

We shall be needing increasingly large quantities of raw materials.

You, gentlemen, see the situation much too simply. To be sure, with our vertical trusts we shall be able to speed up our processes of manufacture and thereby reduce our requirements for raw materials. Just now, with our eight hour day and the reduced efficiency of our labor, we have vastly more raw materials and half-manufactured goods in process of fabrication than we used to have. But in addition to that, for instance in our iron and steel industry,

we shall have to produce more, and we shall require more capital with which to produce. Our drafts for payment on our deliveries will not be collected for several months. So we shall inevitably need large sums of ready money. . . .

Everybody who has any brains and influence in Germany must take it upon himself to convince the people that there is no way out of our difficulties except by hard work. But if we are to work, we must naturally have places where we can sell the products of our labor.

## LITERARY LANGUAGE AS A POLITICAL FORCE

BY DR. ARNOLD SCHRÖER

*[The author of this article is Professor of English Language and Literature in the University of Cologne.]*

From *Kölnische Zeitung*, Nov. 11-12

(CONSERVATIVE DAILY, BRITISH OCCUPIED TERRITORY)

By literary language as a political force I mean such an adaptation of language to the needs of civilized mankind that it unconsciously imposes itself even upon people of another tongue, and spontaneously extends its conquests. Language merely as a device for communication is something quite different from this. Persons who do not speak the same tongue often make themselves intelligible to each other in a compromise idiom, and persons who speak different dialects of the same language can understand each other, as, for instance, a peasant from Tyrol and a peasant from East Prussia. Such emergency devices, however, have little in common with language as an

instrument of aesthetic expression. They are occasional, primitive, and obedient to no definite linguistic law. They never set a standard; never invite imitation; never impose themselves upon the mind of a nation.

It is a common impression that the spread of a language is due mainly to its practical utility, especially in business. That is a great error. 'Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.' History teaches us that the immediate practical purposes of speech do not determine the spread of any language. Artificial attempts to extend the use of a language and to impose it upon other nations have seldom suc-

ceeded. On the other hand, a language that responds to the artistic needs of men unconsciously conquers their hearts, wins its way without effort, and irresistibly invites adoption, by virtue of its cultural and æsthetic appeal. If practical business motives determined the use of a language, Volapük, Esperanto, Ido, or some other artificial — mark well, I do not say artistic — compromise tongue would long since have conquered the world and supplanted the cultural languages in daily intercourse. However, their service has always been extremely limited, like that of cable codes and the signals used at sea.

Language in its artistic aspect is not primarily and directly practical. It signifies, first, something that transcends the haste and bustle of business life — an instrument for self-searching and self-interpretation, the holiday garb rather than the working clothes of thought.

Language is more than anything else an expression of national thinking and feeling. It is incomparably more important in this respect than ancestry and race. Therein lies its peculiar significance for the evolution of nations. Ancestry and race are difficult to trace, even in our historical period. We know very little indeed of the different racial strains that in prehistoric times were merged in our western nations, for instance in the ancient Germans. Among the later Germanic races, the English are a mixture of many distinct racial breeds and yet they form a single nation. And it is their language that is the historical evidence of their national tradition. Their language embodies what we express to-day by the current terms 'national culture,' and 'national ideals.' Race is usually a vague concept, and even when it is more or less distinct it retreats after a few generations behind the concept of national

tradition. On the other hand, national culture as we apprehend it through a language — and indeed we can apprehend it distinctly only through language — transcends race and is transferable to every race.

Therefore when people of different race adopt a language, they unconsciously adopt the ancestral traditions, culture, and ideals that go with that language. In other words, language is the great instrument of peaceful conquest. But if a language is to possess this tremendous political and cultural potency it must, as I have tried to point out, possess an artistic quality. It must have attained a degree of development and perfection that makes it a perfect medium of thought and expression. It must be what we ordinarily call a written language, or a literary language; or to put it still more precisely, a living, written language.

The development of a literary language is registered by the lives of the great geniuses who have used that language, and who create literary traditions. While political events may favor or prevent the development of such literary models, on the other hand, the existence of literary masterpieces has a profound influence upon political history. This is illustrated in the expansion of the Kingdom of England into a World Empire.

Let us review briefly the steps in this process.

When the ancestors of the Englishmen of to-day, the Anglo-Saxons, occupied the southern half of Great Britain in the fourth and fifth centuries of our era, partly as peaceful immigrants and partly as warlike invaders, they for many years had a precarious hold upon that country. The northern and western half of Great Britain and all of Ireland were still inhabited by Celts, an alien and enemy race. For several hundred years they were ex-

posed to the constant incursions of the Danes. Those Scandinavian adventurers were, like themselves, of Germanic stock, but throughout the course of history kinship of race has never implied friendship. Our modern racial enthusiasms rest on illusion.

Even after the Norman conquest, which was speedily followed by the political consolidation of the kingdom, England's situation still remained precarious. Her powerful and hereditary enemy, France, lay just across the Channel, and at the beginning of the modern era Spain was mistress of the seas. On her northern border was defiant Scotland, also an hereditary enemy, whose feud with her southern neighbor had been almost unbroken for centuries. So the powerful England of to-day was an insignificant power during the Middle Ages, and down almost to modern times. Indeed, she owes her survival largely to her comparative unimportance, which protected her from the unpleasant attentions of her more powerful Continental neighbors.

England's most dangerous enemy was Scotland, which early made an alliance with France, and down to the eighteenth century served, in the hands of France, to keep England in check. Scotland alone was not particularly dangerous, because the country was constantly rent with domestic controversies; but her country might serve as a convenient base of operations for any invading Power. Had it come to a racial conflict, what would have become of the comparatively small number of Teutons who formed the nucleus of the English people? Celts to the north, Celts to the west, Celts to the south — in France!

But history is made not by races, but by nations — and leaders. History does not deal with racial cultures, but with national cultures. Everything depended on Scotland. If the people of

Scotland had become a Scottish nation, England would have been lost, or at least she never would have become a World Power. But Scotland became an English nation, and not through political conquest, but voluntarily — voluntarily in spite of her many centuries of consistent political enmity for England. She became part of England unconsciously, through peaceful conquest by the English language as a literary language — as an artistic medium.

When, after the death of Queen Elizabeth in 1603, Mary Stuart's son, the Scotch King James the Sixth, ascended the English throne as next of kin and transferred his capital to the banks of the Thames, England's hereditary enemy on the north fell like a ripe apple into her lap. That would have been inconceivable had not Scotland been passing through a slow period of Anglicization for many years. In spite of hereditary enmity, and in spite of local patriotism, the Scotch had watched their southern neighbor with covert envy and secret admiration. This admiration was for England's superior culture, which had developed steadily and harmoniously, uncontaminated by foreign influences; and the medium through which they became cognizant of this culture was the English language.

At a very early period, ever since the tenth century, Celtic-speaking Scotland had ruled over the border territory — still known as the Scottish Lowlands — where the present capital of Edinburgh is situated. But at a still earlier date this territory had belonged to one of the southern English kingdoms, and its people spoke English. This Scotch, but English-speaking, border territory, thanks to its superior English culture, became the heart and centre of Scotland's political realm. At that time, people knew nothing about race and had even less realization of the influence that language exercises over political

conditions. The people thought of themselves as Scotchmen. They hated England, though they spoke English. Gentlemen at the Scottish Court laughed at their own Celtic-speaking backwoodsmen, the Highlanders, and felt immeasurably superior to them. To be sure, they themselves spoke a North English dialect, different from that of the English Court, but they called that dialect English.

This northern dialect — which was also spoken in the northern districts of England proper as well as throughout the Lowlands — differed from the South English spoken at the English Court almost as much as the language of Holland differs from the language of Bavaria to-day. It was quite conceivable that a North English nation might grow up side by side with a South English nation, with a language and culture as distinct from that of the latter as the language and culture of Holland are different from those of Bavaria. We can easily imagine what effect this would have had upon England's future expansion.

Right here a history-making linguistic phenomenon occurred. A miracle of language happened at the capital of England. Speech blossomed into art. In the second half of the fourteenth century the greatest poet of the English Middle Ages appeared, Geoffrey Chaucer. England thereby gained a literary language that gradually unified the whole nation. Scotland was not so blessed. Not only did England thereby attain earlier linguistic unity through her literary language supplanting her local dialects, but this literary medium soon began to make headway in Scotland itself. The North-English-speaking-and-writing Scots began spontaneously to copy the new born English literary speech, because they were irresistibly attracted by the charm of English literature and influenced by it.

So the London speech and poetry of Geoffrey Chaucer and his school conquered Scotland.

During the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, when political hostility between Scotland and England was most intense and when the native poetry of Scotland flourished as never before, the language of the North was rapidly becoming assimilated with the language of the South.

Naturally there was more than language alone involved in this. Many cultural elements and common ideals had already prepared the ground in Scotland for the reception of the literary tongue. But the latter was, and continued to be, the most significant expression of the community of culture developing in the two countries.

During the period of spiritual and religious ferment that followed the Reformation, this process of linguistic fusion was completed. Language as an art was found to cover a broader field than belles lettres and poetry. The thoughts that had the deepest hold upon the hearts and feelings of the people — their religious sentiments and convictions — were struggling on every hand for expression, and they expressed themselves in English.

The influence of the language of religion upon the development and the dissemination of the written tongue among the rank and file of the people cannot be overestimated. The anxious longings of troubled human hearts, almost unutterable and inexpressible, had long since acquired symbolical substance in the traditional forms of religious liturgies, which had left their indelible imprint upon the old and young, the humble and the exalted, through centuries, and had perpetuated in unchanging language the loftiest forms of thought. During the Reformation the venerated liturgical formulæ of the old Church were given an English version,

inspired with the fervent religious passion of the age, and in this popular garb, that even the common man could comprehend, they exercised an all-powerful influence upon the ideals of the nation, the effects of which continue even to-day. John Knox, the great Scotch reformer and pulpit orator, could not repudiate his Scottish blood nor did he desire to do so, but he wrote in English, for both Englishmen and Scotchmen. The mighty pulsating life of his age knew no territorial boundaries in the religious field, and Scotland was carried along with the same spiritual flood that stirred from the depths her neighbor on the south.

Just at this critical period, English literature blossomed in the Golden Age of Spenser and Shakespeare. . . . The glory of their era threw into the shade whatever had preceded it in England, and all that Scotland had produced. The latter country thus became in a sense an intellectual province of England. Its written language, as a separate variety of speech, ceased to exist long before the countries became one through personal union under James the First. After that event the literary men of Scotland gradually followed their monarch to London, where they devoted themselves to imitating the models of their adopted country.

The linguistic union of England and Scotland was an indispensable prerequisite for England's expansion into a great Power and eventually into a World Empire.

We witness the same process in the case of England's Colonies, and partic-

ularly in North America. The United States separated from the mother country after a bitter war. Since then the two nations have at times been political enemies. There still exist, and probably will exist in the future, economic causes of controversy and political differences between them, and likewise between England and her Dominions. But the cultural connection between these countries has never been broken, and their common language and common literature give them a common attitude toward life and toward the world, in spite of all their temporary and local differences.

If the culture and the ideals of a great nation do not possess an intrinsic value that wins the voluntary assent and allegiance of other nations, they neither can nor ought to prevail over them.

It is no longer possible for other languages to compete on equal terms with a civilized tongue that is already spoken by 170,000,000 human beings, that is the political binder which cements into a governmental whole 320,000,000 subjects of the Anglo-Saxon Powers, and that affords them their only access to higher culture. The posterity of smaller nations can never overtake in numbers the descendants of 170,000,000 members of a vigorous and growing race. And it is language as an art, as a literary medium, that will for all time to come bind these multiplying multitudes together. Let us hope, in the interest of humanity, it will also lead them toward constantly higher levels of civilization.

# RELIGION AND REVOLUTION IN CHINA

BY HENRY RUDYÈS

From *Clarté*, November 15  
(PARIS RADICAL PACIFIST WEEKLY)

WE are wont to think of China as a compact block of several hundred million human beings speaking the same language and possessing the same civilization — what we call Oriental civilization. Our scholars have taught us to regard this civilization as an immortal Byzantinism. Our missionaries have encouraged us in believing that they go forth to China to civilize barbarians. But we know at last that this great heart of Asia is palpitating with the stress and struggle of a mighty awakening. We know that Europe's monstrous error, the Great War, and the doctrine of Bolshevism spreading eastward through Siberia have thrilled this ancient Orient with the hope of a speedy resurrection.

However, distance still draws her veil of mystery across the picture. Let us, therefore, examine the fixed habits of thought and belief that this new revival must encounter. This aspect of the world-wide problem of revolution, as it presents itself in China, is the more important since her social changes for the moment manifest themselves less markedly in the domain of politics than in the domain of morals and ideals.

Wherever Chinese civilization exists — and it extends far beyond the frontiers of the old Middle Empire — all education begins with the study of the 'Four Classical Books,' which contain the moral teaching of Confucius. The thought of this master, who lived five centuries before Jesus Christ, has exercised an influence over the Chinese comparable only with the influence that

the Bible has exercised over the Protestant countries of Europe and America. This doctrine embalms the essential principles of Chinese civilization as it existed more than twenty centuries ago, and it has established ethical standards so perfectly meeting the wants of the Chinese people that they have until recently been considered final. The manuals of Confucius were the only books that escaped the universal destruction of literature ordered by the Emperor Hwang-ti about 221 B.C. Consequently, his writings have become practically the sole repository of China's ancient wisdom, an oracle handed down from the venerable past.

Confucian ethics are exclusively social. All else is subordinated to the primary purpose of establishing order and harmony throughout the vast territories of the Middle Empire.

What does Confucius say to his sovereign? You are the head of the nation. You have a mission to fulfill. If you are not faithful to that mission, resign; for you must be replaced by one better qualified. That will be the punishment the people will inflict upon you for the misery they endure through your evil administration. A sovereign should not reign except for the welfare of his people. On the other hand, the people should obey their sovereign and regard him as 'their father and their mother.' Why should there be wars? Do you wish to conquer foreign nations? A wise government will draw these nations willingly within the boundaries of your Empire. Govern well, and you