and still further to travel before our home-grown wheat can make a good loaf without the aid of Canada. It will be a misuse of words to call our various depôts or stores part of selling costs. The arrangements which will be needed will certainly cost money, but every penny will be chargeable to the production of a marketable commodity. And the return is immediate unless a famine strike should arise. Much depends upon the use which will be made of the middleman. As I have said else-

where, he can be used, and will be able to secure an income even larger than in the past, because the total of the produce will be much greater, and it will be very much more valuable than ever before in intrinsic quality. The middleman cannot be in any sense a commercial traveller. He must be content to be a shopkeeper, selling goods at strictly fixed prices upon commission. The other middleman or higgler must become the paid servant of the county in its transport and other work. The village shopkeeper will thus have to decide whether he will adapt himself to the circumstances of an entirely new era in which England will set out to feed herself with good and wholesome food from her own acres. Free trade will send up from the coast the teas, coffees, and cocoas, the sugars and spices, and the numberless other goods from far-off lands which we have grown accustomed to.

To me the problem presents itself thus : Those who work on the land must be fed first, and if the new minimum wage is not sufficient, a better one must be paid. The farmer must secure enough, not only to save, but to obtain in each generation a better education. We cannot know too much about the earth : it will respond gener-

ously to all we spend upon it in study and work. The old landlord and new State tenant will find a world of interest not only in the direction of the home farm, but in developing the new county studs and eliminating the inferior in every kind of stock and vegetation. The inhabitants of the countryside itself having been supplied, and the various depôts and manufacturing centres having been established in convenient county towns, there will remain our larger industrial cities to cater for with skill and energy.

It is here that free trade should first be allowed to appear in respect of agricultural produce. I have consistently admitted that free trade must remain in being, and I have maintained that it can only do so if we first secure the thorough cultivation of our own acres by a vigorous national effort. The student must therefore consider with the greatest care how the two activities can run together towards national prosperity. If we find out first what our own acres can be made to yield, and how the products can best be dealt with, we shall be in a better position to estimate how we may avoid chaos, and how we may add to our world trade by guiding the activities of the trader. I will return to this subject on a later page.

Our head depôt in the unit has primarily to collect and deal with the following products: milk and its derivatives, poultry and eggs, pigs, sheep, cattle and horses, wheat and other cereals including the leguminous plants, potatoes, turnips and other vegetables needed for both man and beast, fruit of all kinds. Certain districts grow such specialities as hops and mustard; but I desire at the moment to speak of the more usual commodities which I have named. Many of the crops are such as will be grown simply for the purpose of feeding stock, and I need not here refer to them. Many others which are looked upon as almost indigenous to special districts can be developed upon ordinary land when the need for intensive culture is fully realised. But, taking the items I have named, it will be acknowledged that if in their crude form we gather them from every corner of the county, we shall have more than enough to supply the people when the land is fully tilled. To put it another way: if we farm so thoroughly that we can supply all calls for these prime articles we must always have a working surplus to meet the uncertainties of day to day demand. No human being on this earth can draw even from a small unit the quantity each day to

supply exactly and no more the constantly varying demands of the public in his section. But if we have milk in profusion, that is in sufficient quantities to supply every household, we shall have made in the regular course of business butter also and cheeses of all kinds with still a surplus of skim milk. This can be used for feeding purposes, for the bacon is to be finished at headquarters in order to secure exactitude in quality; but there will be something over yet. The chemists are then put to work to turn this surplus of a surplus into the valuable foods which can be made from this source.

Again, the eggs that are too numerous for direct sale, even after preserving, are useful for many purposes; the feathers of the birds, the skins of the animals, the horns, the hair; all such minor products are the foundation of other industries if the bulk is such as it must be when the county acts as one dealer with the produce. The wool of the sheep can be handled for the market with some degree of purpose if the area is considered at headquarters with a single eye to the best results.

Potatoes are the foundation of vast weights of produce in other countries which had the faculty

of turning them into farinas and starches. We imported these without asking ourselves why we did so when we had so much land, so much science, and a market at home. Our own oats and barleys would taste just as well as those which have reached us from across the seas if we determined to make them up into similar convenient packages for use in the home. Some of the most deadly losses which we are sustaining are due to our apathy in growing and preserving both fruit and vegetables as they ought to be grown, dried and preserved. Farming can face free trade without a trace of nervousness if the counties will only turn to upon their own acres and bring out the primary and subsidiary products for us by all the best methods. The profit and loss accounts in the county units will stagger free trade itself by their rosy hues. I ask nothing better than that free trade should set the prices where it can.

When we have set on foot this effort towards self-support we shall find that we have instituted an army of minor industries that will be of great value to labour and to the markets of the world. Why has the farmer been guaranteed a price for his wheat lately? Because no effort is being made to farm the land as one whole, and the

PRODUCER AND CONSUMER 39

State has put off the day when it must act for itself.

I am continually harping upon the value of the surplus of surpluses, the importance in every revenue account of "waste products." I emphasize this because in ordinary individualist farming a waste product is waste. It is difficult enough for the poor farmer to get an adequate price for his prime products, his beef and mutton and pigs, after time and money have been spent upon them. This is what the Board of Agriculture says in one of its leaflets: "The small pig-keeper should select the type of pig that is the most popular in his district, the reason being that should he wish to sell he will probably have to rely on a local buyer. *This is important.* Pork, rather than bacon, should be the aim." Suppose that instead of selling you decide to get your own pig killed, have you ever considered the waste products that you have upon your hands? What will you do with that hair, "long, fine and plentiful" or "black, curly, and coarse" as the case may be? What will you make of the offal? What possible price or even use can you make of particles of horny matter from your popular pig? If you refer to the output from a good bacon factory

you will see that every such item has its use, nothing is lost. And taking a survey of the general produce of the district you will find that after the first great batch of meat products, and the second list of skins, hair, horns, feathers, and such commodities, which must be more marketable at fair values where a district bulks its output, there remains the actual waste which can be sent back to the farms, in forms which can be used with great effect, as nitrogenous organic manures. These waste products have to be ground into fine parts, or treated in some simple chemical manner, which no individual farmer even, not to speak of an amateur pig-keeper, could possibly bring about.

It may not matter much to you, acting as a special pig-keeper under the inspiration of a Board's leaflet, that you should get the last shilling out of your porker, if you sell instead of killing; but have you ever seen an individualist bargain made between a poor farmer, to whom every shilling is of moment, and the gentleman in the gig who comes to buy his fat beast? Have you watched the preliminary skirmish, the generalities and soft nothings which precede the naming of a price—whether on one side or the other does not matter—and the immaterial dialogue which

gets within a couple of pounds of the final figure? Have you then observed the efforts of the poor farmer for some nearness to a recompense for his toil and care and pinching? Have you seen the smile of impossibility upon the buyer's face and the desolate, almost prayerful, attitude of his anxious victim? Have you heard the final No! and seen the gig drive off, to be followed all too soon by the despairing seller who realises what the vanishing buyer means to him and his tiny store of food which must carry over the remaining stock? The system is a barbarous one and an unmitigated curse to all who use it. For the victors in such strife are citizens not fit to tie the shoe-strings—however worn these look!—of the patient beings who toil and scheme for them. And yet even these have their own difficulties with poorly-bred and still more poorly-fed cattle, the result of our present land system, which impoverishes all.

But to come back to selling costs—at present we have incurred none, for we have spent no money upon a salesman, a catalogue or an advertisement. We have housed our goods in the large towns, and I will proceed to call the places of their housing the county stores. I will ask the student here to note that whatever we may do

subsequently to make these county stores more useful we have at present merely ranged our various goods in them for the hungry county customers to see and buy. If the present shopkeeper in every street continues to deal in such goods they will be supplied to him for sale at fixed prices and definite discounts or commission for his expense and trouble. There will be here no buying in the cheapest and selling in the dearest market. Within limits, too, the cost of transport will be pooled with a view to the prevention of that *congested area* in prices which injures the housing of the people. As we shall restore to active use most of our remoter soil, so we may make our distant streets more habitable by taking to them many of those goods upon which a comfortable life depends.

We have, then, at a considerable number of convenient centres a mass of perfectly produced goods of a quality which I may call the average available in the district under consideration. I contend that such quality will be very much finer than anything we have at present, that is, it will be uniformly good, better by far than the ordinary housekeeper can now buy in an ordinary shop. The first point to consider is the possible difference of qualities between the counties. I do

not expect much difference to occur among the *averages*, but there will be some among the finer historic marks which are so familiar. The first movement of what I may call the market, for it is not salesmanship yet, would be some arrangement among the counties for the mutual interchange of those definite specialities of which I hope that each county or group of counties will have some. These would be carefully branded by the districts of origin in order that they might always secure the honest price of their work. London and the very large towns would probably be the chief users of all these delectable things.

But when we have got into London the products of all the counties, arranged in convenient centres of distribution, we are still without the bugbear of selling costs which loom so large in trade circles. I shall venture to refer to advertising later, but here I want to ask whether we are to let individualism run amok upon our country sides just because we have got into a fashion of listening to the loudest voice and dealing only with those who elbow their fellows away? Do our people want the best food that the country can produce or not? Is the co-operative method of obtaining such perfect food the best or not?

Is the food improved by shouting about it, and can we do better than take it, at the lowest possible rate of carriage, to every street in the towns? Hunger is said to be the best sauce, but it is more than that, it is the best antidote to selling costs when you put before peer and peasant alike the best food the country can produce. I can trust the householder to see that the necessary orders reach the selling places—shops or stores as the case may be—which the management will provide. If the advocate of the profiteer has anything to say let us hear it before his death knell is rung. I do not for a moment suggest that eggs and butter will be always obtainable at one unvarying price. The sun itself gives us an ever-varying number of bright hours, and the cost of things will probably change materially according to the season. It is, therefore, quite possible for those who will insist on betting upon food, like Jim Smiley who would bet on anything, to keep on doing so with neighbours of a like taste. But all this betting and gambling will pass over our depôts like water over a duck's back. The poor will not be affected by it because no consumer will be touched; there will be no markets in these foods to rig. It is true that the law ignores gambling; it will not enforce

a betting debt, but betting upon food and other products which are almost equally important has been the country's curse in trade. The gauntlet is now down, however, and I hope that the State will once for all destroy that nest of iniquity which breeds the noisome pest of speculation, some specimens of which I shall have to return to, in things which concern the country's life.

There is one very important difference between the question of food and that of those other innumerable articles which are used in the home. We have here come at last to a new position in the economic world—it has been definitely settled that food should be equally distributed whatever the inequalities of purse may be, and the balance of supply and demand. Efforts have been made to equalise distribution, but they are crude and uncertain in view of what could be done by a State which was not the victim of the hallucinations of the black art. If the matter be fairly examined it will be clear to everyone that, if there is not enough to go round, the questions of supply, demand, and the resultant price are superfluous. Theoretically in such a case the State takes the whole, after paying cost price and a reasonable profit, and then acts impartially towards every

citizen, giving to each a due share. And we have been treated to the cheering sight of food kept useless, even depreciating, in the store, and allowed to change hands many times at a profit, before it is permitted to emerge for the consumer's benefit. If action of this kind is bad, essentially treasonable to the State, in time of war and scarcity, what makes it good in time of plenty? The theory is that the public gains by the competition of the sellers in ordinary times. But in reality the public suffers in ordinary seasons in the same way as in times of scarcity. For if every dealer in competition, and in order to advantage the public, should so mismanage the trade that losses—which are supposed to be to the advantage of the people—were the uniform result, the bankruptcies that must occur would be the greater evil, for the whole machinery of trade would perish. In reality the dealers in the trades make their profit not only on the legitimate amounts of definite and real imports but on a sum many times as large as these imports. A broker once told me—what I knew as well as he did—that he could not live—at, of course, his generous rate—but for speculation. Consequently the public, unless, as I said, the whole of the trades vanish in bankruptcy, pays not only

legitimate prices for imports, but an added and gratuitously improper profit on the imaginary cargoes of wheat of the speculator and other imports on paper which are brought to the country. I shall have to return to this subject also later.

Free trade has been very unfairly made to shine with a false lustre : we do not need to burnish the sun. It has been looked at as our saviour for bringing us plenty to eat ; whereas we might have done much better with its energies than feed upon them while our brains lay idle. The goods that it has brought might all have been used to much better advantage if we had had the wit so to use them. I have instanced potatoes. These may come to us in a variety of forms, but State activity will, I trust in the future, assist us to regulate the exact form in which this produce will arrive. But the ordinary party enthusiast will not sit down quietly and consider the overwhelming necessity for State control in the primary operations on its acres. On one side he will howl for a tariff on farina, and on the other for absolute free trade in everything because of the well-known influence on food prices of a crude tariff. If we treated our potatoes scientifically after having grown plenty of them we might await the import

of potatoes and farina equally with equanimity. They would then arrive because we could use them either in industry or export to additional purpose.

The student, therefore, will be wise to calculate how perfectly our industrial activities could be built upon State ownership and control of those things which represent the health of the State. We ought undoubtedly, henceforth, to devote our own acres primarily to food, and only secondarily with a view to using surpluses to the best advantage, in order that the State may be preserved in safety. We can then consider with a greater prospect of illumination how the available imports can be used to the aptest purpose, whether further industries can be built upon the imports of raw material or whether reciprocity—that rather ill-omened name—requires us to take, in some cases, the finished product of our friends.

I must here interpolate, however, lest I be misunderstood, that no State “liveth to itself.” I am pleading for State control in order that as a people we may be more useful, not less, to our neighbours and friends. But no State can be useful for long if it allows itself to be merely exploited by others: a spendthrift is the least desirable of all friends. A man is less useful in a feeble, emaci-

ated condition than in a healthy, robust one. Thank God ! we have begun to think in terms of people, kindreds and tongues, and we are persuaded that our Russia, our Italy, and our Japan must be considered even at the expense of ourselves.

The progress of the world calls for the strongest league of brotherhood that it is possible to secure. And it makes the heart sink to know that, although we have been preaching to others all these years on freedom, we have in our midst a discontented Ireland, and something only too like junkerism and its kindred ills !

These things I shall continue to reiterate as long as life is given me in the hope that some influential men and women and classes will listen. First, that we must grow food for everyone as a measure of safety. Second, that this can only be done efficiently if we do it as a community regardless of free trade prices. Third, that we cannot afford to add to the expense by allowing traffic in this food, it must be available at cost price for all citizens. And fourth, that from this basis we can study free trade with more chance of success in connection with the industries which we already possess and those others which are possible to a nation which is not anxious about its food.

Our Natural Wealth

WHEN we have taken from the soil all the food we can we are only at the beginning of our economic problem, but we shall find that by State action we have saved to the people an almost untold amount of wealth which has hitherto been lost. The item which perhaps comes nearest to the previous group of commodities is timber, and this presents a fascinating study from several points of view. We have to decide upon the various trees that we can grow to good purpose, and from them we must select those which we need most, keeping the national security and convenience specially before us, just as we had to do in food. We are then confronted by the financial question, and the certainty that our mature crops will lock up the money they represent for, say, 80 years. To meet these costs of planting and of waiting we have two resources. We may, while the plants are young, get out of the land other more ephemeral crops. And as the trees continue to grow we have the thinnings to our credit at the bank. The reader will see that a problem is here presented that can scarcely

be dealt with in a piecemeal fashion, although, of course, a multitude of experimental crops and methods may have their trials in our various soils and elevations. He will see also that the question of game and vermin cannot be overlooked; and that besides the professors and experts who are needed to take charge of the whole, there will be required a fine array of foresters living among our trees, and co-operating with our scientific men towards a very paradise of healthy timber adorning our hillsides. I hope that we shall not be too sordid in this national effort, but that we shall find room and encouragement in the various districts for our rarer birds. The hills will not all be watersheds for the reservoirs of our numerous towns, and some will for a time at least permit of a little relaxation from the sanitary engineer in the interest of the lover of wild things as well as of our mountain sheep and goats. The shepherd and the forester will make our uplands, our woods and forests alive with national interest, and will become in time a corps of our most valued public servants.

Some of our most respected writers upon country and sylvan subjects, such as S. L. B., appear to think very bitterly of the advent of

the motor plough. They hint that the effort to grow more food must necessarily lead to the decay of rural life, the destruction of the study of botany and natural history, the elimination of the labourer and the eradication of the picturesque. I deny the truth of such painful forebodings absolutely, but perhaps upon a few points our ideals may clash. The rheumatic labourer and his squalid hovel are in no sense picturesque. Even when I look at what our early water-colourists have made of them I cannot remove from my mind what is connoted by them, foul soil, foetid odours, stagnant water and the rest. Our recent efforts towards better housing never lose sight of real architectural beauty both of house and garden while they aim primarily at health and comfort. They are at present severely handicapped by the necessity for low rents, so much so that the better type of cottage is reserved largely for the housing of the industrial rather than the rural worker. In the coming *régime* of which I speak the farm labourer will demand as good a house as any factory hand. He has always been entitled to it, for he is a worker just as skilled in his own line as a cotton operative.

Am I to be told that our rabbits and wild

birds will leave us if we clean out the haunts of mosquitos in the ditches and trim our hedges and carefully tend our trees? There is a balance, an equipoise, in these things, and no naturalist revels in neglect and decay; he can find a wider field of study in reasonable conditions which are not obtainable under the game laws. I do not charge the keeper with absolute ignorance and want of scientific interest, but I do say that the system under which he works puts a premium upon both.

He is paid to prepare for battues of pheasants and partridges and under the present system agriculture and natural history decay equally. He breeds pheasants and places them upon the poor farmer's little bit of wheat, and they dig up the crop by the roots in defiance of right and justice. Meantime the clever people who can hit glass balls in the air show off their powers of killing right and left the creatures who have ruined the farmer's work. But the real pleasure of taking a gun over the farm with a clever dog and finding what ought to be found in the strictest moderation from a hare to a snipe is never felt by plutocracy. The farmer gains a reasonable kind of sport and adds to the plenty of his table, or he may send his bag to the depôt, but he and

his friends will at the same time gain an interest in natural history when the new system includes the study of wild life rather than the destruction of everything which appears to interfere with game.

In the less known science of forestry, the ranger and the natural history student may be expected to attain greater success than the farmer can. By the same policy of moderation, while preserving the vitalities of forest growth, we may expect to see opportunities for the study of those rarer beings that S. L. B. and others will welcome with enthusiasm. I appeal to him to take part with the national movement against squalid farming on the one side and plutocratic game-preserving on the other.

The timber for our houses leads us naturally to the question of stone and slate and clay, and lime and sand, to build them with. I must say that—when I contemplate the condition of our housing, and then consider the population which requires its daily bread while it is hewing and blasting the stone, digging out the clay, washing it and moulding it into bricks, cutting the slate out of the hill, bringing it from the quarry or down the mountain side, and then putting it through

those ordeals which yield terrible ear-deafening sounds, loading the lime and sand required in such vast amounts—I cannot help asking myself whether, in a well-ordered State, these labours should be subject to the freaks and foibles of individuals or be amenable only to the country itself as a whole. In the first place, are these men themselves, upon whom our safety from the elements and our comfort depends, to be the sport of landlord and speculator for their daily bread? And, in the second, are the citizens as a whole satisfied that their labours should have the same result towards the nation, in the matter of construction of every kind, as the work of the farmer and farm labourer has upon our vital food? Land nationalisation, or public ownership—choose which name you please—appears to me to be the only reasonable solution of our present difficulties. And each case as it arises, where the citizen, called in the bulk Labour, is examined at his toil, seems worse than the one before in injustice, improvidence and inconvenience. The workman does not want, when it comes to realities, pounds, shillings and pence : he wants a comfortable home, enough to eat and to wear, and something to save in order that he may secure these things in his

old age or in infirmity. The very first necessity, therefore, of his case is regularity. He does not want his wages to represent sufficient one day and want the next, and then all the anxiety of a strike to secure a livelihood. State ownership, and in consequence regularity of work and wages, are the very first conditions of citizenship in these difficult times. The sites of dwellings and of workshops are at present the sport of brutal conditions, and no one can obtain reasonable treatment through the heartless vagaries of Capitalism. To buy land and leave it unused until the activities of the community have made it necessary is now considered the ideal method of using the intellect and one's credit at the bank. It is analogous to speculating with the food the army needs, and betting upon the guns which our life depends on. It is treason to the brotherhood of man.

I have on earlier occasions pointed out how present methods of individual ownership of national assets interfere with individual freedom and usefulness. I have suggested that land stock would be a more liquid security than a mortgage is, and I threw out the hint that a State bank might reasonably advance money upon county or urban debentures upon the district

edifices of all kinds. If the State took control of our quarries it might conceivably in the public interest co-ordinate the delivery of stone and bricks, slate and flags, with the said debenture. The actual charge for these building materials might be made the exact amount—in round figures of course—of the debenture, because the remaining items of timber, lead and iron, as well as the important one of labour, would constitute an adequate margin of security. By such a poetic piece of national finance the State would carry through its proper parental interest and control over its natural wealth into its very usefulness and protective value to its children. The house would in another direction represent the fruition of State forestry, iron, and lead mining ; and the timber, the spoutings and flashings would be the products of State fellings and minings guaranteed at a price which represented the expense of production without the intervention of our old friend “ selling costs.” I must keep noting that here we are getting, in genuine practical form, more of that desirable thing—not upon a mere *à priori* theory, but upon an urgent immediate demand—a co-operative method of each working for all. The quarryman cuts out the

stone and slate, the brick and tile maker forms his bricks and ridge tiles, the forester supplies his rafters and planks, the lead miner—secured, I hope, from phthisis—sends his lead, and the iron, passing through the hands of miner and founder, reaches the builder by means of national transport, in the form of spouting, and rails, and gates. Then the builder himself and his various artizans construct, what? Houses for the quarryman, the brick and tile maker, the miner and the forester, the workers in the metals, the railway man, and the men who are building the village or the street. When these are all comfortably settled in their homes they require for their sustenance and comfort the work of the agricultural labourer, the fisherman and the collier, who in their turn need a share of the houses which are erected as above.

The experts can tell us to a nicety how many of the citizens we have used up in these various classes of toil; but there is one more, too obvious to be omitted from the list. The multitude of textile workers and clothiers of all kinds introduces a new element, free trade, which I shall speak of later; but here I note that those who clothe us in various ways are entitled to their share of the buildings which we put up. Where

does the profiteer come in, the betting man and the gambler in all these things? What does he add to the common stock? To act as a drone is bad enough, but the matter is worse when the lust for money kills the artistic at every turn. The State which controlled its own property could decide that unnecessary eyesores of every description should disappear. Those who have had much to do with housing know the difficulty of the problem. The unsightliness of some inhabited areas has tempted the jerry-builder, who, to use an expression to which Carlyle objected, "must live," to run up houses with a certain attractive exterior but of poor accommodation. Comfort and convenience in a home are the first considerations; but the general aspect of the whole is of great importance to every community. To imagine that we can ever eradicate mean streets without taking possession of our land is to imagine a vain thing.

Education and Management

I NEED not labour the fact that the same story can be told of each industry in its turn, *mutatis mutandis*, and that the individualist owner, the speculator, and simple brutal money which buys for the rise and "sits upon" necessary goods in order to line its own pocket, are one and all injurious to genuine industry and trade. But when I say this I am not for a moment suggesting that we can do without leaders of all kinds—professors, managers, and experts in every department, or that many of such fine business and scientific brains are not to be found among capitalists. But who is to distinguish between the useful and the useless? Who is to see that our coal, for instance, is treated by science and skill, if everyone is allowed "to do what he likes with his own" through our unwise action as a people in the past? The mistake we make is to confound money with brains and education. The further mistake we make is to allow money to control education. Why has Scotland for many years set us the example in educational matters? Simply because the young Scot has refused to

allow the scarcity of money to hinder his training. And the State cannot afford to let good brains rot in the slums or vanish into crime because a good education is needed to employ those brains. In reality there is no enemy so dangerous to real education as money itself. The luxuries that money obtains not only unfit the student for making the best of learning, but the love of money and the lust for luxuries set up a spurious ideal in education which saps a nation's real culture. I am hoping that the simpler habits and the practical labours which have been pressed upon the well-to-do by the calls of the war will lead to a truer estimate of education itself. If the educated classes get into touch with the labour of agriculture, for instance, in some of its many forms, it may happen that labour itself may get some insight into the value and pleasures of education. Real culture has always affected the simpler life; I claim, therefore, that we ought to set before labour, by our own habits and ways, the ideal of education, rather than vulgar luxury and the pot-house, as a solace after work. On the other hand, our very first duty is to see that squalor and inconvenience do not interfere with the amenities of a simple life. Hence I have

urged that we must put an end to this ignoble **strife** between capital and labour by acting for ourselves in the interest of the whole. And when we have made it the usual thing for labour to be thoroughly educated, we may rely upon a steady supply of learned, scientific, and organising brains for the carrying on of our national activities. Brains are the monopoly of no class, and we cannot afford to lose the services of a single active brain. Still less can we afford as a nation to continue the policy or claim that common vulgar money alone can purchase brain power. If it must be purchased at all by any class rather than by the nation at large it would be infinitely less harmful to let labour purchase its own leaders in every walk of life.

In dealing with our national wealth we need the very finest brains that we can secure. Let anyone consider the potentialities of our soil and mineral wealth and then study the dangers incident to what I may call the nation's business account of allowing individualism any longer a free hand, and I think he will learn very soon that commercial ruin is involved in our continuance in the old system. It is all very well for a few people to dig out our coal by the miners' help

and draw royalties upon the yields; but the value to the State does not consist either in these royalties or even in the miners' wages, but in the innumerable values, almost past computation, which can be abstracted from the raw products when the chemist and other scientists have worked upon them. In the course of the activities which circulate round a piece of coal or iron, for instance, we should extract a very army of brainy citizens who are now acting as the mere scarecrows of industry so to speak. This danger of loss is as great at the upper as at the lower end of the scale if we work by the methods of capitalism. The object of this mammoth agent is to obtain automata who will act as machines, so that certain operations may be carried through by touching a button. I admit that organisation is of wonderful value; but I affirm that the State is the loser if its citizens become machines themselves instead of the masters of real machinery. Our various industries need certain elements of power and light and heat, of chemical products for further manufacture, of material which can be guaranteed. All those who are dependent upon these primary objects for their business, factory, or trade, will obtain them under more regular and

just conditions when the State conducts the preliminary processes. The State will thus prevent the wasteful, almost wanton, abuse of our wealth, and will deal with the international problems presented, under scrupulous arrangements. The careless but kindly spirit which has guided us in the past, the welcome we have given to foreign science and even capital, and the general effort to see happiness and progress established everywhere are not to be regretted or apologised for. The newer and better system has been forced upon us by the events of recent years, and it must be our business now to preserve the kindly spirit of the past when we adopt the cautious policy of the future. Free trade and tariff reform equally are unable to cope with the new needs; the people only, in our Empire at least, can bring out a new free trade, one free from the vices of individualist capitalism. The bases in the new era will be education and State control of national assets and interests.

Let me therefore look at our industries and our imports from another point of view. We cannot pretend that we have, or are likely to have, in the future any home-grown substitutes for tea, coffee, or cocoa. In the matter of sugar there is

a good deal of doubt concerning our future; it may have a real effect upon our agriculture at some time, but at present we are more concerned about wheat than about beetroot. Wines and tobaccos are not so important that we need to consider them in our efforts towards self-support and defence. Spirits and beer are made at home in quite sufficient quantities. Maize and rice are not likely to be grown here, but they come from our Empire and our brothers in America, and may have an important bearing upon our Colonial developments. With the exception of our teas, coffees, and cocoas, which are almost essential to our reasonable satisfaction, we might treat most of the remaining food imports as dependent upon our various world exports.

The economist must always look this position in the face. Although we might manage to eke out an existence by farming our own acres to the best advantage; though we might live in comfortable houses and wear warm clothes, we could not expect to add to these prime needs without selling to the world raw or manufactured goods. The British Isles have become a vast workshop into which are received immense quantities of the products of our Empire and of foreign countries.

We must, in a sense, expect to have to import always a certain amount of food to sustain those workers who are fashioning the ever-increasing imported products into commodities either for export or for use at home. Free trade is a very independent personage, and is quite capable of carrying his own provisions with him to his various habitats. But it seems to me obvious—I wish it were as clear to everyone else—that considering we are a people first, and free traders afterwards, we must make our workshop secure against enemies who may become jealous of our successful activities, and attempt to destroy them by U boat and other devices. The cotton trade is perhaps the most salient example of British methods in free trade. We bring from various tropical countries the fibre which we have succeeded in turning into most excellent cloths of all kinds. The U boat would like to destroy transport of every description—cotton for our workers and wheat to supplement the food we need for them. My point is that if we interfere with this kind of free trade we are striking at the root of our prosperity, and that to obtain the full advantage of it we must minimize the difficulties which it raises. I shall return to this again, but mention it now because

I wish to raise that side of our economic position before proceeding with another. We may develop many activities if we organise our too small areas, but we must organise these for a reason which lies nearer home. Our coal and other minerals do not lie across the seas, and towards them we have been acting largely as if others were the free traders, and we the newly-discovered, undeveloped district. Our wonderful products have left us under the unguided energies of free trade, and have come back to us made up into commodities that we were well able to form them into ourselves. If we had real possession of our own wealth we should be able to direct its use into the wisest channels. We have allowed the world to treat our mines as we ourselves might treat some island rich in guano just waiting to be dug out and shipped away. Our people have suffered by this process in pocket and in mind. We might have built up comfortable homes for the workers and highly technical education for them at the same time. But we have made a fetish of free trade and of personal property, with the necessary corollary that our people have been slaves. There is one very dangerous risk hidden under this policy : it is of the *panem et circenses* order. We

have got our labour to accept conditions that were not conducive to State health, because we supplied it with a cheap loaf and a few other things. Education is not pleasant to the child—I believe he will always go unwillingly to school in the first instance—and he is apt to prefer his wild life in the gutter or the ditch to more orderly efforts in the class. But we have done worse than this. We have tried to teach certain things which have borne no relation to the future life of the lad, and he has, in a few years, relapsed into ignorance as dense as if he had never seen a school. We could scarcely expect to inoculate a scholar with a love of reading of any kind while the social conditions of his home were so bad, and to this fundamental difficulty we must address ourselves resolutely first. But the further care or treatment which we shall have to use in this case is not entirely scholastic. It will have to be the bestowal of an interest touching on the technical or even trade needs of the future, so that our farm lads may see the bearing of the best agricultural methods, the miner recognise the wonders hidden in the product he wins, and the workers in building materials catch some idea of the romance of the earth's crust, and some gleam, perhaps, of the artistic

uses to which their labours may lead. I am quite sure that our teachers, if once put upon their mettle, can make the wonders of a piece of chalk more alluring even than tobacco and a jug of beer. And what is more important still, they can make the pipe and the tankard themselves more alluring when taken with an interesting book bearing on the subjects connected with their daily lives. A poacher is a naturalist gone wrong; a miner only can appreciate to the full the wonders of Nature's building; a farm hand goes through experiences which the philosopher needs. I believe in these citizens: I do not believe in the policy which makes them serfs to feudalism, or pawns in capitalist operations. And, what is more to the point, I do not believe that my fellow citizens are willing, any more than I am, to let the old system continue longer.

In one sense this problem of education is the most difficult we have to face. No one can presume to claim that he can either define true education, or show the path by which it may be won. It is not the attainment of the most perfect insight into science, or the greatest technical skill. It is not the literary genius of a Shakespeare, or the wonderful suggestiveness of

a Darwin. It seems more like that humble desire to know and to think aright which grows more modest at every step in its own career. But to limit the opportunities it craves, to destroy or injure the simple conditions it demands, is an offence against humanity itself. The world is at the moment face to face with two ideals of culture. One has been developed in semi-secret fashion in the scientific laboratories which work upon the formula that knowledge is power. The power of explosive and of destruction is colossal, but it does not carry with it the source of all power—life. It is the second ideal, set up to some extent by the mere opposing action of the first, and only dimly seen by the best among us, that we cherish here in England, the search for life, more life, abundant life for man. As each historic epoch passes on its way man draws a little nearer to his goal. Yet through what suffering are we to gain the present forward step! But if through unflinching courage we should gain it all will be well.

Finance

THE usual working of capital is in its character the exact opposite of what it should be in a well-regulated State. Take what class of investment you like you will find that it works like this. An institution is founded by certain capitalists who pay down, say, 20 per cent. of the subscribed capital, leaving the 80 per cent. to be called up if and when required. There never was much need for capital; credit was the one desirable thing; and before long the original money put into the concern becomes unnecessary and has to be invested in some other Stock Exchange venture. Business pursues its course, and profits increase, till in the long run 5 per cent. is earned not merely on the money first paid but on the whole 80 per cent. "nominal" capital which has been in the books. But the capital value of profits such as these would never do to leave unrealised! So it is sold to the ordinary public with all the risks adhering to it, and the original investor pockets a big haul.

Now, in the majority of these undertakings the public itself was from the first the entity most

interested. If the State had undertaken the venture it would have said to the subscriber : " Your security is as good as any mundane transaction can be, and you must therefore be content with a return of at least 1 per cent. less than from risky businesses, and you must understand that the increment in capital value inheres to the State itself, it will not be available for your individual pockets. All the success which will attach to this State bank of ours, to this great people's insurance, or to this other big national work, will be used for adding conveniences and benefits to the undertaking itself, so that it may be a huge blessing to the citizens who make use of it in all their needs."

The founders of these national institutions are but a small number compared with the workers employed in the industry itself. From very general admission such workers fare worse in individualist or private service than in State hands. Investors are largely made up of those who do not work in the business concerned. And it has become a commonplace that those who put money into an undertaking secure vast profits, while those who are working to earn them get merely a living wage. It is obvious, therefore,

that capitalism thus tends to add to its luxuries and even to its barbarous treatment of labour, while State activity reduces the investment return to a minimum with a view to general usefulness and the careful watching of the needs and rights of labour.

This truth has reached me from all sides in the confessions of the capitalist and in the ingenuous reasonings of the economist who thinks for capitalism rather than for the people. A State manager, even, forgetting the pit from which he has been digged, grumbles at the rise to 30s. a week for a family, while the official gently whispers that his objection to State management is the effect that it must have upon wages! If, then, by sweating and other vigorous principles of management he makes a profit, who is to get the dividends?

I do not wish, therefore, to attempt to evade this economic fact. I want it faced because it comes to nothing more than letting a cat out of a bag in which it has been imprisoned too long. I urge that it is an unjust state of affairs when those who do not work draw a higher rate of interest than those who do: and I contend that those who owe all their safety and comfort and

ease to the labours and perils and unceasing care of the State in its various activities should welcome as a natural and becoming thing that investments for old age, or for dependents and heirs should be of a less lucrative type than those which are connected with personal exertion. For a large part of the object of personal exertion consists in the endeavour to provide for the future; and a large part of the solicitude which ought to be involved in the definition of a state should consist in the endeavour to make these provisions available for an enormously increased number of people, till practically it secures decent wholesome, and healthy conditions for all.

If we quietly audit the books of great national undertakings such as banks we shall find that the difference in yield to the original investor who sets out to do work—which he can only do with State permission, by State help, and under State guardianship and care—in his semi-private venture, the difference, I say, between these and *bonâ fide* national stocks; the difference in the result of this sanctified kind of individualism and real popular function is in the proportion of 25 to 4 per cent. In other words, the State loses upon work, which it could do better than the

present system does, 21 per cent. ! The idea of the State running to Lombard and Threadneedle Streets for safety and financial help would be the most exquisite piece of fun in the whole world if it were not so grotesque and even tragic. The figures I have given would look not only larger but blacker if the full horror of the hidden facts were appreciated by all. The people who maintain the injustice and the injury do not themselves know that they are standing upon the neck of Democracy. The few who may know allow the ignorant to do all the talking. Junkerism in finance, as well as in land affairs and in politics, well knows how to be as silent as the grave !

As everyone by this time knows, banking and its attendant industries have been made to rotate round gold. The whole well-meaning policy of Sir Robert Peel has been used by those international and other financiers, not to save and steady the old country, but to injure it. It is a relic of the old fear of clipped coins and the rest ; but the idea of the sovereign being the only legal means of paying debts is so extremely untruthful that one would have thought that the mere suggestion would have made old Nestor laugh. It would not much matter, for the sovereign is a

convenient thing in the pocket, if the professionals did not make use of Sir Robert to injure the State. The present law gives the bankers the power to dictate to their clients, by the mere pressure of a request for payment, *i.e.*, gold; whereas when the depositors return the compliment, as in August, 1914, the State steps in and works night and day at the manufacture of paper notes to substitute for its own "legal tender." Is it necessary still to remind Englishmen of the old fable of the bundle of sticks? The individual faggot or client is powerless against the present financial interest when he protests against the legal tender fiction, and is broken. But if the whole bundle of faggots were to say in Parliament at once: "Away with this deception: let the State take charge of banking and put an end to the fiction that gold is any more than one among many commodities, and the sovereign a convenience only such as silver and notes are," we should soon begin to give Democracy a chance to come by its own.

If the wealth of our country or even of our empire lay in gold, then were we poor indeed. If our business had to be conducted by the passage or transfer from office to office of gold in payment of our various debts then few could go to the

transport service of the war. If our exchange of commodities were simpler, as I have tried to show that it could be made for many of the fundamental things, we should not need to hear so much of this question of exchange, which in reality means the betting upon the price of gold.

As, I fear, I may have said before in other words, if banking were made a function of the State all the risks would vanish except the fundamental one of the State itself; as long as the State survived a very serious panic could not arise. The wealth of a State does not in any part of the world consist in gold. It consists in its soil and crops, its timber, its mineral and other resources, brought into use by the skill and labour of men and women. Gold has its value like other commodities, but it is conceivable that a piece of elaborately made paper might have a rarity value similar to that of gold. The metal has been chosen as money for its useful and attractive qualities.

If the State took charge it would ignore the legal tender anachronism, and it would take scant notice of the market movements in gold, using the sovereign, as it does silver and notes, merely as a token. Certain international risks have to be

guarded against, as well as some commercial ones. We could not afford, *e.g.*, to risk giving with the sovereign more gold than a pound would buy in the market. We might make a charming alloy that had no particular market value. It is more than likely that we might have to become monopolists in the precious metal, and guide its commercial use in co-operation with our overseas brethren. But what artistic prospects might be opened out in the future if all our coinage were produced purely for convenience, and our real commodities, our daily bread, raiment, and fire-sides, were freed from the bewildering competition with the artificial value of gold! I have little hope of a change coming in this direction until the People's Party emerges into the light. For it cannot be disguised, the fact is too patent, that we fly to the city for our financiers! We actually, as Trojans, send to the Greeks for help!

I wonder if I can make this subject of gold a little clearer by a rough parable.

There was in a certain State an individual, an individualist, who possessed a great fortune; indeed, it was so great that its total was equal to the stock of gold that was in the country; but his possessions were scattered over the whole world.

Now, this individual said to himself : “ The only legal tender is gold, and therefore, if I control the supply of gold I can become the Master of trade and industry. I will therefore sell all my investments, and possessions in various lands, and accumulate gold, not of course openly, but quietly and by stealth, until I am ready to declare my purpose.” So he called in his loans, sold his stocks, and converted even his lands into the metal.

One of the first to feel the effect of his doings was Micawber, who had been accustomed to draw bills and get them discounted for gold through Heep at a large loss. But I said to Micawber’s friends, “ Let the individual keep his gold, and we will get the impecunious one some good provisions and a pipe and trust him to send us in time a parcel of wheat, or some apples or the like when he gets settled across the seas.”

So it was on every side. I said to them all : “ Give your cheques and notes and silver for all your different debts, but let him have his gold.” And it came to pass that the people handed over their sovereigns and half-sovereigns till there was a great scarcity and war came, but still I said : “ Let him have his gold.”

But when war came the banks had to give up

the use of gold and there was nothing left but bars unminted. So the individual offered huge guns and valuable cargoes—for his scheme was well worked out—and would take nothing but gold for them. So I said of the bars of gold still remaining in the chief bank: "Let him have them; we must have guns and stores."

Thus the individual turned all his wealth into gold, and it was given to him, as you shall hear.

Now, although the individual had a well-thought-out scheme, he did not reckon upon quite all of its effects. In the first place, he had not realised that gold lying in a stocking—he was of huge build—earns no interest; money kept at home does not increase, as it would do if only placed upon deposit at the bank. But he reasoned with himself: "I shall make it up when all the gold is mine; but if I now let it out it will circulate again, and all the trouble will have to be repeated, and time will be lost."

So this said time wore on and—though he had immense store-rooms and cellars, for he was a heavy feeder—his stock of provisions began to run low, and he was at last willing to let out a little gold for food and drink. But I said: "Not so; you have your gold, eat and drink that."

It had come to pass in the meantime that the people, having no gold, had learnt to do without, and when they wanted big guns they would arrange some other means of payment for them, according to the wishes of the sellers. Indeed, they used as before their cheques and notes and silver, and the absence of gold itself was scarcely felt, for it was purely an ornament and a convenience.

But the individual grew less bulky, and began to see with concern that, though he had secured all the gold in the State, he was not yet the master as he intended to be. In fact, he saw at last with dismay that a little food would be better for him than a large quantity of gold. But I said: "Nothing but gold," for I saw that the people were happier than ever, and that the individual was a curse to them, and would be better dead.

Soon he, too, came to the conclusion that he were better dead, for he had now no pleasure in gold with hunger, or in ingots while he was athirst. So he made up his mind—for I was in deadly earnest—that he would arrange his affairs and die. Then he proposed to leave a great monument of himself in gold as a legacy to the

world. So I said : " The gold is there ; make it into what you like." Then, said he, " Let me have an artist," but I answered, " No ! "

So he died in the midst of his pile of shapeless bars and rolls of coin, a monument of the amorphous and a warning against the lust for gold. And Mammon died in that particular State, but I cannot say that he left no progeny elsewhere. His monument having no shape and no cohesion, the gold was carried away, and finally restored to its original use, so that what he had collected with such cruel care was scattered, and his tomb, even as a warning, was lost to the world. Only in men's memories did the evil thing survive.

In his most valuable and interesting book, " A Fraudulent Standard " (King), Mr. Kitson urges the nationalisation of banks, but, following Mr. Stoll, seems to contend against the charging of interest on loans. I am unable to agree with him in this, as long as the interest is reasonable and free from the absurdity of bank rates. I do not accuse our banks of usury ; and I do not see how any bank can be run unless some such charge is made. In fact, I have questioned whether the very large profits referred to above could, without drastic writings down in times of continued pros-

perity towards a risk fund, preserve our banks from catastrophe on the outbreak of war. If the banks have £33 of their own for every £900 they hold of other people's money, and their investments are unsaleable, what can the few pounds of gold they have do to avert collapse? The objections to the system are rather its lack of safety; its payment of the people's profits to a few individuals; and its use of the money of the public for individualist finance. The State should obtain the benefit of the people's activities.

But if I may buy a house and merely pay back its price in instalments, or start a business without reckoning the cost of financing it, I cannot see why we should not all become millionaires at each other's expense. Five per cent. per annum is not a heavy charge upon a business which may have at least that upon a quick turnover: some hesitation ought to be forced upon us or we might make orderly business into chaos. Interest is not usury because the word seems to say so: use is not abuse: let us invent the word abusury rather than be led off into too hasty generalisations. If 4 or 5 per cent. turns out to be too high a charge in our new State bank we shall at least feel that the State itself is the gainer, not the plutocrat or the

international financier. The whole doctrine of thrift or saving is built upon the idea of some annual return upon such savings. It would be easy to legislate against those mathematical enormities which Mr. Kitson recites as flowing from compound interest. I venture to make this modest protest because I fear that the real value of bank nationalisation may possibly be obscured if a genuine attempt were made to prove that it involved loans for everybody free of interest.

In that enthralling publication, "Labour and the New Social Order: A Report on Reconstruction," there are but few omissions, but there seemed to be one which I could not understand. I rubbed my eyes and wiped my spectacles and read again and again to find the subject of, or even the word, banks. I found land and minerals, railways and public-houses, shipping and the milk supply, to which food for babes I will return. I found even reference to large forward movements and drastic taxing proposals; I found municipalisation schemes, and huge insurance designs: in fact, I may say that, roughly, I found everything we need for a genuine start, except—the machinery for doing everything, the national bank! I do not for a moment hint that I do not welcome with the

very tears of joy and thankfulness the party and policy set out in the golden penny pamphlet of which I speak. But if we are to leave the banks in private hands I must save and borrow every penny that I can and put it into them at any exorbitant price the Stock Exchange may demand, so that I may participate to some small extent in the magnificent profits which will accrue to those institutions if they are to be allowed to carry out the new programme! There ought to be some splendid betting chances upon the pamphlet and all that it means. There will be no need for writing down the risks of these new national ventures; the cash will be safe, secured on the taxes, the turnover much greater, for every lump of coal is going to have its manufactured price here, rather than in Germany. Perhaps, however, I am making a mistake in talking so openly of the matter in these pages. I ought, as a thrifty, business man, to have secured the bank shares first!

As I am speaking of the labour policy, perhaps I may refer to some other points which properly belong to other sections of this little book rather than strictly to finance. Under municipalisation I learn that "every facility should be afforded to

acquire (easily, quickly, and cheaply) all the land they require, and to extend their enterprises in housing, town planning, parks, and public libraries." But, surely, land nationalisation is the municipalisation of land in every direction in which local government needs it? The greater includes the less, and I shall be deeply disappointed and surprised if parishes are not, equally with lord mayoralties, given all the land they need.

The paragraph proceeds : " and also to undertake, besides the retailing of coal, other services of common utility, particularly the local supply of milk, wherever this is not already fully and satisfactorily organised by a co-operative society." Now why is it necessary to undertake this difficult and unsatisfactory work in a piecemeal fashion? Why may we not procure meat and poultry, wheat and other cereals, potatoes, vegetables, and fruit for the people in an adequate fashion as I have tried to set the matter out? The fact is the politicians have only one way of doing things, and reconstruction will need all its energy and science to alter that way. How is Mr. Asquith going to destroy profiteering unless he carries out his own suggestion and descends from generalities to concrete facts and business methods? You

cannot be fair to those who are engaged in trade at present, in which profit is the mainspring, unless you substitute a definite commission or a salary for it. You cannot at a crisis bring meat and wheat from the Argentine at a reasonable price unless you substitute for individual speculation and capitalistic enterprise national purchase and national freight. But, says Mr. Asquith, "I am not one of those who think that the experience of the war lends encouragement to the ideal of a general and direct control by the State of the production and distribution of commodities." May I, therefore, present to our great leader the particular cases of our home-grown food supply—not a little milk only—and our coal and minerals? Perhaps, as time goes on—and I cannot hope to see the full sunrise myself—the Liberal Party will give help to the People's Party as it develops its great programme of national well-being.

Crude free trade and cruder international finance have led to the crudest form of interstate action or diplomacy. Let me take four states or empires—America, France, Italy, and Britain—as representatives of the opponents of the Central Empires. I need not spend time in

proving that Italy is playing a *rôle* that is of exactly the same quality in battle as the rest. If Italy breaks down in her mountains the Central hordes break through. An Italian gun is as important as a British weapon, an Italian mountaineer can give the best of our armed climbers points. But we are conversant now with the fact that, if Italy tries to arm herself well for her arduous task, she has to pay nearly two *lire* for her goods, instead of one! She even has to pay at the same high figure for her imported food! We are, therefore, in this position: we welcome Italy's help, but make her "pay through the nose" for her kindness; we lend her money to assist ourselves upon international finance terms!

We cannot afford to parley while we are in this dangerous situation. Whatever may be the simple Doric character of Italy's *peace* needs, she is one with us in this terrible ordeal and must be placed upon a par with America and the rest of us at once in the matter of finance. The simplest method appears to be to issue no longer British or American or French, but *Entente*, war loans at 5 per cent., and let each State pay for her military requirements in such

war stock wherever they may be marketed. If the money to take up these is not forthcoming, the tax-collector must be set to work; and, above all things, the idea of offering a higher rate than 5 per cent., and thus reducing the market value of earlier issues, must be avoided. The international financier is a machine, not a soul; he would rather see the Entente Army pierced than that gold should suffer!

I am, myself, quite willing to become a citizen of the world. I am none the less an Englishman because I was born in a county; and I shall work for freedom of continents as ardently as for self-government of States. But if we abated the gold nuisance at home we should be better prepared to deal with the evil when it reaches inter-state proportions. In fact, I want to be a citizen of, not an alien in, the brotherhood of man.

Publicity

No one can discuss the questions of economy and politics without being brought into violent contact with the problems of publicity. Our Parliamentary action depends upon the voting of the citizens, and this voting is largely influenced by the journals of the time and place. When the Beauchamp of Meredith's most perfect of romances wished to promote the cause of the people he set his heart upon a journal to be called *The Dawn*. He could not resist the two ideas coming into his mind together—Cecilia's fortune and the daily newspaper! But Cecilia's fortune went elsewhere; and the Labour Party of to-day is without an organ. It is interesting to hear Beauchamp's opinion on press matters, which, by permission of Messrs. Constable & Co., Ltd., London, and Messrs. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, I am able to quote entire :—

“ He could now support of his own resources a weekly paper. A paper published weekly, however, is a poor thing, out of the tide, behind the date, mainly a literary periodical, no foremost combatant in politics, no champion in the arena; hardly better than a commentator on the events of the six past days; an echo, not a voice.

It sits on a Saturday bench and pretends to sum up. Who listens? The verdict knocks dust out of a cushion. It has no steady continuous pressure of influence. It is the organ of sleepers. Of all the bigger instruments of money it is the feeblest, Beauchamp thought. His constant faith in the good effects of utterance naturally inclined him to value six occasions per week above one; and in the fight he was for waging, it was necessary that he should enter the ring and hit blow for blow sans intermission. A statement that he could call false must be challenged hot the next morning. The covert Toryism, the fits of flunkeyism, the cowardice, of the relapsing middle-class, which is now England before mankind, because it fills the sails of the Press, must be exposed. It supports the Press in its own interests, affecting to speak for the people. It belies the people. And this Press, declaring itself independent, can hardly walk for fear of treading on an interest here, an interest there. It cannot have a conscience. It is a bad guide, a false guardian; its abject claim to be our national and popular interpreter—even that is hollow and a mockery! It is powerful only while subservient. An engine of money, appealing to the sensitiveness of money, it has no connection with the mind of the nation. And that it is not of, but apart from, the people, may be seen when great crises come. Can it stop a war? The people would, and with thunder, had they the medium. But in strong gales the power of the Press collapses; it wheezes like a pricked pigskin of a piper. At its best Beauchamp regarded our lordly Press as a curiously

diapered curtain and delusive mask, behind which the country struggles vainly to show an honest feature; and as a trumpet that deafened and terrorized the people; a mere engine of leaguers banded to keep a smooth face upon affairs, quite soullessly: he meanwhile having to be dumb.

“ But a journal that should be actually independent of circulation and advertisements: a popular journal in the true sense, very lungs to the people, for them to breathe freely through at last, and be heard out of it, with well-paid men of mark to head and aid them;—the establishment of such a Journal seemed to him brave work of a life, though one should die early. The money launching it would be coin washed pure of its iniquity of selfish reproduction, by service to mankind. This *Dawn* of his conception stood over him like a rosier Aurora for the country. He beheld it in imagination as a new light rising above hugeous London. You turn the sheets of *The Dawn*, and it is the manhood of the land addressing you, no longer that alternately puling and insolent cry of the coffers. The health, wealth, comfort, contentment of the greater number are there to be striven for, in contempt of compromise and ‘unseasonable times.’

“ Beauchamp’s illuminated dream of the power of his *Dawn* to vitalize old England, liberated him singularly from his wearing regrets and heart-sickness.”

Now Beauchamp’s ideas, if I do not mistake them, or at least those of Dr. Shrapnel, were very much like those which I have been trying to

express in books which have even less chance of reaching the people than the weekly journal has. In a certain sense I may almost congratulate labour that it has no organ; because someone must provide the money to start it at least, and some individual must carry out the duties of editor. But how can the most perfect of editors deal with the daily problems as they arise in exactly the spirit which is required? The labour organ can never carry out its full task if it confine itself to what are called labour problems. It is labour as an ordinary citizen that is at present in process of formation into a party; and a premature press declaration on subjects which are in the melting pot might injure the prospects of the policy itself. In order to make myself clearer here I should like to say a word upon self-government.

If we are to avoid the pitfalls of bureaucracy and centralised inspectorships we must develop the larger political sense and national honour of individuals in units as small as the parish council. The parish councillor must be appointed to carry out, not to defeat, the national will as expressed in legislation. The control of the county should be seen in developing, not in overriding, parish

efforts, in order that the local knowledge may be of the greatest benefit to us all, not, as it has often been found in the past, a public nuisance.

Now in these local efforts towards the betterment of the State citizens of every kind are interested. The big trade union questions do not to any large extent appear, but the trade unionist with all his knowledge and experience of affairs is a very valuable asset in parish matters. It will be a disaster if he ignores what ought to be the very basis of citizenship and self-government under the idea that his union is enough. If this small and selfish spirit prevail, how shall we ever build up in the People's party an organism which can control the whole destiny of the empire? We may simplify and make more public and more truthful all our diplomacies, but this will not do away with the need for big and educated brains to do the country's work. The whole spirit of the future, as I have often urged, is the doing of things well and in a scientific manner, not in sending round inspectors to see that we do not cheat and evade the law at every turn. And this spirit of evasion must be met and vanquished in its birthplace, the parish. The election of members to keep down rates, and destroy sanitary measures, to condone

soil conditions and injurious methods, can only be put an end to when Labour goes to the poll with its country's best interests in its heart.

As to publicity and the dissemination of policy, there is no better way of leading up to a final declaration than the reasoned speeches of the trusted leaders, and the resolutions of the conferences and meetings. It may be necessary even to go to the poll with certain battle cries before the Press can be entrusted with the people's whole policy. Personally I am in sympathy with Newcastle programme honesty, but when it comes to elections the leaders have to decide how much at a time they can undertake to carry into legislation. But there can be no question, in my own opinion, as to the wisdom and honesty of revealing as fully and as often as possible every clause of a desirable people's charter. And, while money counts for so much in present organs, it will be a valuable statement to make on the part of the leaders that the future and the policy of the organisation do not depend upon any capitalist or literary venture.

The cross-currents which are set up by the present system of "organs" are very injurious to all. *The Dawn*, if it had come to birth, would no doubt have contained all those "attractive

features" which bring forth a circulation. I do not mean merely the mysterious murders and such items, which secure the adhesion of so vast a number of readers, but the short story, the prize poem, and all those solacing tit-bits which take the mind away from the sordid question of politics.

It must not be forgotten that we can never expect to finish with politics and social reform. But it is probable that when *The Dawn* had become thoroughly established, and Beauchamp had left it, as he thought, in good hands, the efforts of the management would almost involuntarily, but certainly and imperceptibly, have drifted into that of *laissez faire*, and that the new and necessary adaptations would have been received by the editorial staff with at least passive resistance. The ideal should never be suggested as a finished product: man never *is* but always *to be* blessed.

It ought here to be remarked also that the successful social effort is most blessed when it has no history. The organ which caters for the latest murder has but scant use for the story of a steady stream of perfect butter issuing from our counties, and but little space to afford to the biography of a new and very good potato, or to

the dynamic force behind the pint of the best milk which penetrates to the most remote baby in the slums. And from the nature of the case such a medium would disappoint the fire-eater, for it would be avoided by the national laboratory which was extracting something new and exquisitely dangerous from the public coal. The lighter kind of journal will no doubt need copy more voluminous than ever dealing with what we are coming to look upon as junkerism, which I come to bury, they to praise. In the form of fiction, too, and in hands such as those of Meredith, I shall be among the first to applaud. We can all enjoy those terrible thrills of terror, or paroxysms of adulation, which are purveyed to us with fancy pictures of things past. Of such days gone, as of the dead, I will speak nothing but good.

In short, the coming days are needed for work, not for talk. Have you ever estimated what part publicity bears in the real work of life? And have you estimated further what portion of publicity is devoted to the retention of long recognised abuses, and how little is applied to the amelioration of the evil conditions of our social state?

We get back soon to the old dilemma, pub-

licity and selling costs. We desire to give everyone a chance of hearing of the new evangel, and we can only do so apparently by hiding it in masses of lurid facts, catchpenny information, threadbare drivel, and pictures of the seamy side of everything. The war has done an infinite amount of good by reducing the amount of paper in these directions, and has, unfortunately, supplied so many subjects for shocking and thrilling us that we are nearer than before to an ideal "Dawn." But this dreadful crisis brings its own difficulty; every individualist panacea and martial routine is tried rather than let public safety override naked individualism; every cure must be tried for the scarcity of margarine, milk and bacon, rather than the one effective method of public control of national concerns.

How, then, can it be suggested that we deal with this question? The best kind of publicity is, as I have said, the careful reporting of the leaders' speeches, and the resolutions of conferences. But is it likely that we can get good leaded type, on the leader page, in every journal for the "vapourings," as some would honestly believe them to be, of the leaders trusted by Labour? When violent attacks are made upon the policy of such

leaders—I am not really suggesting that anything so crude as this is ever done,—or they are treated to a stony silence, it might be necessary to prepare a reasoned statement, worded in perfect taste, and present it in the form of a half double column advertisement to the proprietors. Which party is Israelite and which Egyptian I cannot say; but they would spoil each other admirably by such a course, the moneyed party getting money and the people publicity on terms. But I am getting nearer to the fighting line now than some will suppose when I put this solution forward. The readers of the said journal will almost unanimously growl “Out, vile jelly, throw the thing away!” But suppose that at this point an appeal for a fair hearing be made by labour to its printers, is it not possible that wiser counsels will prevail, that *bonâ fide* argument will be established—truth can never ask for more—and a genuine effort at discussion arrived at between editorial and labour before the hostile audience addressed? Sometimes it has been suggested that discussion should be permitted between the pulpit and the pew. The situations would be similar but not the same: if the resources of capital in this matter of publicity appear to be almost irresistible, the

very safety of self-government depends upon our making the resources of the people itself unquestionably so.

But it may be wondered what part publicity takes in those economic movements in state management which I have tried to describe. I claim that the whole case presented by Mr. Dibblee in his "Laws of Supply and Demand" (Constable), in which publicity bears its part, falls to the ground in the larger conditions of State ownership. Advertisement is part of selling costs, and there has been no cause to incur them yet. The genius of the dealer who was able "to sell a man a bad picture which he did not want" is not required here; and we may glean from Mr. Dibblee some of the curious facts which underlie the practice of advertising. In one place (p. 259) he states that "there is an inevitable personal factor demanded from the seller, some consideration for the buyer's own special preferences, some sympathy for his need and its satisfaction, some delicate persuasion that the satisfaction of the want is really complete. If many sellers do not succeed in fulfilling all these requirements, it is some consolation for us to feel that at least it is attempted. The impersonal seller makes surprise impossible and

stifles desire." The personality who does not know what he wants is a familiar one: he, of course, must be helped to decide; but what is at the bottom of this psychological state is, that which everyone in a state of health ought to endeavour to compass, a reasonable variety in everything. But I have emphasized, and dwell once more on the fact, that variety of the true sort does not consist in an unscientific method of production out of which the seller can never give a guarantee of quality and of regularity. True variety lies in the choice of a number of goods, each of which is perfectly regular in quality.

Now it is easy to see, if my contention be accepted, that advertising became a necessity growing out of the old conditions, but leading eventually to its own decease in certain directions. When Free Trade came in, and business and wealth grew, the old system of taking just what one could get from the nearest shop could no longer be entertained. New and more carefully prepared commodities came on the market, the wholesalers were asked to undertake the distribution, but were obliged to refuse until (selling costs again) the said commodities were advertised, and the demand for them created

and stimulated. The public gained because it was thus protected in many directions from the weaker consciences among the tradesmen, who were compelled, under the new methods, to sell the advertised articles under the conditions laid down by the proprietors. I am dealing, however, with our daily bread only, and must not pursue the subject beyond it here. In the production and distribution of home-grown food there should be no need for advertising, except in very exceptional circumstances, and those bearing chiefly upon the incidence of Free Trade. The varieties which people seek for ought to be part of the distribution scheme to which Free Trade will afford interesting supplements. The dépôts can with the greatest ease and efficiency supply all the information that the householder requires. Every day there will be added some fresh detail to the lists of commodities and to the simple methods of presenting housekeeping facts. All the time earnest efforts will be made to minimise inconvenience and delays and to improve delivery in the respective areas affected.

Free Trade

I HAVE taken cotton as the most typical and important instance of the working of free trade in England, and cotton affords the best illustration of the dangers incidental to it. I have tried to show that absolute free trade such as our extremists desire, might mean death to every national aspiration and interest, and that the crude alternative of free trade or protection, as so many crude alternatives are, is false. The real alternative is between organised and chaotic free trade, between co-operation and trade war among nations. The organisation of free trade is of two characters. The first I have discussed to some extent when I tried to show that we need public ownership and national organisation here at home in several directions if we are to open our doors to unbridled free trade. But that other danger which I alluded to of speculation and cornering is one which can only be dealt with adequately by something resembling international control of those commodities upon which the daily bread of millions depends. Those who are not familiar with the cotton trade should study

Mr. Haslam Mills' sketch of Sir Charles Macara's life (Sherratt and Hughes). The author makes the life of his hero the opportunity for describing vividly the whole Lancashire industry. Lancashire has always gone whole-heartedly for free trade, and has at times had to pay for the privilege by crises almost as severe as the American Civil War brought about. This is what Mr. Mills says in one place :—

“ The crisis of 1903 and 1904 would not wait for Africa. It was Sully's year. The shortage of raw material together with the operations of a single speculator brought Lancashire to a state of things which recalled, if it did not repeat, the experience of the Cotton Famine in the sixties. Lancashire escaped final disaster by adopting and faithfully working Charles Macara's plan of short hours. The working hours in the Lancashire factories were reduced from 55½ to 40 per week; the operatives went on a regimen which in the following summer spelt Blackpool again instead of Paris or Lucerne, which were growing in favour.* The call upon the raw cotton market was eased, and Sully was broken in pieces. Lancashire had saved the cotton trade of the world, but it was clearly felt that the sacrifice must not be asked of her again. The mass meeting of employers and employed which had pledged itself to

* Charles Macara was always against complete stoppages of the trade, even if they were short ones, and preferred what may be called the rationing of work and wages.

Charles Macara's proposal at the end of 1903 was in telegraphic communication with the American and European spinners, and was attended by a representative of the French trade, and so strong was the *rappport* found to be already existing, that an international movement of the cotton trade was felt to be at least possible."

And this is what Sir Charles himself said to America in 1907 :—

" The American cotton crop plays such an important part in the supply of the world's needs that operations which affect it practically affect, more or less, the entire crop of the world, and when consideration is given to the colossal dimensions of the world's cotton crop, and to the fact that the raising of the annual average price by illegitimate speculation by even one cent per pound represents £18,000,000 (\$90,000,000), it must be obvious that it is time that some determined effort was made to rid the industry of this serious and unnecessary burden.

" It is impossible to imagine any more important work, or one in which growers and spinners can more readily join hands, as it is inimical to the interests of both that such colossal sums should be extracted by those who neither grow cotton nor manufacture it, nor, indeed, render any actual service in the distribution of the raw material or its manufactured products."

In the earlier days of free trade we purchased in the various areas the wheat, cotton, and other products that were available ; we obtained ships for the transport of these products ; and we sold

the cargoes either "to arrive" or on the quay. Such a commonplace method has long been outgrown. Wheat and kindred imports are purchased on paper merely, and are treated in the various markets just as a racehorse is treated in the betting ring. Not only has the old technical knowledge of commodities gone from "the operators," but there is great difficulty now in wording contracts to cover the infinite small differences which exist, under the dispensation of providence, among all crops. The merchant of the earlier type can no longer afford to import products in the former sense because his knowledge of values is useless; prices do not depend upon them, but upon the State of the betting ring. Uncle Tom used to grow the cotton and Uncle Sam sent it to us as fast as we could take it, at prices which varied with the supply. John Bull had his work cut out to look at the demand as well as the supply, and to adapt his hours of factory labour and his building of new works to these things. But soon the speculator was always present, and, as I have said, his influence came to this. The cotton crop, like the wheat crop, was subject to a "turnover" greatly in excess of the real quantity, and, of course, the consumer had to pay

for the finished goods a price which included a profit on the sales of the imaginary stock. At times, and, of course, at the least favourable juncture when there was a pinch, the speculator, by secret and anonymous purchases, tried to corner the market, to buy up and attempt to insist on the delivery of goods which did not exist, just as gold is treated by the financial world. In order to check this act of treason to the States concerned the whole industrial population of the cotton district of England had to face starvation. And the question Labour ought to be asking urgently now in all such cases is whether States are going to put up with these acts of piracy any longer. Sir Charles Macara has tried to find a cure by international arrangements to estimate crops and give full information to each other. But the cure would be brought about much sooner if States would put an end once for all to these gambling hells in produce that have arisen among them. Has the public ever been shown a real produce betting book? Have the churches even under seal of the various kinds of confession ever been asked to listen to the story of a devout believer's methods among the markets; how the risk upon one adventure is set in orthodox turf

style against another; and how some restive steed among the imports is "pulled" by some regular church-goer, or group of such, in order to bring about the required winning price of the commodity? The infamy should be stopped, and I see no power strong enough to stop it except the State under labour pressure. The growers, the manufacturers, the transport service, even the genuine merchants and brokers themselves are victims of the system; and the peoples of the earth would welcome with a sigh of relief the knowledge that gambling in the world's produce had been put an end to.

It simplifies economics to some extent if we look at its problems from the point of view of the people—whose true interest is supposed to be the subject of economic research—in some of its larger classes of labour. It is obvious that the cotton trade wants the raw material in regular quantities, and at reasonably stable prices, so that it may address itself to excellence in output, economy in manufacture, careful adaptation to the requirements of varied markets, and efficient distribution. The coal-miners' interests are bound up with the effort to make every ton of coal produce its ideal quantity of force, or its maximum amount of chemical value. The farm-

ing population is dependent for happy conditions upon heavy yields of the best foods. The shipping railway and canal services are dependent upon the other classes, but these other classes are equally dependent upon their own efficiency. Let the most advanced student in economic science show us how individualism can do any sort of justice to these great interdependent classes. For the peculiarity of the position lies in the fact that each of the great classes becomes a mass of ordinary citizens when it comes to the production of commodities and the performance of services outside its own; it can, therefore, in the sense of consumer, take part with us all against itself as producer.

The State only can look at the whole of them as citizens, and endeavour to bring about conditions that are fair all round. But it cannot begin to do this while the private individual can defy both State and separate citizen alike. If, for instance, in my Lancashire district where all classes meet, the miner can prove to his fellows in cotton, railways and agriculture that his wages and general conditions are unfair he is appealing to the State as a whole, not to his fellow unionists in the mines. Free trade, therefore, when it can be proved that it injures agriculture, however

necessary it may be to cotton, must be prepared to undergo some guidance from the State, and tariff reform cannot be allowed its innings because we learnt long ago all too well what its working comes to. But to make it clearer to the Englishman why State activity has become a necessity we must look at what its absence has brought about. When we say that our Empire has accumulated its total area in some absence of mind we mean that its increase has been due to the work of pioneers who had little or no State support. And we have recently found that our present enemies have made use of those very principles upon which we pride ourselves to injure us. If we adopt a gold standard they establish it, too, as a ready tool to be used by the State itself through its obedient citizens towards our financial injury. If we work quietly among primitive peoples towards an exploitation more or less innocent, our opponents work by their most ingenious, unscrupulous but imperial agents, not only to injure and forestall us but to blacken our characters and those of others against whom they are plotting. The State *must* now take charge. And whether it be cotton, or oil, or rubber, or wheat, there must be some definite State policy which will use those individuals who are willing to be used, but which

will insist upon guiding and directing the national energies whether certain other individuals like it or not.

It, therefore, comes to this: Free trade, like land and minerals, banking and the rest, must become nationalised. Free trade, like the banks, is only a machine, and the State must control that machine. Cotton is the child of free trade, and yet in every direction it will require State help if it is to preserve its national value. Where is cotton to come from if America wants all her own? From many places which our Empire can develop. But even before we have to admit that America cannot longer supply us there is an urgent call for State activity in discussing the situation with America, as if Brother Jonathan were once more a brother in very deed—more closely united with us than ever on account of the mutual discoveries of the intervening years. Free trade within the empire ought henceforth to have no meaning which excludes the United States. Then hand in hand we may go on to free mankind. And yet we must beware of preaching freedom to others as if the manacles of feudalism, of trusts and of capitalism were already unriveted from our own wrists.

Socialism so-called

I HAVE now reached this point. I have suggested that we should farm our own land, plant our own forests, cut, dig and blast our own minerals, run our own motors, trains, and, to some extent, ships, and keep our own banks and taverns. In order to do these things we should require to buy out the landlord, royalty owner and shareholder on liberal terms—no vindictive “tax and buy” policy here—as people who have been led into a false position through no fault of their own. I have urged that all these State functions will require us to use the very highest abilities we can secure from among the citizens, sometimes in the physical sciences, such as chemistry, botany and electricity, sometimes as commercial organisers and technical advisers of various kinds and calibres. I have tried to show, or to remind people of the truism, that each separate section of the population, vast or small, depends upon the other sections of the community, that no one lives to himself, and that this interdependence is much more intimate under a system such as I have pressed upon the reader than under our present

most uncertain methods. But I want to ask now in what detail the organised policy which I have advocated causes the citizen to differ in his opportunities and in his liberty from the present, except to amplify both? What does Hodge lose by working for his county instead of for a tenant farmer who may or may not have the power to give him good wages and a good house? What does the tenant farmer gain by continuing to pay rent to a landlord who may sell his farm over his head, as in recent transactions, who may or may not have cash to do well by the land, and who, in any case, can by no conceivable financial *coup* get him a daily market for his produce, and prompt delivery to it? What will a real forester, or even a keeper, gain by continuing to devastate the land by sport when we can employ four or five self-respecting independent men, instead of one, in the new developments upon the hills? What will all those ill-paid men gain who snatch a living from the tiny efforts of co-operation we are making now by remaining ill-paid and ill-appreciated, instead of becoming county advisers in a mighty national uprising?

I might go on asking a dozen such questions, but I am bound to admit that those experienced

and learned men to whom I should next appeal do not exist under the present *régime* in sufficient quantities. We shall have to collect them and to manufacture them as quickly as we can. We have a few professors, a few students, a few experts, but we want a stalwart array of them before we can "make things hum." Are we likely to be told by the students when we appeal for them, and offer them a well-paid job, that they will have none of it, because they fear it is socialism in disguise? How have our poor urban and county authorities got along all these years for staffs under such socialism as I desire to see? Are the posts sought for, or does every engineer and chemist turn up his nose in disgust when the berth is vacant? Or is the difficulty now that these berths are so few, and science languishes? There are more applicants than berths you say: then why is such socialism despised? Oh! It is not despised by the office holder; it is disliked by the ratepayer because of the cost! Now we are getting nearer to the mark! My suggestions are objected to by some because it will make the servants of the State more independent, more happy, more comfortable in every way. But what about efficiency, will these men do the work

I ask them to do and give us more wheat, oats, and meat, purer and richer milk, plenty of timber and fruit and the rest? Yes! But look at the wages! I admit that I want to pay them better than the old serfs upon the land, but I appeal to every successful business man with a national reputation for confirmation of my statement that well-paid, happy, comfortable servants are not only more efficient in every way but are *cheaper* than are the underpaid.

It is too late to talk to me of socialism. I have been saved in this war by a State-paid fleet, a State improvised army, State railways, and State fishermen, State finance of a bungling order—not the real type, State everything. But I have been hampered at every point by the greedy individualist, although the State has saved him at every turn from ruin and despair. What at the present moment is preventing the effective dealing with the land and its products by the State? The nervous anxiety to do nothing to interfere with the personal ownership of national assets. And yet, strangely enough, the Prime Minister (Mr. Lloyd George) has said to those who are helping him, “Be ruthless, court-martial them if they resist!” What a system, what a spirit, compared with that

which we should raise in our villages and hamlets if we cheered them by prizes and helped them by every known device of co-operative work ! The horror which is in the hearts of those who are wedded to the old *régime* is painful to behold when we hint that free trade in labour—in other words, sweating—is no more to be allowed. Look what the old method has been in the light of efficiency. To carry out any of the activities of a farm there is required an intelligent brain as well as a strong arm. Personally, I have found among the labourers more of the intelligence regarding good milkers and the requisites of good feeding than I have among their employers, who, under the present system, look to profit only, not to the production of the best. But out of that class, in an intelligently-conducted State, we should have been drawing annually a large number of young men who could be qualified by the necessary education for the more responsible posts in farming operations. I fancy, if we had time to investigate so interesting an agricultural problem, that, in the old days of monasteries, more young men were discovered by systematic search worthy of a good education than in later years of supposed freedom. There is nothing so brutal in this world as pluto-

cracy. It scarcely needs proving that finance is at bottom the thing which sends the patriot into filthy European gaols, or that the classes which worship money and its glistening effects are now fighting for their own hands in favour of Kaiserdom or junkerism in every State. Who is financing the spurious, anarchic socialism which is adding so much anxiety and death to the present war? The people who are interested in showing that freedom and civic rights and State activity are wrong, and that the dictator's the thing. Who is desirous of tampering with our present votes and the House of Commons? Who is perpetually harping upon the hereditary principle in the Upper House? Those who desire to keep the citizen down in ignorance and misery lest he should usurp by sheer weight of brain and singleness of purpose their hereditary rights! None of these taunts about socialism affect me because I am an Englishman and need not resort to civil war while the House of Commons exists. But by every disloyal and unpatriotic effort to restrict our free impulses and businesslike efforts here we are multiplying in other less free countries the dangers of anarchy and civil war. If we could have shown to Russians a better formula of freedom than we

have been able to do we should have minimised their present troubles, and should have helped them far more effectively than we have done to draw order out of chaos by this time.

One of the great terrors that is in the minds of well-disposed persons is that of bureaucracy. It is hinted, and not obscurely, that the new labour programme is likely to lead to this much hated thing. I should have thought—I may be wrong, for it would be impertinent of me to speak for labour as if I had authority to do so—I should have thought that bureaucracy would be more distasteful to the collier and the farm labourer than to anyone else upon earth. But I claim that real self-government is the very antithesis of bureaucracy, which is the sign and engine of the autocrat. Personally, I would almost risk the postponement of State farming and the other activities if we cannot have them as a sign of home rule in self-government. The problems that county farming and colliery working raise in such local administration have to be solved, not run away from, if we are going to show the world one more example of true liberty. The work that is coming upon our local councils is so great that a county will become more important to our domestic concerns than

Westminster itself. But if St. Stephen's is becoming involved in vast imperial labours, and is in need of relief, is that a valid reason for belittling the national value of our county parliaments, and making responsibility a plea for shirking? If the county labours become too heavy the same process must be continued of training elected bodies beneath to carry through the various functions called for. We have multitudes of highly respected men and women on the land who will discharge the country's tasks in a spirit the reverse of the bureaucrat. Is it a small thing that the pining child in the slums—whom I hope soon to see lifted out of this abhorrent destitution—should bless the men and women who direct farming operations for sending pure, refreshing milk and wholesome fruit to every urban street? The whole country is tired of the bureaucrat, the Stock and other exchanges, and Trust alike. It wants to give its honest hearts and active brains a chance to work faithfully for the good of all. Do not let us forget that the voters in the country will be accustomed to the hoeing of turnips and the loading of dung; to the cutting of coal and the hewing of stone. The members of committees will have to understand all about these things or

they will soon have to give place to those who do. We may have to wait for full efficiency, but the permanent heads will have some guiding power. Things are coming to such a pass in the political world, where the Trust and Capital have long had their nominees, that we shall soon have to divide ourselves into two new but final groups: those who intend to govern themselves and those who do not, but prefer to leave the State to "family" and "influence" and wealth. If the latter prevail there will have to be built many fleets of *Mayflowers* to take the rest of us away! And as we sigh farewell may we not be allowed to wonder who, now, in the dear land will do the work? Who will get the coal when the shrewd winds penetrate even into the palaces? Who will grind the corn and bake the bread? Who will hew the wood and draw the water in the coming time? The sycophants! those who have taken side with wealth to get its crumbs! The work should do them good, but will they do it? To do servile work because you must and have no vote is one thing, but to toady to avoid it and then to have to do it is another. We can respect and fight for a real slave forced by grim circumstances against his will. But this other thing, this syc-

phant, one who panders to luxury and wealth and sells his vote to them, who prostitutes his very suffrage for a mess of pottage, can history show anywhere that even a very little war was fought for him ?

The dawn of freedom is at hand, and when I say this I do not wish to belittle the beauty of those earlier moonlight effects which patriots gave us in the past. Some glimmerings we have had in my short life : the Ballot Act introduced decency and some safety from the bully into the voter's task ; the Parliament Act would be a sufficient makeshift if there were any reason in nature and justice why we should wait for all the best legislation so long that true co-ordination of our activities can never really take place. Political freedom is not yet thoroughly understood. The slave lying exhausted on the free shore after swimming from the master's whip may be at liberty—to die. But true liberty accepts responsibility as its first charter of freedom, and can never enjoy its escape from bondage until it forgets itself and works for the rest. Freedom is not a selfish thing ; it must have freedom about it. And yet the well-being of the whole may be called a selfish aim if we realise to the full how it bestows upon

every citizen his highest joy. The socialism of self-government can never be other than beneficent. It is the handshake of comrades, the genial smile of friendship, the kiss of blood-relations. Whoso fears it must be the guilty holder of another's freedom; the trespasser upon someone's premises; the perpetrator of some injury to the state. When any of us desire it we desire a good and harmless thing.

The Real Peace

WHEN I think of the outrages which the patriot has endured during the present war and hear men talk of peace, I have to ask myself in some bitterness of spirit what peace means. I must, therefore, apologise for leaving for the moment such sordid things as international finance and falling back upon ultimate truths, for by them only can this case be decided. The "pacifist," the man or woman who calls for peace when there appears to most of us to be no peace, is generally a man or woman of deep religious convictions, determined to go to judgment and to prison rather than sacrifice truth. He finds himself in many instances upon Christian doctrine as he believes it, and follows the example of the Master as he sees it. I have come straight to the point because I believe it to be the real difficulty. If many of us thought that the premisses of the pacifist were right we should probably, in as brave a manner as we could, follow the same path. But I believe that these premisses are not only wrong but a terrible travesty of the truth.

This perversion of the truth is very difficult to meet because it is in large measure the legacy of the churches. This is not the place to go into the matter fully, but the churches have been apt to lay an undue emphasis on the statement that religion—to put the matter generally—gives promise of physical things rather than spiritual ones. It is very difficult to prevent the ignorant—and this is the final claim for education—turning all spiritual things into physical forms. Thus ignorance in the churches as well as out of them has come to view the peace of God as a temporal earthly state of absence of war.

If this view of peace were a true one we should soon see to what it would lead, but the inborn common sense and feeling for rectitude of our greatest minds has corrected this misconception in all ages. “Be content with your wages” is a good precept; but the care of others is a better; and the decision of God-inspired souls to fight for justice to their brethren has always controverted the Church’s sanction of such generalities, and has steadily refused the social peace which meant to a man’s neighbour squalor and misery and vice. A far greater generality than earthly peace is found in the saying that he that is chief among

you let him be the minister or servant; and a man ought never to use the word peace while his neighbour is being tormented and enslaved. The real peace is often one of death on the battlefield as on the cross; and to allow a desert to be formed under the name of peace, whether we be acting upon principle or upon fear and laziness, is a short cut to remorse. Can a State, as a State, secure something resembling the peace of God? I believe it can; and I believe that the churches now brought up once more face to face with their Master will answer "Yes"! But will such peace come to the fanatic who thinks of anything in these dreadful days but victory or death? As a people we have gone into this war with hands as clean, thank God! as ever a people did. Let us then go on in His name to whatever comes, whether it be victory or death. But afterwards, if we survive, and even now as well as we can, let us apply this principle of ministry to our own citizens. Let us give everyone the chance which he was meant to have of service for all. There is sometimes a wonderful dilemma to which real Christianity leads; the Apostle found it in his triumphal course of service. Having followed his Master in the service of his fellows he became so

absorbed in that pursuit, and so carried away by his Master's spirit, that he declared in defiance of all wordy fanatics that he could wish himself accursed from Christ for his brethren's sake. Let England answer the pacifist in the same spirit and all will be well.

Our daily bread in very simple fashion thus brings before us all the very deepest problem of life. It represents the fundamental need of physical life without which the mental and spiritual activity of man cannot exist. It stands next for that duty which has been imposed upon us of securing for our neighbours that sustenance which we have obtained for ourselves so that the best in them, too, may come to birth. "Am I my brother's keeper" can never be answered in the negative with truth. Anyone who admits this and then proceeds to declare that peace and contentment are God's will, and that our brethren should starve rather than call upon us to fight for them, is own brother to a fool, if not a blasphemer. The one simple ordinance of Christianity becomes of more exquisite beauty still if we take the due provision of bread or food as the rallying point for religious men gathering together and working for the attainment of social well-being

and reform, earnest mental training, and vivid spiritual life.

Give us this day our daily bread! But may that bread be sweeter because we have grown it in the soil of freedom, sown it by the strong hands of comfort, weeded it by the careful fingers of education, and reaped it by the glad effort of national social life! May it give the People strength to begin the labours of a new world!

OUR LAND PRESS

EDITED BY GEO. RADFORD, M.A.

The previous Volumes in this Series were:—

THE STATE AS FARMER
STATE SERVICES
AGRICULTURAL ORGANIZATION

4/6 each net.

The Serial Issue of OUR LAND will be resumed (D.V.) by the
publication on 1st January, 1919, of

OUR LAND ANNUAL

6/- net.

Orders and Subscriptions for above may be sent to
CONSTABLE & CO. LTD. 10 ORANGE STREET
W.C.2.

