WHITEFRIARS JOURNAL.

Edited by FRIAR G. B. BURGIN.

No. 2. Vol. VI. JANUARY, 1922. PRIVATE CIRCULATION.

DINNER TO SIR CAMPBELL STUART.

January 28th, 1921.

Prior—FRIAR SIR ROBERT HUDSON.

Topic for Discussion—

SOME ASPECTS OF JOURNALISM IN TWO HEMISPHERES.

Among the Guests were : Mr. Hew T. Fraser, Mr. C. N. Brown, Mr. O. H. Davies, Mr. G. N. Morris, Mr. Gerald Gould (Editor of the *Daily Herald*), Mr. W. B. Robertson, Mr. E. Sharpe Grew, Mr. H. B. Warner, Captain Paul Kimberley, Sir Harry Wilson, K.C.M.G., K.B.E. (Secretary of the Colonial Institute), Mr. H. T. Montague Bell, Mr. A. N. Glen, The Right Hon. James MacMahon (Permanent Under-Secretary for Ireland), Mr. P. Callinan, Dr. Andrew Balfour (Director-in-Chief of the Bureau of Scientific Research), Mr. Arnold Statham, Colonel Boyle and Mr. G. E. Pearson.

The Prior reminded his hearers that Sir Campbell Stuart was a young man who had secured the best post in journalism, though still only 35 years of age. He was already in his musty room at Westminster while Sir Campbell Stuart was being wheeled about in a perambulator in Canada. With regard to our guest's recent book, it had a splendid title, even if he were disappointed with the contents ; but he still hoped that Sir Campbell Stuart would one day write a book on Printing House Square. He asked the Friars to join in drinking with him to the guest of the evening, wishing him the health, strength and courage necessary for the great duties entrusted to him as Managing Director of *The Times*.

Sir Campbell Stuart, proceeding to trace the history of the Press, reminded his hearers that man's earliest chronicle was the foot-print which marked his coming and going. As the ages wore on, man wanted a greater means of expression, and registered his impressions on the walls of caves with red earth and sticks. This was the real birth of journalism, and, finally, the descendants of these early chroniclers were those truly great men who acted as War correspondents in the late War. It was interesting to remember that Paris possesses a scrip 2,000 B.C., and in that scrip is shown a very real spirit of journalism.

The first daily paper was the *Post Boy*. England was late starting in daily journalism, but she rapidly made progress, and there is no doubt we must consider Daniel Defoe the father of English journalism.

We talk of an alliance between the Motherland and the Colonies, but our Guest could not help thinking that this would be more quickly helped forward by internationalizing the Press and by interchange of journalists. The Imperial Press Conference was doing good work, and he believed, as war generally arose through misunderstanding, that this would do as much to prevent war as the League of Nations. Before he concluded his address, Sir Campbell Stuart made some interesting references to the Press of America.

Friar Harold Spender pointed out that in speaking of journalism in the United States, Sir Campbell Stuart had very deftly skated over thin ice. The American Press was not always accurate in its head-lines. When he was over in the States, he was misguided enough to try to read the American newspapers right through, and though he generally succeeded, he had to admit that he was conquered by the Sunday papers. It was most difficult to understand where they got so much paper, and he would like Sir Campbell Stuart to use his influence to divert some of the Swedish paper that was going to America to England.

There was no truly national Press in America with the exception of Hearst's, because the American Press divided itself into circles or little suns. Why could not Britain get up an anti-Hearst paper, in order to combat the violent anti-English propaganda carried on by the Hearst papers. No doubt some opinion in America was

friendly to this country, but the American Press view as a whole did not represent the true American mind.

Friar Clement Shorter reminded his hearers of the man who, speaking on the history of the world, spoke for two hours and then stated that time did not allow him to exhaust the subject. There was no paper in the world to equal *The Times*, though he found much to attract and interest him in certain American journals. He could not share Sir Campbell Stuart's lamentations over the three days' absence of newspapers last Christmas; to him they were very restful days. He thought newspapers had done more than anything else to promote war, and only the weaker papers had made any effort to prevent it. There should be a full expression of views. In America, papers only reflected the opinions of very few men, and these grew fewer as the papers became the property of a smaller number of individuals.

Friar Sir John Foster Fraser thought that the talk had drifted into one channel—a criticism of American journals. No doubt cultured and travelled Americans were most kindly disposed towards the English, but they were in the minority, and this minority would not, unfortunately, go on the platform and say what they thought of the English. Most Americans get their ideas of the English from comic supplements in the Sunday papers, and they were in the habit of saying it takes an Englishman twenty minutes to see a joke. No doubt Americans were emotional and much more ready to take up causes than the English, but they were much more ready to drop them. Yet he did not wish his hearers to get frightened nor disturbed by any sudden enthusiasm for a cause displayed by the Americans. They might remember that if the Irish question were settled to-morrow, the American feelings towards the English would be entirely changed in the course of a few weeks.

We ought, however, to ask ourselves why the Americans should be expected to like us. No doubt there was as much trouble caused in America by their educational books as by their newspapers. The true story of the Revolution, if told over there, is put down as pro-British. Difficult questions often arose, but there were many journalists honestly trying to remove the cobwebs of prejudice.

The Right Hon. James MacMahon in discussing the present Irish difficulties in Ireland, blamed his audience, who found time

for holidays on the Continent and yet could not take a holiday in Ireland. If only they could spend a few weeks there in this way, they would quickly get to understand the Irish. He once knew a politician who went to Ireland for twenty-four hours, and spoke on Irish matters for the rest of his life. Journalists should visit the Irish at their firesides. He thought that the Irish had every reason to complain of their treatment by the English Press. Incidents reported in leaded type, do not represent life in Ireland. There was really no difference under the skin between the Ulster and Munster men, and he would appeal to English Pressmen not to make their readers think it was a land of murderers. If Ireland were looked at apart from politics, it would be found that the Irish are most certainly not criminal.

Friar Hamilton Fyfe thought on coming into the room that he knew Sir Campbell Stuart, but he had no idea that he was a man of such erudition. He had cut the ground from under his feet, because he also spent a day with the " Encyclopædia Britannica." He reminded the Friars that the English Election of 1905 did not show the papers had much influence. One of the speakers had said that peace should be secured by war with Russia ; but only last summer showed that people were solid against any further war. The newspapers were trying to give people what they thought they wanted, and not a good lead. If they did, we should get various currents of thought and opinion, and the public would choose the best. He would like to see groups of papers appealing to definite groups of the public, and not all trying for one group.

Friar Harry Jones reminded his hearers of the brilliant galaxy of editors of provincial papers of the last century, and, with one exception, the entire absence of any outstanding journalist in the Provinces to-day. To-day the proprietor had far too great an influence over the editor, and this influence and interference should be curtailed.

The evening closed with a very able reply from Sir Campbell Stuart, at the conclusion of which he spoke in most eulogistic terms of the life and work of the Prior.

DINNER TO PROFESSOR ARTHUR KEITH, F.R.S., M.D., F.R.C.S., L.L.D.

February 25th, 1921.

Prior—FRIAR DR. KIMMINS.

Topic for Discussion—WHAT IS MAN BECOMING ?

Among the Guests were : Dr. Russell Wells (Vice-Chancellor University of London), Professor John Adams, Sir Dawson Williams (Editor of *R.B.M.*), Mr. Fred T. Hopkinson, Mr. L. W. Bourne, Dr. Bousfield, Mr. A. W. Holland (Assistant Editor Harmsworth's " Universal Encyclopædia "), Mr. John Gulland (Ministry of Labour), Mr. H. V. M. Jones (St. Thomas's Hospital), Mr. B. W. Matz (Editor of the *Dickensian*), Dr. J. Charlton Briscoe, M.D., F.R.C.P., Mr. G. Bulkeley, Mr. T. Cox Meech, Dr. H. A. Lucas, Mr. Roy Saunders, Mr. W. H. Nicholls, Mr. Frank Cossor, Mr. William Graham, Dr. J. G. Porter Phillips (Bethlehem Royal Hospital, Colonel the Hon. A. B. Bathurst and Mr. W. S. Rowntree.

The Prior said that our distinguished Guest needed no introduction. We all knew Dr. Arthur Keith as a fascinating writer, as a brilliant scholar, a great researcher and a most delightful lecturer.

Professor Keith speaking on " What is man becoming ? " stated that his only claim to special information on this matter was the opportunity he had had of studying mankind as he existed in the distant past. He referred to the history which was to be obtained from rivers, caves and valleys, pointing out that 8,000 years ago there were only about seventy persons living in the Metropolitan area now occupied by seven millions of people. Coming to later times, he showed the important part the steamship played in modern development. This country was able to lay our civilization alongside the weak civilization of the world. Nature had always worked by a favoured race. From the point of view of progress, Australia would be white ; New Zealand was white. A striking statement was issued a few years ago showing that if every acre in the world which was capable of cultivation could be cultivated, it would provide for an increase of the population by eighty times.

This would mean that all the towns in England and Greater London would extend outwards, with a great dock all the way round. It would not be a case then of using steamships but airships.

The Professor proceeded to show that the deepest instinct nowadays was self-preservation. We found indications of this in the newspapers. Journalists knew that there was nothing more attractive to the people than a good murder case. They would sacrifice columns of intellectual news from St. Stephen's for a good sensational murder case. Why was this true ? Because the reader obtained more pleasure from the sensational revelations of a murder trial. We were glad to see the villain brought to book ; this was self-preservation. The same thing could be said as to a detective story—it was one of the best series which could be run in a paper. Here was self-preservation again ; we were glad that the detective ran down the guilty person, leaving us in quietness to pursue our own peaceful avocations. Further, he would ask them what journalistic matter editors found best wherewith to fill their columns. Undoubtedly there was nothing like a " saucy " divorce case ; every woman read these cases. It was impossible to run a serial story without a love element coming in.

Professor Keith next urged the important part taken by tribal instinct. Anybody who had lived in primitive countries knew the extraordinary strength of this tribal instinct. We saw this tribal instinct in the *Daily Mail* and *The Times*. In Scotland, the people were sharply divided into Highlanders and Lowlanders. These were looked upon as quite two different people. In England, the Press had helped to unify the tribal spirit, which had become the national spirit. There was a manifestation of this tribal instinct in 45,000 people attending a football match at Highbury. The tribal spirit worked in two ways ; it could be used in the opposite way and cause disruption. It was a most curious thing that people most nearly allied in blood were most prone to disrupt. Some people said that we cannot fight America ; she was of our own blood. Those were just the people we had to keep an eye upon. This tribal spirit had survived in Ireland.

We sometimes dreamed of settling down to an intellectual life on a little cabbage patch and singing praises all day long. Think of that life—should we like it ? The tribal spirit was inimical to

the successful working of a League of Nations. Even America was most anxious to build a bigger fleet. As to the possibility of extending life the Professor had read that in France, by the insertion of a thyroid gland, it was possible to extend life to 100 years, but this was mostly newspaper talk. The trouble was that we could not take more out of the human body than was put in. In the future men would survive very much on the present lines.

Friar Hamilton Fyfe considered that Professor Keith was wrong in his estimate of the future of humanity so far as it affected the tribal instinct. The only advance man had made was the endeavour to look at things from the other fellow's point of view. This was even more marked in the eighteenth century than now. In the past, the family had advanced to the clan, and the clan to the nation. Why not a further development from the nation to a still larger unit ? Unless we could make this further step forward from a nation to a still greater unit the future of mankind was going to be a very poor one.

The Vice-Chancellor of the University of London pointed out that the highly industrialized nations were struggling for the wheat of the less developed countries ; we were fighting continuously for the means of subsistence. Unless we continued the struggle, all progress would cease. He gave an instance of this from the history of China and its Government built up on an intellectual basis.

Professor Adams had read an article in a magazine which contended that in the past it was quite possible that the civilization which existed was as great as ours, and that there were many inventions which had died out. The question was " Are we making progress or not ? "

Friar Percy Alden thought that Professor Keith had omitted to deal with the co-operative instinct, which was manifested in our family and national life to-day. If we could get the co-operative spirit working in the Labour movement then there was some hope for the League of Nations. He did not believe in a League of Nations built up on the old diplomacy.

Sir Dawson Williams replied that the spirit of co-operation in some form existed with the tribal spirit. An important fact was that remarkable people were thrown up in every profession to show

us the way. This was the reason for the extraordinary influence which Professor Keith exercised in medicine and biology.

Friar Harry Jones dissented from Professor Keith's views on the League of Nations. Our distinguished Guest had invited us to worship the old Pagan gods, force and war. This was a Pagan worship which the world would shortly get over. Love would beat force all the time ; it had always beaten it. What had made greatness in the empire was that England had stood for the idea of justice in human affairs.

Colonel A. B. Bathurst differed from Professor Keith as to his estimate of the population in London in the early days. He did not think it was quite so sparse as the Professor had pictured. The speaker dealt with some theories as to the origin of man contained in a series of works written by Mr. Massey.

Friar Snowden considered that the nineteenth century divided the past from the present in a way no other century since the beginning of time had done. He did not believe that the commercial interest was the natural breeder of war. If the Germans had trusted to commerce and not to the force of arms, they might have become the commercial leaders of the world. They would not have had to wait more than ten years to achieve this.

Friar Clement Shorter expressed himself as being entirely with Professor Keith in the views put forward in his beautiful and striking address. If Professor Keith had shown a materialistic point of view, he could reassure them that he was an entirely human person. He first met the Professor some twenty-five years ago in a little Soho restaurant. On behalf of the Club, he thanked Professor Keith for his delightful and stimulating address.

Professor Keith briefly replied to some of the chief points raised in the discussion.

DINNER TO DR. T. R. GLOVER

(THE PUBLIC ORATOR AT CAMBRIDGE).

March 11th, 1921.

Prior—FRIAR HAMILTON FYFE.

Topic for Discussion—

DEMOCRACY : ATHENIAN OR AMERICAN. WHICH ?

Among the Guests were : Dr. Maclean (President of American University Union), Mr. Reginald Berkeley (League of Nations Union), Mr. G. P. Gooch, Mr. C. E. Byles, Mr. R. W. Neeser, Mr. Frank C. Dodd, Mr. G. L. Burton, Mr. S. Wilkinson, Mr. T. P. O'Connor, M.P., Mr. R. G. Emery, Mr. A. C. Stanley-Stone, C.C., Mr. F. A. Mostyn, C.C., Mr. T. Lawis Sayer, Mr. Frank Lindley-Jones, Mr. Charles Rudy, Mr. W. H. C. Plummer, Major J. E. Marston, D.S.O., M.C.R.A., Mr. H. Warner, C.B.E., Mr. W. Douglas Newton (Author of " Westward with the Prince of Wales "), Mr. Alec Waugh, Mr. W. T. Cranfield, Mr. H. Mattingly, Mr. C. E. A. Bedwell, Rev. A. R. Ingram and Sir John McClure.

Prior Hamilton Fyfe had the honour to introduce Dr. T. R. Glover, Public Orator at Cambridge, and a very distinguished scholar. The Public Orator at Cambridge was much more accustomed to introducing than to being introduced. He was unaccustomed to hear the language of the vulgar tongue called English ; he preferred to deal in Latin. Dr. Glover was a little doubtful at the beginning of the dinner as to why we should want to know about Athenian democracy, and he had to assure Dr. Glover that the members were really more intelligent than they looked.

Dr. Glover showed that Greece was a miraculous country—as miraculous as the Government of the United States in a different way. Men were ready to walk four miles from the Pyreus to Athens in order to attend the assembly. Was there any man so interested in British politics that he would walk four miles to attend a meeting ?

Friar Silas Hocking : " Yes, I have done it."

Professor Glover: "A gentleman says 'Yes.' He must belong to another age, of which he and I are the only survivors. At this wonderful meeting of Athenians there was nobody in the chair. The Clerk at the assembly said, 'Who wishes to speak?' There was no Government and no Prime Minister. Some might doubt whether this would be a disadvantage. In the United States a man stated that he thought Eugene Debs ought to have been elected, because after America's experience of the last administration the best place for the President was in gaol."

The speaker regarded the Athenian as the most miraculous democracy the world had ever seen. Why this slap-dash haphazard democracy did so well was that it produced so many men prepared not only to die for the country, but to live for her; men trained their minds in order to give to the country what was most wanted. This was a great ideal for our democracy to set before itself. What struck one about America was the conservatism of its constitution. For many years some of the States disputed a point of grammar whether it should be "the United States is," or "the United States are." They eventually decided that "the United States is." The constitution rested on geography.

The American people were the most patient on the earth. Some time ago there was an election at Paisley and a candidate was elected who had never been in Paisley before. This was not done in the United States; members to Congress were elected from the constituencies in which they resided. America was tied hand and foot by its rules. He was looking for an American millionaire with imagination and genius to endow a chair of American history in Cambridge as well as Oxford. He wanted to see Englishmen taught the history of America. There was the American whom we got from *Punch* sixty years ago. It was not surprising that the Germans reprinted selections from *Punch* and circulated them in the United States. We deserved it. Dr. Glover hoped that we should have no more of the Lincoln cartoons.

One part of a real League of Nations was the knowing and the understanding of another nation. How many Englishmen to-day sympathized with a great country, the story of which they did not know? He had heard Englishmen say that Americans talked big about their country, but the speaker had never heard an

American talk about their country, as big as it was. If they wanted to understand America, let them read the four volumes of the work, " The Winning of the West." He told a friend that the author, Roosevelt, was in a great hurry when he wrote Volume III. His friend replied : " He always was." To understand this great democracy, we must read the Constitution, and the amendments which had brought about Prohibition and Women's Suffrage. All this had been done by the common people. Lincoln said : " The Lord loves the common people ; that is why He makes so many of them."

Friar Silas Hocking thought that it was not surprising that Americans and Canadians talked about the bigness of their country. He once heard a story of an American who said that they might drop the British Isles into the middle of one big American lake, and would not know it was dropped in except for the smell of whisky. He must have referred to the northern part of the British Isles. He was not aware that the Athenian democracy was so unorganized as Dr. Glover had represented it to be. In late years we had suffered from over-organization ; we were being organized out of existence. Individualism seemed to be disappearing rapidly. He confessed that when he read American fiction he sometimes wondered whether the authors represented anything that was real in America.

Dr. Maclean, President of the American University Union, said that we believed to-day that the American democracy was simply the bloom and blossom of the democracy to be found in this country. No one could understand American democracy by simply referring to the outstanding things in the Federal Government ; that was as far as most foreign students of democracy got. He regarded American democracy as primarily local self-government. The Federal Constitution was simply an attempt to adapt it to millions of people in limited spheres of action. American democracy did get back to the essence of the Athenian town meeting.

Friar A. G. Gardiner said Professor Glover had justly put very high the wonderful achievements of the Athenians. They had the advantage of having no Press. The Press under present conditions was about the greatest disaster democracy could have. He urged the importance of securing a better understanding of the history

and ideals of the American people. English people too often assumed the attitude of superior people. On one occasion he was invited to a dinner in a great American city, and he sat next to the French Consul. The English Consul had also been asked to attend. He sent a letter to apologize for his absence, couched in these terms : " Dear Sir, I have another engagement this evening. I shall not be able to attend the dinner." The French Consul remarked that the reply might have been done a little more tactfully, and he agreed.

Mr. T. P. O'Connor, M.P., expressed appreciation of the privilege of being present to share in the intellectual enjoyment of Dr. Glover's address. He did not know what a public orator meant ; if Dr. Glover was as good an orator in public as in private he congratulated him. He started his visits to America before Dr. Glover was born. His first visit was in 1881, and he had been there off and on ever since, generally with the same purpose. Before making one of his trips, he went to Lincoln and Bennett's to buy a new hat. A friend, who was in the shop on the same errand, said : " Judging for the purpose for which you are going to America the shabbier hat you have the better." His impression was that if they got beneath the surface and analyzed the inner mind of the homogeneous population, they would find that the spirit of the Pilgrim Fathers remained. In America there were more readers of Irish books than in Ireland. America, psychologically and spiritually, especially in literature and to some extent in politics, was more influenced by the Irish race than any other race collected within its hospitable shores. The reason was not far to seek. After the disastrous famine in Ireland in 1846, there was a steady flow of Irish people to the United States. The people were poor and illiterate, and for a long time were a servile race in America. Many Irish nurses found employment in American families. There was an Irish teacher in every school, and an Irish leader at the head of the various electorial parties. He contended that if they wanted to produce thorough unity between the people of America and England they must first begin by producing reconciliation between the Irish people at home. If there was to be a real understanding between America and England, we must learn to know and understand each other. It was not so easy as it seemed. An

American was hard to understand by an Englishman ; an Englishman was impossible to be understood by anybody.

Friar J. H. Fisher thought that the newspapers were responsible for arousing passion and irritation between the nations. He had been reading a book by Upton Sinclair, entitled " The Brass Check," representing the conditions prevailing in American journalism. Nothing could be more alarming to anyone interested in the progress of democracy than the facts contained in this book.

Friar Robert Sommerville, speaking of his experiences in America, found that there were disturbing influences caused by an element which had no sympathy at all with England for the simple reason that they did not know anything about England from the point of view of race or association of any kind.

Dr. Glover briefly replied.

DINNER TO THE RT. HON. LORD LEVERHULME.

April 8th, 1921.

Prior—FRIAR A. D. POWER.

Topic for Discussion—THE HUMAN ELEMENT IN BUSINESS.

Among the Guests were : Mr. H. Cameron Hind, Mr. W. A. Appleton, Mr. W. L. Hichens, Mr. T. L. Gilmour, Captain Francis D. Grierson, Mr. R. A. Brown, Mr. Gordon Dabell, Mr. Oscar Hobson, Mr. C. N. Brown, Mr. A. B. Cooper, Mr. Frederick T. Hopkinson, Mr. J. Pugh Gregory, Mr. W. B. Robertson, Mr. S. J. Brown, Mr. T. H. Roberts, J.P., Major Raymond Smythies, Mr. John MacDowell, The Hon. W. Hulme Lever, Mr. W. A. Adams, Mr. J. A. Brownell, Mr. A. Sole, Mr. Eusden, Mr. W. Mackenzie and Mr. Thomas Young.

Prior A. D. Power, in introducing Lord Leverhulme, who was announced to open a discussion on " The Human Element in Business," said that although most of the members were more accustomed to the precincts of Alsatia than the realms of Midas,

very few who read the daily papers could have failed to miss the alluring invitations to subscribe from £3,000,000 to £4,000,000 to the enormous capital which was apparently necessary to keep England clean. Those of us who have had the privilege of going to Port Sunlight well knew that Lord Leverhulme carried into practice something of the human element in business.

Lord Leverhulme said he had asked his brother-in-law how long he should speak. His reply was: "You cannot do better than follow the fashion of ladies' dresses in London. You should make it long enough to cover the subject, but not so long as to take away the interest." There was a general impression that there was no room in business for sentiment. There was more sentiment in business than in any other occupation of life. He found the same sentiment running through the working man to-day as in the past; it was not on the surface—one must dig deeply for it.

Considering the five years of war in which the workman was trained to slay and destroy—and on his return he found the conditions more difficult than when he went—the fact that he remained level-headed was the greatest tribute to the British workman we could have. Just extending from these thoughts the question arose as to what would be the progress of business in the future. In the old days the master knew everybody in the place. The master and man were then more or less on an equal footing. Means would have to be adopted to bring us closer together, and the efforts made in that direction were efforts for higher production, with a greater power to meet competition in all parts of the world. We heard sometimes, in his opinion, too much of what was called scientific management. Under this method a man stood with a stop-watch and tried to count how many blocks of pig-iron a man could carry off a barge down a plank and deposit on a pile. The man who could carry the most in the shortest time was encouraged. One would imagine that they were dealing with a mere machine of muscles, sinews, and brawn. It was a clumsy and unscientific method of dealing with the human machine, and it produced no results.

Compare this with the real scientific method in which a study was made of the temperament of the man, and instilling into his mind a pride in his work. Not by fixing a piece rate, which was

cut down when it yielded to the man a handsome weekly wage. Apart from its brutality and inhumanity, it defeated its own object. The same moral code related to each of us—to do our duty and love our neighbour as ourselves. The phase of business which we were now going through was just as impossible to avoid as was the war. Service and not a wrestling match was the basis of business, and to the extent to which we serve our fellow-men to that extent our business will be a success and our relations with our workers add zest to the business. The future of the town in which we lived, the country in which we were citizens and the world at large, would be raised and bettered.

Friar Silas Hocking thought the main qualification for a commercial traveller was not sympathy, but thickness of skin. A young man set out for the first time to get orders in the west of England. At Plymouth he met an old commercial traveller, who asked him how he had got on. "Badly," he replied. "I was insulted in every place I visited." "That is strange," said the old commercial, "I have been on the road forty years; I have had my samples flung into the street; I have been taken by the scruff of the neck and pitched downstairs; I don't deny that I have been rolled in the gutter, but insulted never!" There was also the case of an insurance agent, who was thrown out of a place several times after calling for business. At last the gentleman whom he saw pitched him downstairs. The insurance agent dashed up the stairs again, brushed his silk hat with the sleeve of his coat, and calmly said: "Joking apart, what about that insurance policy?" He agreed with all that Lord Leverhulme had stated with regard to sympathy. The problem was how this sympathy could be extended in those huge companies which were the feature of present-day commerce. Suspicion was prevalent everywhere. The great work of statesmen, preachers, and journalists was to get rid as far as possible of this suspicion. He was certain that if all employers in the country had lived up to the ideal of humanity in business, as Lord Leverhulme had done, we should not be in the troublous times we were to-day.

Mr. Appleton contended that the human factor, whether in politics or business, must always be taken into consideration. We should never be a properly educated nation until we realized that

education did not consist in the acquirement of a smattering of knowledge concerning a number of things. Education should teach a boy or a girl a knowledge of something of themselves physically. We ought also to teach them that there were certain laws which could not be broken with impunity; that in a country like ours we were not only subject to our common desires, but the influences coming from other countries. As regards the present discontent, he urged everyone to be patient with these poor folk, when we remember how they had been bred, trained, reared and preached at for over thirty years by men who tried to provoke class antagonism. He considered that amongst our people there was a greater capacity to appreciate sympathy than amongst any other people in the world.

Sir Herbert Morgan sympathetically referred to the work of commercial travellers, who formed a most important part in the whole of the organization of the commercial community. He ventured to think that the trouble we were suffering to-day was inherited from ages and generations starting with the early nineteenth century, when business was governed by a type of men who did not truly represent justice or humanity. He was glad to think, however, to-day that the finest and best type of citizens were anxious and willing to participate in the government and regulation of industry. If they were allowed to give full expression to their own ideals he was sure we should have a great deal more humanity.

Friar Dr. Leslie Burgin considered that the human note in business very largely consisted in consideration "for the other fellow." Friar Hocking had asked how it was possible for sympathy to radiate to all the different countries in which the employees of Lord Leverhulme worked. Sympathy was generated by his personality. Every man jack in the service, whether at home or abroad, knew that there was no finer advertised production than Sunlight Soap. The worker conjured up thoughts of a genial personality, with breezy Lancashire manners, hard as iron, generous to a fault, ready to listen, and always a counsellor and friend. This needed no advertisement nor wireless method of communication; in the language of the cinema producer, "It got over to the people." Nothing flew quicker than the news that there was a man in sympathy with everyone at the head of affairs.

Mr. W. L. Hichens emphasized the importance of the right type of foreman being selected in big industrial organizations. He felt that there was a great deal which could be done in the way of tactful sympathy and consideration between the workers and those responsible for them. At the same time this did not solve the industrial problem. The difficulty was twofold. In the first place there was a strong feeling in the minds of the workers that they ought to have a larger share in the control of industry, but he did not believe that this was practical politics. Then there was the question as to the proportion of profits which should go to the worker. There we did not get very far by sympathy in these days. If we wanted to raise money to carry on business he doubted whether we could get it from the city merely by appealing for sympathy, and that it was proposed to reduce the rate of interest to enable higher wages to be paid. The investor had not very much sentiment; he would have the best return he could obtain for his money. From the beginning, civilization had been based primarily on self-interest and a desire for gain. Seeing that the great incentive was profit, if we were going to do what was fundamental in altering the unrest which existed we should try to hold a somewhat less exaggerated view of the importance of profit to ourselves; we should try to realize that industry must be first and foremost a public service. It must not be first and foremost a love of making money.

Mr. Gilmour considered that the underlying idea of the debate was that there should be co-operation between the various elements which go to make up business. We heard a great deal about capital and labour; he had always thought that there was a third element which was perhaps paramount over both, and this was the element of management and brains. He frankly confessed that he would rather have a bad business managed by Lord Leverhulme than a good business managed by a great number of people whom he could name. He agreed with a great deal of what had been said by Mr. Appleton. It seemed that throughout the so-called labour classes there was an entire misconception of the whole position. During the last thirty years a great deal of the teaching and propaganda was based on the idea that the whole social system was founded on injustice. We were told according to the Marxian doctrine that labour alone created wealth, but everyone in that

room knew that this was a fallacy. He thought that we had not merely to show sympathy, but also to endeavour to inculcate in our minds and the minds of those concerned in industry that in all our concerns there must be an element of justice.

Lord Leverhulme briefly replied, and was cordially thanked by the Prior for his delightful and discussion-provoking address.

DINNER TO THE RT. HON. REGINALD McKENNA.

April 22nd, 1921.

Prior—FRIAR CLEMENT K. SHORTER.

Topic for Discussion—OUR NATIONAL FINANCE.

Among the Guests were : Mr. W. T. Smith, Mr. Stuart Hodgson (Editor *Daily News*), Mr. H. Lewes Williams, Mr. G. Cretal, Mr. S. Grave Morris, Captain C. F. Chetwynd Talbot, Mr. H. T. Fraser, Mr. J. Douglas Young, Mr. E. A. Lusher, Mr. James Robinson, Mr. A. H. Wesley Dennis, Mr. W. G. Taylor, Dr. R. Wilson, Mr. Conway Davies, Mr. Philip Williams, Mr. Irving B. Saul, Mr. T. H. Roberts, Sir William Plender, Mr. W. Bray, Lieut.-Colonel Fagalde, C.M.G. (Assistant Military Attaché at French Embassy), Major Raymond Smythies, Mr. T. Lloyd Williams, Mr. F. H. Minett, Mr. Gordon Piper, Mr. Barwell, Mr. L. Starling, Mr. R. A. J. Walling, Colonel L. C. Davis and Mr. John A. Cheston.

At the express wish of the Guest of the evening, this dinner was not reported.—EDITOR.

LADIES' DINNER.

May 6th, 1921.

Prior—FRIAR DR. BURNETT SMITH.

Among the Guests were : Lady Spurgeon, Miss Edith Bestwick, Mrs. G. B. Burgin, Mrs. Goldfinch Bate, Mr. and Mrs. Entract, Miss Anna Walsh, Mrs. Leslie Burgin, Mr. and Mrs. Gordon D. Hodge, Mrs. Philip Wilson, Mr. and Mrs. Patrick Callinan, Mr. and Mrs. S. J. Shaylor, Miss Shaylor, Mrs. H. Shaylor, Mrs. Cecil Palmer, Mrs. Cecil Chesterton, Mrs. Walter Jerrold, the Misses Ianthe and Althea Jerrold, Miss Violet Garrod, Mrs. Algernon Rose, Mrs. Burnett Smith (" Annie Swan "), Mr. and Mrs. Lawrence Gloan, Lady Arrol, Miss Robertson, Mr. and Mrs. Ogston, Miss Burnett Smith, Mrs. G. M. Piper, Madame Moulton Mayer, Mr. R. Mayer, Mr. Gordon Piper, Mrs. Silas Hocking, Mr. and Mrs. M. Fairclough, Miss S. Kammer, Mrs. F. A. Roberts, Miss Pullen, Miss Cayley, Mr. Macklough Smith, Mr. and Mrs. St. John Irvine, Mr. and Mrs. Alfred Noyes, Miss Clemence Dane, Mrs. Power, Miss L. D. Power, Mrs. H. T. Brown, Mr. and Mrs. Sidney H. Baker, Mrs. Alden, Sir George Paish, Mr. Adsett, Mrs. Cyril Gamon, Captain Hosking, Miss Hemmens, Mrs. Duncan, Mrs. Somers-Smith and Mr. A. M. Duncan.

Mr. St. John Ervine, in proposing " Sovran Woman," had never before realized how absolutely necessary to one's equilibrium was the advice a Frenchman gave to someone that in order to get through life what was needed firstly was audacity, secondly, audacity, and thirdly, audacity. The toast which he had to propose was so overwhelming that the audacity with which heaven had endowed him was insufficient to carry him through. He did not intend to say anything about " Sovran Woman," but only about the particular woman who was to reply to the toast.

Miss Clemence Dane was a unique example of the ease with which a woman could step into the domain of man, and beat him at his own game. She had written three novels and a play—he had read two of the novels and seen the play. The first time he read anything of Miss Dane's was her " Regiment of Women," an exceedingly brilliant book with a remarkable insight into the

character of her own sex. In the "Regiment of Women," Miss Dane had done something he had never seen in a woman writer since the time of the Brontës. At that time he did not know anything about her name—it rather suggested a church in the Strand. He was most interested in the drama, and here, he was going to say, Miss Dane had "black-legged." She had pushed into his world, doing with the utmost ease what people with greater experience very often found it exceedingly difficult to do. "A Bill of Divorcement" was a very remarkable play, for he had seldom seen a first play by any writer, male or female, in which the author had obtained the desired effect with so little expenditure of words.

Most first plays, like most first novels, were remarkable for the number of things which might have been left out. He saw quite an interesting play the other day with four acts; one ought to have been left out altogether. It did not affect the play, but repeated what was said in the previous act. How Miss Dane obtained the knowledge to enable her to do what experienced playwrights could do he did not understand; he had tried to pump her all the evening, but she refused to tell him. He had seen a great many plays on first nights, but he had seldom seen one received with such favour or one deserving it so much as Miss Dane's first effort.

Miss Clemence Dane, in responding, asked for sympathy, as she had been horribly treated. She had been away on a holiday, and had looked forward with pleasure to attending that dinner. On her return she received a letter from the Whitefriars Club, asking her to speak for ten minutes on the toast, "Sovran Woman." Imagine what any Friar would feel like if he were asked to speak for ten minutes on "Sovran Man." There was another toast, "Literature," to which Mr. Alfred Noyes would reply. This was another injustice, for that was a nice spicy subject, and she would simply love to talk about it. But this had been given to a simple man. She did not like the word "sovran," and did not believe women quite liked it. They were just a little suspicious of it. Men told women that they were queens and angels, and they were given the crown and sceptre to play with. When the queen went out for a walk, Parliament and the County Council were horrified.

Women were out to get education, and to see that things were made better than in the past. When they had achieved their object, it would do away with the fetish associated with the word equality. We did not say that Shakespeare was equal to Angelo, or that a rose was equal to a lily. We said that Shakespeare was equal to Milton, and Angelo to Raphael. We did not say that people each are equal, but that they were complements. Modern women's ambition was to make their own way through the forest. There was a tendency on the men's side of socialism and collectivism, and the sacrifice of the individual to the group. It was very significant that in this age, when men were tending to think in groups, women for the first time were beginning to become articulate, and the whole attitude of women was against the group spirit of men.

Woman was an individualist first of all ; in the past the poets were always complaining on that score. She was described as changeable and fickle ; her friends did not know what she was going to do next. Women had the vote, and were out to stand for the side which kept the scales equal. Woman was called reactionary ; she was ; and a very good thing too. Man nowadays seemed to be in the process of pouring new wine into old bottles. People could not understand why women were endeavouring to make the new bottles preserve the old wine—the old wine they had been careful should not be spilt ; the old wine of old-fashioned domesticity, kindness, good sense, and those old-fashioned mid-Victorian virtues which would be preserved in the new bottle.

The Prior, in proposing " Literature," disclaimed any title to speak on this subject. He had no connection with literature, except on the collateral side. He belonged to a different order. He had heard that medical men had left the ranks of medicine for the adventurous career of literature. Literature was a thing which concerned the whole world ; we were all benefited by it. Just fancy for a moment what it would be to have the world without books—if they were to destroy all biography, works of travel, science, fiction, and, he was going to say newspapers, for there could be literature in newspapers. He was only one of the great British public, and he regarded literature as a " philosopher, guide, and friend." He would not detain them on this subject, as he

was merely a common or garden medical man, but had to couple with the toast the name of Mr. Alfred Noyes, a poet of proud repute. He had read many of his poems and had enjoyed them. We remembered what he wrote during the War, and what a great inspiration it was to men and women during that trying time.

Mr. Alfred Noyes was probably in a far more difficult position than any former speaker. He came there with some pessimistic things to say about criticism. He had heard one of the most efficient critical analyses it had been his privilege to listen to, and the case of individualism against the group theory presented with a delicate art. He received somewhat of a shock on reading something in the papers which indicated that there would really be some serious trouble in Ireland before long. A paragraph stated that Mr. T. P. O'Connor attributed his literary taste very largely to the reading of Burns in his youth, and that he admired chiefly amongst his poems that beautiful ballad, " Annie Laurie." From what he knew of Scotland, Ireland would soon have another war to face. Of course this was only a slip on Mr. O'Connor's part.

Some time ago he wanted to find out how much people really cared for poetry, and had a few passages typed from some of the greatest poets. Each quotation was followed by extracts from bad poems or parodies. These were handed to a number of people who were supposed to be seriously studying literature, and they were asked to pick out the worst and the best passages. Much of the doggerel was preferred to genuine poetry.

Some time ago an experiment was tried on a larger scale. Two men in America published a book as a joke—published it quite seriously to initiate a new school of poetry. Ninety-nine out of a hundred newspapers reviewed the book, stating that it was really one of the masterpieces of the age. Letters were received from anthologists in America. One wrote asking that a poem might be quoted in an anthology. This anthology had since been reviewed in the *Spectator* as " the greatest anthology of modern times." This was a little indication of the reason why he spoke pessimistically.

Where poetry was concerned, we had cause to be somewhat pessimistic. The group system in England was a serious danger to those people who were honestly endeavouring intelligently to write poetry, and was responsible for a state of affairs in which one

could get a book of the kind reviewed in the *Spectator*. In another country there was one man in particular who had stood out as a bulwark against that kind of group Bolshevism. It had been the custom during the past twenty-five years in England to ridicule this man as being hopelessly behind the times, and as not being worth considering as an artist. The question arose whether English literature was going to capitulate to this kind of Bolshevism, which was lowering the standards of every department of life since the War broke out.

The real question before us was whether we were going to break away from tradition in the wrong sense. There was a great deal of literary snobbery at the present day; a good deal of conceit was masked as intellect. People were absolutely trampling on the great dead. One of the finest incidents in the history of literature was when Tennyson wrote to Rudyard Kipling, praising one of his poems. Kipling wrote back: "When a private in the ranks is praised by the general he does not presume to thank him, but fights better the next day." We had our choice in this matter whether we should do our utmost to carry out the best traditions or lose ourselves in a flood of Bolshevism.

Mrs. Burnett Smith ("Annie Swan"), in giving the toast of "The Prior," said that when she was requested to undertake this duty she asked her husband whether he had done anything to offend Mr. Shansfield, the Club secretary. He replied, "I am not aware that I have." She had also asked her husband whether she should tell them fairy tales or the truth about himself. He informed her that it did not matter, as none of them would believe it. It was the unvarnished truth they were going to get. At this juncture she was reminded of a little story. There was a tea party attended by a number of women not well known to one another. They were discussing men who had successfully come into the limelight and had arrived at a stage when they were interesting to women. A small woman sitting in the corner said nothing. She was asked: "Do you know Mr. So-and-so, and have you anything to say about him?" "Oh, yes, I know him," was the reply. "I live with him." She had lived with the Prior for forty years, and although they had disagreed over every subject in earth and heaven and under the earth, she never wanted to claim anyone else; and she

hoped to go on living with him until the last call came. It had been a perfectly commonplace happy marriage. Matrimony was not very popular in these islands just now. This point of view was part of the lowering of the standard of which Mr. Noyes had so splendidly spoken. She was a more or less old-fashioned person, and her heart warmed when Miss Clemence Dane had enumerated the qualities which the new woman felt it was essential should be kept to the front.

The Prior, in the course of his reply, narrated a story of a man who arrived home very late from his club. He found the door locked. After ringing the bell for some time a window was thrown open and his wife put her head out and inquired where he had been. The husband answered : " I have been to the club discussing the coal strike." The irate lady said : " Now you can sit on the doorstep and discuss the lock-out."

A very brilliant and successful evening, although the enforced brevity of this report necessarily fails to do adequate justice to a series of remarkably able and forceful speeches.—EDITOR.

DINNER TO PROFESSOR STEPHEN LEACOCK.

7th October, 1921.

Prior—FRIAR WARD MUIR.

Topic for Discussion—THE LIGHTER SIDE.

Among the Guests were : Dr. J. M. Bulloch, Mr. Thomas Moult, Mr. S. H. Webb, Captain Donnelly Aitken, Mr. F. Peaker, Mr. A. H. Watson, Mr. John H. Alden, Mr. J. D. Knox, Mr. C. Isler, Mr. W. Elliott Williams, Mr. R. C. Watson, Mr. Lewis Benjamin, Mr. Lewis Melville, Mr. Leonard Hitch, Mr. Richard O'Sullivan, Mr. Gordon D. Hodge, Captain Norrie Thompson, Colonel H. M. Leaf, D.S.O., Mr. Wilfred Coleridge, Mr. Henry Winkworth, Sir Frank Newnes, Sir Kenneth Goadly, Mr. Irving B. Gane, Mr. H. V. N. Jones, Dr. Percy With, Mr. F. A. Mostyn, Mr. C. C. T. Lewes Sayer, Captain Edwards, Mr. Basil King, Mr. F. Lindley-Jones, Mr. Charles Rudy,

Mr. A. H. Lukyn, Mr. E. M. Rich, Mr. Kenneth Kinninmont, Mr. Oscar Berry, Mr. Frederick Wissler, Mr. Stanley Wissler, Mr. Stacy Aumonier, Mr. B. W. Matz, Mr. D. Neylan, Mr. W. M. Gaul, Mr. Gordon Piper, Mr. W. Elles-Hill, Mr. Michael Hornby, Mr. I. J. Pitman, Mr. Albert F. Calvert, Mr. G. Bulkeley, Mr. W. Mackenzie, Mr. Evan Pughe, Mr. H. J. Cape, Mr. E. W. Howard, Mr. H. T. Butler, Mr. W. Crawford Snowdon, Mr. Sax Rohmer, Mr. Bertram Atkey, Mr. Bisgood, Mr. George Crosby, Mr. Fred T. Hopkinson, Mr. Cecil Hopkinson and Mr. Gerald Christy.

The Prior had never felt happier than in the anticipation of hearing Mr. Leacock that night. He did not suppose Mr. Leacock cared how his name was pronounced, so long as his books sold ; but he preferred himself that the name should rhyme with haycock, and then it would bring into his mind memories of sunny days like Mr. Leacock's sunny books. Some people had invented jokes where the laugh was on both sides. Our Guest had provided plenty of stingless jokes, and only England could have produced a Leacock. He was one of the greatest fun makers.

Mr. Stephen Leacock said that he was frequently filled with a sense of his own inefficiency, but that this was not one of those times, and this was an evening for which he had long waited. The Prior had said in answer to his question as to what he was to talk about, " Just get up and say a few things to make them think." This he was not sure whether he could do. The Prior then said, " Then make them talk ; a lot of them can talk but can't think ! "

An author cannot have a sense of humour if he has had nothing but success. To him humour was a compensation to a man when he is down and out. He would put down men without a sense of humour, and at the top of these men, without disrespect, he would wish to put the Pope, next the Archbishop, and next the Prime Minister, while in office, and always all striving, successful people—captains of industry, etc., now called profiteers.

There is a popular impression that a humourist or comedian must needs be sad ; that in appearance he should be tall, lantern-jawed, and cadaverous ; and that his countenance should wear a woebegone expression calculated to excite laughter. The loss of his hair is supposed to increase his market value, and if he is as bald as a boiled egg with the shell off his reputation is assured.

"This, I think," continued Professor Leacock, "springs from the fact that, in the past at least, people preferred not to laugh *with* the humourist but *at* him. They laughed in an apologetic way. They considered him simply *too* silly. He wrung a laugh from them in spite of their better selves.

"In other words, till our own time laughter was low. Our dull forefathers had no notion of its intellectual meaning. The Court jester, referred to haughtily as 'yon poor fool,' was most likely the cleverest man round the Court; and yet historical novels are filled with little touches such as this:—

> The King sank wearily upon his couch. 'My lady,' he said, 'I am aweary. My mind is distraught. In faith I am like to become as deftless as yon poor fool.'

"Now, as a matter of fact, the King was probably what we should call in America a great big boob; and the poor fool, if he had lived with us, would be either on the staff of *Punch* or at the head of a university—whichever he pleased.

"A generation or so back this idea of the melancholy humourist got a lot of corroboration from the fact that some of the best humourists of the time were in actual reality of a woebegone appearance.

"The famous Bill Nye was tall, mournful, and exceedingly thin, a fact which he exploited to the full. He used to tell his hearers that there had been a request for him to come to them again and to appear '*in broadsword combat with a parallel of latitude*'.

"The still more celebrated Artemus Ward was also of a shambling and woebegone habit; his melancholy face and feeble frame bespoke in reality the ravages of a mortal disease, and the laughter that greeted his shambling appearance and his timid gestures appears in retrospect as cruel mockery. The humour of Ward's public appearance, which captivated the London of sixty years ago, is turned now to pathos.

"But Ward and Nye are only two examples of the 'melancholy comedian,' a thing familiar through the ages. Yet in spite of all such precedents, and admitting that exceptions are exceptions, I cannot but think that the true manner of the comedian is that of smiles and laughter. If I am to be amused let me see on the stage before me not the lantern jaws of sorrow, but a genial countenance

shaped like the map of the world, lit with spectacles, and illuminated with a smile. Let me hear the comedian's own laughter come first, and mine shall follow readily enough, laughing not *at* him but *with* him.

" This much, however, I will admit, that if a man has a genuine sense of humour he is apt to take a somewhat melancholy, or, at least, a disillusioned view of life. Humour and disillusionment are twin sisters. Humour cannot exist alongside eager ambition, brisk success, and absorption in the game of life. Humour comes best to those who are down and out, or who have at least discovered their limitations and their failures. Humour is essentially a comforter, reconciling us to things as they are in contrast to things as they might be.

" This is why I think such a great number of people are cut off from having any very highly developed sense of humour.

" One special class I must put all by itself. I refer to women. I give it as my opinion, reached after fifty-one years of reflection, that their sense of humour is dim.

" The mental process that humour implies is contrary to their whole nature. Women are idealists—it is an essential characteristic of their mentality to idealize, to exalt, to admire. They like to ' go crazy over ' something—a hero, a matinée artist, a convicted criminal—it doesn't matter what. They would rather dream of the world as it might be than smile at the world as it is. Disillusionment ripens men. It embitters women. An old bachelor is a man who has failed in the chief matter of life, and is all the jollier for it. An old maid is pathetic.

" People point, indeed, to women comedians. *There are none.* In proportion as they become comedians they cease to be women. I suppose this, like many other things that I say, is an over-statement. But I have found that the only kind of statement worth while is an over-statement.

" *A half-truth, like half a brick, is always more forcible as an argument than a whole one.*"

Friar Hamilton Fyfe considered that his only right to be regarded as a humourist was because he was an optimist. He admired Mr. Leacock because he had as a matter of fact gone at humour like a captain of industry.

Friar G. B. Burgin, Mr. O'Sullivan, Friars Robert Donald and Dr. Leslie Burgin continued the debate.

Mr. Pett Ridge pointed out that Mr. Leacock had been extremely fortunate in creeping into the country almost unobserved, apart from two or three paltry columns in several English newspapers.

A humourist was among the few who still had the habit of morning prayer. He told the story of the aunt who, in answer to the little girl's question, said, " I certainly say my prayers in the morning." The little girl answered, " I say my prayers at night and in the morning do my breathing exercises."

A writer of pathos can be merely hitting the reader somewhere, whereas the writer of humour must hit the reader right in the centre of the forehead, or not at all.

Friar Sir Ernest Wild thought that we owed a great debt of gratitude to our Leacocks and Pett Ridges in these times of stress and strain. The Prime Minister, to get through at all, must have a sense of humour, and but for these humorous writers we should surely find life intolerable.

Dr. J. M. Bulloch wondered why it was necessary to call on a Scotsman to speak about joking, when the Scots made jokes with difficulty. He pointed out that Mr. Stephen Leacock was not an American, but a Scotsman. The English had the greatest sense of humour of any people in the world, because they could laugh at themselves. If only other nations could laugh at themselves the difficulties of life would be smoothed over.

He reminded his audience that wit proceeded from the head, but that true humour, like Leacock's, came from the heart.

Other most interesting contributions were made by some of the guests, notably a number of anecdotes from Mr. Knox, of Glasgow.

DINNER TO MR. COMPTON MACKENZIE.

November 4th, 1921.

Prior—FRIAR CLEMENT K. SHORTER.

Topic for Discussion—ROMANTICISM AND REALISM.

Among the Guests were: Mr. F. W. Goodenough, Mr. Clifford D. Sharp, Mr. Ian Hovoben, Mr. Kenneth Kinninmont, Mr. W. B. Hamilton, Mr. Dew, M.A., Mr. Bannister, Mr. James Milne, Mr. Geoffrey Williams, Mr. Sole, Mr. Eusden and Mr. R. H. Walling.

The Prior (Friar Clement K. Shorter) expressed his great regret at the absence of Friar Sir Robertson Nicoll, who had been announced to preside. There must be a feeling of disappointment in not hearing that delightful Doric, which must always be a joy to them. He recalled in this connection a story told by a Scotch Minister about the absent Prior. Someone asked him if it would not facilitate his work if he were to use a dictaphone. He replied: "I tried it once, but it came out with such an extraordinary weather-beaten sound that I threw the thing away." Prior Nicoll had sent a letter to Friar Shansfield in which he stated that he had had an attack of neurasthenia and had gone to Brighton to get massaged. He could bear witness with all his heart to the gratification we felt in having Mr. Compton Mackenzie with them. He had noticed once or twice on the occasion he had had the privilege of addressing audiences in small provincial towns that the Chairman of the evening always showed an astonishing acquaintance with "Who's Who." He had no need to go the pages of "Who's Who" for a record of Mr. Compton Mackenzie, for he knew his story all through, and was aware of his marvellous inheritance from two most historic families—the family of Compton and the family of Bateman. He had been enchanted by Mr. Compton's father's acting, and had also had the privilege of seeing Miss Bateman in "Lear."

Mr. Compton Mackenzie opened a discussion on the subject of "Romanticism and Realism." At the outset, he acknowledged the encouragement he had received in the past from the Prior at a time when he was an unknown author. Since the time he had promised to address the Club he had been trying to arrive at a

decision as to what was realism and what was romanticism. He had endeavoured to discover whether he was a romanticist or a realist himself. Nearly every criticism he read of his own books gave him the one title or the other, alternatively both, or neither. Realism was always described as grim and sordid ; he had come to the conclusion that many of the romantic books were just as sordid and just as grim. He did not believe really that there was such a thing as romanticism or realism ; there was really life or no life in a book. During the War every man was a romanticist.

Mr. Mackenzie made an interesting confession respecting his reading. The books he read as a child he was able to re-read with interest. For example, he had read as a child " Nicholas Nickleby " four or five times, although he did not claim that this was Dickens' best novel. But he had lately taken up " Great Expectations," which was an infinitely better book, and could not get on with it at all. He then turned to " Oliver Twist," which he had read as a child, and was enthralled by it. It was a remarkable fact that Frenchmen accepted Victor Hugo, but not Dumas ; personally, he would sooner have one line of Dumas than everything which Victor Hugo wrote.

After the Napoleonic wars, a great romanticist revival took place. Personally, though he lived a very romantic life on one of the Channel Islands, cut off from the world, he was still happy in walking down Fleet Street. A novelist was a servant of the public, and made money by amusing them. Most of his contemporaries would be shocked at that assertion, but the main thing was to entertain. There were so many other ways of boring people at the present time ; and there was always an inclination at present to describe a book as dealing with grim realism. If there were any critics there that night he hoped that they would get rid of that adjective. The tendency was not to be content with a word, but to employ a phrase from which they could not get away. During the War he had a signalling boy on his yacht, and said to him : " Ask the Admiral if we can get out." The boy replied : " I beg your pardon, sir." He answered : " I want to get away." The signaller then hoisted the signal : " Leave to proceed." Mr. Compton Mackenzie's conclusion was that taking the definition there was no difference between romanticism and realism.

Friar G. Whale thought there were two greatly overworked phrases at the present time. These were " exploring the subject," and " social values." On this occasion, Mr. Compton Mackenzie had explored the topic brilliantly and ingeniously. He supported the view of Mr. Mackenzie that the work of the novelist was to entertain, and, in this connection, put in a plea for the " happy ending." A young officer at a dance at Portsmouth, a most susceptible man, in the course of the evening proposed to three ladies, and was accepted by all of them. He went to a friend and asked him what he should do. He could not tell them the advice which was given, but would reserve this for another occasion.

Friar G. B. Burgin owed the Club a personal explanation. During the last fortnight whenever he had been trying to concentrate his attention on this subject he had been the victim of a distressing confusion of identity. He had a gifted nephew, a member of the Friars, who had " gone in for politics." The people in his nephew's constituency seemed to have the idea that he (the speaker) had been adopted as the Liberal candidate for Hornsey, and whenever he had sat down to go into this question of romanticism and realism, letters came in from various constituents, couched in more or less flattering terms, mostly less. One elector wrote : " What do you mean by calling yourself a coupon candidate ? " As he had not read his nephew's address he did not know what a coupon candidate was, and replied : " I am an earnest supporter of coupons bearing interest." This failed to convince the voter, who wrote back, " Hadn't you better stick to your rubbishy novels ?" Although Mr. Mackenzie had dealt with the subject in an interesting and charming manner, he (Mr. Burgin) found it very difficult to get away from politics. There was a lady in the Divorce Court the other day who produced a diary in which there was the entry : " Marriage is an institution, but who wants to live in an institution ? " In Mr. Mackenzie's speech, he did not think that sufficient emphasis had been placed on the realism of happiness and the realism of misery. For instance, when we read Zola we found misery existed in realistic details. He had once seen a second-hand copy of Zola labelled " Dirt cheap." On the other hand, in reading " Lorna Doone " one arose from it with a happy and delighted feeling that everything was for the best in the best of all possible worlds.

Mr. Compton Mackenzie had referred to books which he had read in his early days and could read later. He (Mr. Burgin) was brought up on "Sandford and Merton," and taught to believe in "good Mr. Barlow," but in later years when he re-read the book he wanted to take an axe, brain "good Mr. Barlow," and kick the good boy into the gutter.

Friar Hamilton Fyfe was frequently asked advice from young ladies as to what they should read. They usually wanted something romantic—hard-roe or soft-roe romanticism. The hard roe was Sir Hall Caine, and as to the soft roes there were so many of them that it was difficult to name them. There was a great deal of romance even among the fighting men during the War. Directly the troops found that the Germans were hungry and weary they wanted to help them. During the Battle of the Somme there was a duel between the German and the Australian snipers. One of the German snipers fell out of a tree wounded ; the Australians picked him up, attended to his injuries, and made him as comfortable as they could. This was the reality of the War, as distinct from a great deal of romanticism which was written about it. The real difference between realism and romance was imagination. If a writer had imagination, he would make his romances real. Realism was the term applied to writers who had no imagination, but put down what they saw without transfusing and transmuting it with the fire of imagination which was necessary. Let them take some of the stories which Shakespeare used in writing his plays. Read these stories alone, and there did not appear to be anything in them ; read them in Shakespeare and the whole story was presented with vigour, force, and imagination.

Friar Hammerton reminded the Club that a similar discussion took place there about eighteen years ago, when he took up the cudgels for Zola, who had been referred to that evening as a realistic writer with no imagination. He could not imagine a more imaginative work than "Lourdes." Zola described and made practically real the whole train-load of passengers. In the London Ghetto there was a club where a lot of brilliant Jews got together and discussed extraordinary questions ; they asked him to talk to them on short stories. He had at that time been reading a few hundred thousand short stories, and was full of his subject, like the lecturer

on strong drink. He told them a story which had recently appeared in an American magazine, put forward by one of the young Russian school, characteristic of the effete and strange imagination of the Russians. From this there was the same sort of strange feeling when a Scottish bagpipe gave out a sort of ur-r-r. The young Jews thought it was a beautiful thing.

Mr. J. Milne described the invitation which the Prior had made to him to speak as the first wrench in his friendship with Prior Shorter for twenty years. The question was not what a book said, but how it said it. He saw a review of a book recently which described the work as a simple and pleasing story. This seemed to suggest a real book. It was a very difficult thing for a Scotsman like Mr. Compton Mackenzie to address an English audience; a Scotsman was always romantic and humorous, and an Englishman practical and witty. Mr. Mackenzie had succeeded in leaving in doubt whether romance was realism, or realism was romance. But did this matter much? His own theory was that men were more romantic than women, and women were more practical and realistic than men. Possibly a man who had been in an office all day, still went home in a romantic state. He might be more romantic if he did not go home, and if he did not go home the wife would be much more realistic.

The Literary Editor of the *New Statesman* had been discussing the problem the other day with three or four people, three being distinguished novelists, and they expressed the opinion that no good book had appeared during the last thirteen or fourteen years. There was a kind of fog at the present moment preventing everybody doing anything either very great in the romantic or realistic field.

Mr. Compton Mackenzie replied, and was thanked by the Prior on behalf of the members.

DINNER TO THE REV. DR. ORCHARD.

November 18*th*, 1921.

Prior—SIR ARTHUR SPURGEON, J.P.

Topic for Discussion—IS CIVILIZATION WORTH SAVING?

Among the Guests were: Mr. J. Hugh Edwards, M.P., Mr. J. Ramsay Macdonald, Captain Donnelly Aitken, Rev. O. Hardman, Mr. D. Campbell Lee, Mr. John Hinds, M.P., Mr. Philip Williams, Mr. John Harries, Mr. W. N. J. Hatch, Mr. H. W. Massingham, Mr. H. V. M. Jones, Mr. Gordon Piper, Mr. Robert Mayer, Mr. H. V. Barwell, Mr. W. T. Smith, The Rev. I. Shimmin, Mr. H. T. Butler, Sir Arthur Carkeek, Mr. Herbert Honey, Mr. P. Callinan and Mr. Porritt.

Owing to the reporter not having appeared and to the fact that no one discovered his absence until the dinner was over, this report is necessarily a fragmentary one. Dr. Orchard, one of the most cultured and original thinkers of our day, introduced the topic for the evening in a scholarly and intellectual speech, provocative of much fragmentary discussion. His great point was the necessity, if the world were to progress, of getting rid of militarism, and he endeavoured to show how this could be done. As illustrating the evils of militarism, he told the story of the old man with four sons. One could create the skeleton of a tiger, the second provide it with muscles, the third clothe it with a skin, and the fourth brought it to life. Then the tiger ate the four.

Mr. Ramsay Macdonald said that armaments existed because of fear. Friar Hamilton Fyfe gave some new definitions of optimists and pessimists. "A pessimist is a man who wears braces as well as a belt; an optimist is a man who buys an article from a Jew in the hope of selling it at a profit to a Scotsman; and religion is a kind of insurance policy against fire on the other side of the grave."

Perhaps the most "reasoned" speech was that of Friar Robert Sommerville, the notes of which he was good enough to lend me. He said: "I have a fellow feeling with Mr. Ramsay Macdonald in his reference to village life and the necessity to get back frequently to the parent plant; because I have just come from the parent plant.

" The ' Back to the Land ' movement is very enticing theoretically, and Dr. Orchard discusses it in an attractive way, but how is it to be done ? I agree with all the suggestions with regard to making village life more attractive, but that does not solve the difficulty. I will give you an illustration in my own experience.

" When my boy was quite young he had been in the habit of going every year to his Aunt's dairy farm in Scotland, and each succeeding year he came back more determined than ever to be a farmer. That did not fit in with my idea at all. I had other plans for him, but I knew perfectly well that these other plans would miscarry unless I did the right thing. So what did I do ? I sent him to live with his Aunt, and in six months' time—certainly at the end of the first winter—he had no use at all for farming. He had had some ! And all that in spite of the fact that he had been cared for in every possible way. Now he is as keen as nails on his education, without any coaxing on my part, and has planned a scholastic career which will carry him forward until he is twenty-one or twenty-two years of age.

" Dr. Kimmins talks enthusiastically about the excellence of the education of the school children. I don't agree with him at all, so far as the education of children in England is concerned. In Scotland it is rather different. In my experience I have never had an office boy that I did not have to educate all over again for practical business purposes. In the schools here, there is far too much attention given to things that do not matter. Education has its dangers as well as its advantages, and we are apt to turn out children who think they know, when they really don't know, and this has much to do with many aspects of the industrial unrest which has become more and more apparent in recent years.

" Dr. Orchard talks about the man who wants to work. Much of our present difficulty is that there are so many men who *don't* want to work. Within limits, I sympathize, because work is an unnatural thing ; but then our present civilization is built up on the necessity to work, and the more we develop that civilization, the more work is necessary.

" Mechanical contrivances have not reduced the necessity for work. They have to some extent aggravated the situation, so that there would seem to me to be something wrong with our civilization.

Labour-saving machines have simply made the unemployment problem more acute, especially at a time like this. Civilization, as we know it, has created artificial circumstances, and I sometimes think that it is not worth saving. At the same time, I shudder to think what would happen if we did not save it. We must save it somehow, because I have no desire to experience the consequences if we let it crash."

The Prior was obviously very unwell and, for the first time in his life, failed to recite the Club ritual *ore rotundo*, but read it instead. This falling from grace cast a gloom over the assembly, which no amount of after-dinner oratory could dissipate.—G. B. B.

CHRISTMAS DINNER

December 16th, 1921.

Prior—FRIAR DR. KIMMINS.

Guests of the Evening—LORD AND LADY ASTOR AND SIR JOHNSTON FORBES-ROBERTSON.

Among the Company were: Friar and Mrs. Francis Aitken, Mr. and Mrs. Faulkner; Friar and Mrs. Goldfinch Bate, Mr. and Mrs. Anthony Reyre, Mr. and Mrs. Walter Palk, Mrs. Stubbs, Mr. Walter Lawrence; Friar and Mrs. Gurney Benham; Friar and Mrs. Herve Browning, Mr. and Mrs. Leonard Hitch, Mrs. F. C. C. Nielsen, Miss Alice Nielsen; Friar and Mrs. G. B. Burgin; Friar and Mrs. Leslie Burgin, Mr. and Mrs. Hew Fraser, Miss Fraser, Mr. and Mrs. William Thomson, Mr. and Mrs. Gordon Hodge, Miss Brenda Cooper, Mr. and Mrs. Edward L. Burgin, Mr. and Mrs. Harold C. Burgin; Friar and Mrs. H. J. Brown, Miss Brown; Friar and The Hon. Mrs. Gilbert Coleridge; Friar and Mrs. C. Duncan Cross; Friar Canon and Mrs. Wesley Dennis, Miss Wesley Dennis; Friar and Mrs. R. N. Fairbanks, Mr. and Mrs. R. D. F. Paul; Friar and Mrs. Louis H. Falck, Mrs. S. Slinger, Mr. Lionel Falck, Miss Shelley Calton; Friar Cyril Gamon, "Mabel Lucy Attwell," Mr. Harold Earnshaw; Friar Walter and Mrs. Clare Jerrold; Friar and Mrs. Harry Jones; Friar W. H. Kesteven,

Mr. and Mrs. Alan Lukyn, Miss Wellings ; Friar and Mrs. C. W. Kimmins, Miss Rennie ; Friar and Mrs. G. H. Northcroft ; Friar and Mrs. Crawfurd Price, Mr. and Mrs. Charles Temperley ; Friar and Mrs. G. M. Piper, Mr. Gordon Piper, Mr. and Mrs. Robert Mayer, Mr. and Mrs. C. H. Bingeman ; Friar and Mrs. Algernon Rose, Sir Henry and Lady New, Mrs. Makower ; Friar and Mrs. F. A. Roberts, Miss Morse, Miss Bulkeley ; Friar and Mrs. W. M. Saunders ; Friar W. N. Shansfield, Mr. and Mrs. George Moore, Miss Walton, Miss Caley, Miss Pullen, Mr. Chas. Fenton, Mr. Macklow Smith, Mr. Macalpine ; Friar H. J. Shepard, Mrs. Oldham ; Friar Joseph Shaylor, Mr. and Mrs. Sidney Shaylor, Miss Ethel Poole, Mr. and Mrs. F. W. Elliott, Miss Shaylor ; Friar and Mrs. Harold Shaylor, Mr. and Mrs. P. M. B. Allen ; Friar and Mrs. W. B. Slater, Mrs. Wilfred de Selincourt, Miss Slater ; Friar A. and Lady Spurgeon, Mr. Ernest Benn, C.B.E., Mrs. Benn ; Friar H. A. Taylor, Miss Audrey Vincent ; Friar Torday ; Friar and Mrs. John Walker, Mr. and Mrs. Percy Barringer, Mr. and Mrs. L. G. Sloan, Mr. and Mrs. F. W Whitlock, Dr. Robert N. Le Cross, Miss Phyllis J. Walker ; Friar and Mrs. R. A. J. Walling, Miss Walling, and Miss P. Walling.

Prior Kimmins read the time-honoured formula, having first remarked that he did not propose to enter into competition with those misguided Priors who, in days gone by, had tried to commit the ritual of the Club to memory. Their attempts had been attended with a conspicuous want of success with, he believed, only one exception, that of their good friend Friar G. B. Burgin, who was letter-perfect !

The Prior was conscious of the honour conferred on the Club by the presence of the distinguished visitor, who was to give them " The Spirit of Christmas." No one in that large assembly had afforded so much genuine pleasure to all sorts and conditions of men and women as Sir Johnston Forbes-Robertson. They had been fascinated by the wonderful parts he had played with such distinction, and some of his marvellous creations would remain as their most cherished stage memories.

Sir Johnston Forbes-Robertson said it was a good thing that the Friars kept up the time-honoured custom of a Christmas Dinner. They were now on the edge of the time when the sun was about

to assert itself: in five days they would have the shortest day; so that they were, in a measure, celebrating the renaissance of life, looking forward to the coming of the spring flowers, and full of hope. Christmas always had that for them. A time came when they entirely associated that great festival with the birth of the greatest of all Gentle Men; and it was becoming and proper—particularly in days when there was so much scepticism and materialism—that they should once again fall back on the old ceremonies which commemorated something great and important in the history of the world.

In such times especially, ceremonies were important to them all as reminding them of the higher ideals. In younger people they helped to foster the religious temperament. Whatever might be their creed or their dogmas, every really honest man and woman certainly had the religious temperament; and human nature desired symbols and ceremonies. They were part and parcel of their constitutions and their lives. That desire had been manifested in the erection all over England and Scotland of the beautiful memorials to their beloved dead, which would testify to coming generations what the sacrifice had been of the many thousands of men who had trod in the footsteps of the Lord Jesus Christ. As long as the individuals composing it had the true religious temperament, the country would survive and flourish.

The speaker was given to understand that religion had enormously increased in France; and it was for the English-speaking peoples, the world over, to see to the encouragement of the religious temperament among themselves. The individual man here, the "man in the street," must be on good terms with the man in New York or California. On each side must they get upon good terms with each other; and in this way—not through agreements and governmental arrangements merely—would the "pin-pricks" between the two great English-speaking peoples cease. He congratulated the Whitefriars' Club upon its success in bringing together such a distinguished assembly to celebrate the great event of Christmas Day and the coming into the world of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Friar R. A. J. Walling, in proposing the toast of "Our Guests," said that it was a great pleasure to see so many friends with them

to-night. His duty was in the nature of a penance, and he was conscious of the peas in his shoes being extremely numerous and excessively *un*boiled. At the time when Lady Astor (with whose name the toast was coupled) was a candidate for the representation of the beautiful city by the western sea, he was associated with a distinguished and honourable journal there—a paper which the candidate had, with nice felicity and incisive vigour, described as his " rag "—and did his utmost to keep her out ; and it was in penance for that misdeed that he was called upon to propose the toast. He was bound to say, however, that, ever since the time referred to, he had rejoiced exceedingly that his wicked machinations had come to naught. The members of the Whitefriars' Club who were connected with journalism had reason to be grateful to Lady Astor for having, during the last two years, provided them with a more continuous and varied stream of " copy " than any twenty mere men the town of Plymouth could have returned.

The quality which induced Plymouth citizens to send Lady Astor to Parliament was neither her prowess in the field of sport nor her humour, but that greatest of all qualities, which she possessed in astonishing measure—courage. At Plymouth they were fond of courageous people for Members of Parliament. In the sixteenth century they returned Sir Francis Drake, Sir John Hawkins and other buccaneers ; and it was evident that the twentieth-century Plymouth found a kindred spirit in Lady Astor ; for, if not another buccaneer, she was, at any rate, another pioneer, and that of a very great and important movement. Lady Astor was not only the Member for Plymouth ; she was the Member for the women and children of this country.

Lady Astor at once accepted Friar Walling's attribution of the quality of courage. It took a great deal of that quality for her to face such a company. She didn't mind Bolshevists, the ordinary citizen, or the editors of " rags " ; but it did take courage to face the distinguished White Friars. They must know a good deal or they wouldn't be there. The proposer of the toast had been extraordinarily gracious and generous. She was glad he had fought against her ; she would rather have it so than not have him at all. One of their troubles in Plymouth was that they had only one type of journal represented, and they would prefer some healthy competition.

Lady Astor was very grateful to the Club for its invitation; but she was no orator. She had heard so many orators pouring out words and rolling out sentences that did not mean anything, that she had determined that, no matter how badly she spoke, she would never be an orator, and thus escape the danger of getting drunk on her own words. The crowd adored oratory; and if the literary men present could induce politicians to cultivate plain speaking, they would be doing a great service to the country. It was discouraging to see how few persons in public life dared to say what they thought: yet the average Anglo-Saxon really liked courage more than anything.

The only note Lady Astor had taken for her remarks was that of the words spoken by the Prior: "By this wine we commemorate the Whitefriars of old, fortified with spirit"—and she was relieved to know that it was "the spirit of admiration," for that became better as it went on; whereas in the case of the other spirit, there was very little admiration left in the morning for anything. Then the Prior spoke of "a cordial"—the cordial of a welcome. Well, they were on the right path. They had gone far ahead of old Friar Tuck—the only friar she knew intimately. She felt that she could speak to them, because they were on the right path, and would like to say a word on the woman's point of view, the importance of which she did not think half the world realized, nor how great a change it was going to make.

The speaker did not agree with the opinion that this was an age of materialism. Materialism was on its last legs. One of her reasons for thinking so was—Woman. Through evolution, women had gradually attained to where they now were. She herself was only a symbol, a symbol of what women want in public life and everywhere, and that was certainly not materialism. (She was speaking of the right sort of women—the women their mothers were and the women they would want to marry.) It was a sort of spiritual energy.

The men who wanted the right things, a better and a cleaner world, were not frightened of women. They did not want to put them on pedestals and keep them there; but those who wanted the same old world were terrified of women; they had "got the wind up"; and well might they, because the women were

desperately in earnest. Not that they thought themselves better than men, but their qualities were different from men, and as much needed.

What had kept the world back, in Lady Astor's view, was that women's qualities had not had full play. The woman's essential quality was spiritual : it was the things of the spirit women cared for. They wanted their sons to be clean, straight and brave. They would like them to be wise ; but they cared far more for their characters than about their wisdom. And they wanted their daughters to be the same.

Lady Astor honestly believed that woman's entry into politics meant the assertion of the spiritual in that domain. The character of public life was largely determined by the sort of God the people believed in. False conceptions had been all too prevalent, but they were breaking up, and people were genuinely thinking about what God is, which was really the only thing worth thinking about, the only thing that could save any country. The future of the country would depend on the children, and it was worth while teaching them that God was Spirit and Love and near the heart of everybody. Mothers were thinking a great deal in these days about what to teach their children, and the country's destiny would be in peril apart from the new spiritual impetus brought into public life by women. They would make mistakes, no doubt—she had herself made mistakes in the House of Commons. But no one knew how difficult was the position of the first woman in the House. That was over, however ; and now she had a splendid woman along with her. The other members of the House had been amazingly good and she made no complaint as to their attitude ; but there had been a mental, subconscious sex-antagonism to contend with. Mr. Balfour himself had said to her : " My dear, I have all my life wanted women to have the vote ; but I never thought it would come to this ! " The women would never kill that feeling in men by fighting it ; the only way was to recognize it and help them out of it.

The speaker did not look at the matter from a personal point of view. She was only a symbol ; but it was not a mere matter of chance that a woman got into the House of Commons—it simply *had* to be. The Whitefriars, as literary men, would know that the

country owed its greatness to the West of England, whose sons had defeated the Spanish Armada; and from which the Pilgrims had set out. Her return was curious, since, being very much of a Virginian, she was wholly British.

Lady Astor concluded by thanking her hosts for " a good meal." " I can't get over how well you Friars live. I really wonder whether you are thinking as much about ' the spirit ' as you ought." They would be doing her another kindness if they would advise her on one thing. She supposed something would have to be written about " the first lady M.P." Should she write it herself, or leave it to them, as literary men? She was afraid, if she did it herself, she would be even more frank than a recent writer of reminiscences, though not so thrilling. In the name of the guests, she thanked them for their hospitality, and would promise, if they asked her again, to come fortified with appropriate literary quotations and speak in the most approved literary style; but—by that time she would be out of politics!

Lord Astor, in proposing the health of " The Prior," imagined that he had been asked to speak through a desire that as many as possible of the forces for public good should be represented on the programme—the Stage, the Press, the House of Commons, and the House of Lords (which included the Church). Of Dr. Kimmins' qualities as Prior he was able to judge from the way in which he handled the ritual, which indicated that he obviously possessed the gift of caution.

It was a platitude to say that we were living in a time of revolutions. Revolutions were more or less associated with guillotines. At the present moment he (Lord Astor) was desperately nervous about " the Geddes axe." A statement had appeared that large reductions were to be made in respect of education. Well, if the Geddes axe were to fall, let it cut off a hand or foot, but they must see to it that it did not cut off the head. The Prior had done great work for child welfare, and it was to be hoped that when, after a distinguished career, he shortly left the public service and ceased to be an administrator, he would be an agitator. Governments were under constant pressure from the forces of reaction, vested interest and self-interest; but there never was a similar amount of pressure from the forces of progress, unselfishness

and service. He therefore asked them to drink to the toast of the potential agitator—the Prior.

The Prior promised to become an agitator in the near future, and would always look back with extreme pleasure to that "glorious Christmas party" at which he had the honour to be Prior.

FRIARS' BOOKS

By Friar Joseph Shaylor.

There are few busier men in the literary world than the able editor of this journal, Friar G. B. Burgin. During 1921 he is responsible for two novels and a most interesting volume of reminiscences. His first novel this year was "The Faithful Fool," and his second "The Man from Turkey," making in all sixty-three novels, for which he is responsible. His output for 1922 will be "More Memoirs (and Some Travels)," "Love and the Locusts," and another book. However, beyond all that Friar Burgin has written, his "Memoirs of a Clubman" takes the first place. It has "caught on" in America as well as in England, and a revised edition is about to appear. It is reminiscent of his early years and also of the various Clubs, particularly "The Whitefriars," with which he has been associated. What is still better, it is full of personal anecdotes and stories, and a most fascinating volume.*

Amongst our prolific writers is Friar Hamilton Fyfe, whose charming volume entitled "The Making of an Optimist" has been a great success. It shows how the author's varied experience in the scenes of politics and war completely changed his outlook on life. Friar Fyfe's other work is "The Fruit of the Tree," a clever novel of up-to-date interest, which discusses the problem of the growing distaste of the more intellectual woman to motherhood. It is to be hoped that the effect will be to benefit both mother and child. In "Noel Hamilton's Probation" Friar A. B. Cooper has published a capital story, full of interest and excitement—a vivid

* *We hide our blushing countenance at this warm-hearted tribute.*—Editor.

account of a boy's school days and his progress through life. Friar Tom Burke has published two of his exciting volumes on East End life—"The Outer Circle" and "Whispering Windows." Friar Warwick Deeping gives us two novels—"The House of Adventure" and "Lantern Lane." Friar Silas Hocking has written "An Interrupted Romance," and Friar Joseph Hocking "The Man Who Almost Lost." Friar Ward Muir, whom we are glad to welcome back after a rather severe illness, has written "Crossing Piccadilly Circus." Judging from its title, many romantic adventures may be developed. Friar St. John Adcock gives us a most interesting volume of poetry entitled "Exit Homo"; also "Hyde Park," an anthology. Friar W. H. Helm has written a most interesting work entitled "Homes of the Past," a very handsome volume with fifty-nine illustrations. It describes the middle-class homes from the Norman to the Georgian ages. Friar MacCallum Scott, M.P., is responsible for a book on "Barbary," a description of his recent motor journey through the land of the Moors. Later on, Friar Helm hopes to give us a book describing the occupations, amusements, dress and social habits of the people who lived in such houses as he has described.

We welcome very heartily a new volume from Friar Sir W. Robertson Nicoll, which is entitled "Princes of the Church," and consists of thirty-four biographical sketches which have appeared in the *British Weekly* during the past thirty years. It is a most instructive and elevating volume.

J. S.

ANNUAL REPORT AND BALANCE SHEET, 1921

Fifteen Friars mustered at the Annual Meeting of the Club, held at Anderton's Hotel on Monday, January 23rd. They were: Joseph Shaylor (in the Chair), H. A. Aitken, W. Francis Aitken, W. Gurney Benham, Andrew Boyle, H. Hamilton Fyfe, Cyril Gamon, J. Morgan de Groot, Silas Hocking, A. D. Power (Hon. Treasurer), W. N. Shansfield (Hon. Secretary), Harold Shaylor, Clement K. Shorter, Walter B. Slater, and Robert Sommerville. There was a general feeling that the position and prospects of the Club were thoroughly satisfactory.

The Minutes of the previous Annual Meeting having been read and approved, the Report and Balance Sheet given below were adopted unanimously.

The Committee of the Whitefriars Club have pleasure in reporting that it continues to justify itself, both by attendance and interest. During the year there were ten events, namely, eight Dinners to Club Guests at Anderton's, and the Ladies Dinners in May and at Christmas. The Guests at the first-named gatherings were: Sir Campbell Stuart, Dr. Arthur Keith, Dr. Glover, Lord Leverhulme, Mr. Reginald McKenna, Mr. Stephen Leacock, Mr. Compton Mackenzie and the Rev. Dr. Orchard. The topics discussed were: "Some Aspects of Journalism in Two Hemispheres," "What is Man Becoming?" "Democracy: Athenian or American," "The Human Element in Business," "Our National Finance," "Romanticism and Realism," "Is Civilization Worth Saving." The Guests at the Ladies' Dinner in May were: Miss Clemence Dane, Mr. Alfred Noyes and Mr. St. John Ervine.

The Committee record with deep regret the death of Friar Hugo Vallentin, a man of real literary distinction who made many friendships in the circle.

The following members were elected during the year: C. E. A. Bedwell, A. Cartwright, Irving Gane, Philip J. Risdon, Frank Rutter and R. A. J. Walling.

The Club is greatly indebted to Friar G. B. Burgin for his editorship of the *Journal*, which maintains its unique interest and literary charm.

The Statement of Account to the end of November shows a balance at the bank of £167 0*s.* 5*d.*, as against £136 14*s.* 9*d.* on December 31st, 1920. It follows, however, that as only eleven months are comprehended, the Christmas Dinner is not included in the expenditure. The present arrangement of the Balance Sheet is with the object of reverting to the old plan under which the year was to be reckoned from December 1st to November 30th.

On the motion of Friar Hamilton Fyfe, seconded by Friar Shorter, Friar Power was cordially thanked for his past services, and re-elected Hon. Treasurer.

Friar Sommerville moved, and Friar Morgan de Groot seconded, the re-election of Friar Shansfield as Hon. Secretary, with like thanks for his continued and invaluable work on behalf of the Club. After other endorsements this was similarly carried.

Friar Shansfield proposed a vote of thanks to Friar G. B. Burgin for his conduct of the Club *Journal* with special reference to his art in summarizing the records, and in the presentation of so much that was excellent in the way of original contributions. Friars Shorter and Silas Hocking associated themselves with this vote, which was heartily carried.

Sir Ernest Clarke was elected an Honorary Member of the Club, with an expression of sympathy for him in his long-continued illness.

STATEMENT OF ACCOUNTS, 1921

RECEIPTS

		£	s.	d.
To	Balance at Bank, January 1st, 1921 ...	136	14	9
,,	Subscriptions	238	7	0
,,	Entrance Fees	12	12	0
,,	Interest	4	14	6
,,	Dinner Receipts	55	4	8
		£447	12	11

EXPENDITURE

		£	s.	d.
By	Postage	17	7	6
,,	Stationery, etc.	21	18	6
,,	*Journal*	40	11	9
,,	Rent and Insurance	66	1	0
,,	Dinner Expenses	66	6	4
,,	List of Members	11	15	0
,,	Sundries	7	14	11
,,	Recovering Seats	48	17	6
,,	Balance at Bank, 23rd November, 1921	167	0	5
		£447	12	11

ALGERNON ROSE } *Hon.*
W. B. SLATER } *Auditors*

(*Signed*) A. D. POWER,
Hon. Treasurer.

CLUB NOTES

Here is a poetical tribute to Friar Alexander Paul on his retiring from the editorship of " Progress."

Felicitations, Alexander Paul !
We'll miss you from our Editorial chair
Where now for twelve years you have sat, for there
Your labours have endeared you to us all.
Port Sunlight held you in its loving thrall ;
For you no poet's Auburn was as fair,
As good to look upon. Now must the care
And stress of office on another fall.

On him succeeding you we trust the sun
Of full success may shine, his work may yield
Content, and for his readers he may wield
His pen as happily as you have done.
For you may Life now turn from Prose to Song ;
And may your days, brim-full of joy, be long !

W. Hulme Lever.

Since his retirement into the country, Friar Paul is too seldom seen among us, which is a pity, for he was always one of the most brilliant of what a new member once enviously called " the old gang."

* * * *

The Christmas Lunch, presided over by Friar Joseph Shaylor, was the usual " success of the season," Robert receiving the heartiest applause for an oratorical effort which eclipsed all his previous records. In a charming speech, Friar Clement K. Shorter proposed the health of the Prior, and the Club servants received their annual " tips."

* * * *

It is with the greatest regret that I chronicle the death in February last of Friar Hugo Vallentin. Besides being a very popular Friar, he was well-known and highly esteemed in Swedish circles in London. Formerly the editor of a Swedish newspaper, he came to this country several years ago, his great endeavour always being to promote good relations between Swedes and Englishmen. Swedes coming to London invariably found in him a true guide, full of the best information. He will be much missed by the Swedish colony in London. One of his most notable literary achievements was the translation into Swedish of the plays of Mr. Bernard Shaw.

* * * *

Friar Vallentin had a charming flat within a few doors of the Little Theatre. His study was an old chapel, filled with rare and curious things collected by him in his extensive travels. A few months before his death, half-a-dozen of us lunched at the flat. He was a delightful host and we lingered with him until the afternoon shadows began to fall, after promising to visit him again at an early opportunity. Little did we think that the opportunity would never come again.

* * * *

Though Friars have done many interesting things during 1921, I am sternly forbidden by the Financial Powers to refer to them. This number of the *Journal* (the Reports have been largely curtailed) is a big one, and the printer's bill is likely to be proportionate. In 1922 perhaps—— But let us not " proticipate." " Gents all," as our worthy Toastmaster says, " Gents all, I wish you every felicity during 1922."

G. B. B.

Boyle, Son & Watchurst, Ltd.,
Printers,
8 & 9, Ivy Lane, E.C.4